DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIFTH SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

11-12 GEORGE V, 1921

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1000 Volume II: Pages 1001-2026
Volume III: Pages 2027-3003 Volume IV: Pages 3005-4040
Volume V: Pages 4041-4580

VOLUME CXLVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF MARCH, 1921, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1921

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

DOMINION OF CANADA

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE ARTHUR MEIGHEN,

P.C., K.C., B.A.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1921

THE MINISTRY

Prime Minister, and Secretary of State for External Affairs	Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN, P.C., K.C., B.A.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. SIR GEORGE EULAS FOSTER, P.C., G.C.M.G., B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General	Rt. Hon. CHARLES JOSEPH DOHERTY, P.C., K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. JOHN DOWSLEY REID, M.D.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. SIR ALBERT EDWARD KEMP, K.C.M.G.
Minister of the Interior, Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Minister of Mines and Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Hon. SIR JAMES ALEXANDER LOUGHEED, K.C.M.G., K.C.
Postmaster General	Hon. PIERRE EDOUARD BLONDIN.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. CHARLES COLQUHOUN BALLANTYNE.
Secretary of State	Vacant.
Minister of Immigration and Colonization; President of the Privy Council, and Minister in charge of the Department of Health	Hon. JAMES ALEXANDER CALDER.
Minister of Labour	Hon. GIDEON DECKER ROBERTSON.
Minister of Militia and Defence and acting Solicitor General	Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE, K.C.
Minister of Finance and Acting Secretary of State	Hon. SIR HENRY LUMLEY DRAYTON, K.C., Kt.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. SIMON FRASER TOLMIE
Minister of Public Works	Hon. FLEMING BLANCHARD MCCURDY.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. EDGAR KEITH SPINNEY.
Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue	Hon. RUPERT WILSON WIGMORE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, K.C., B.A., LL.B.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees ..... George H. Boivin, K.C., B.A.

Clerk of the House ..... W. B. Northrup, K.C., M.A.

Assistant Clerk ..... Arthur Beauchesne, K.C., B.A.

Serjeant-at-Arms ..... Lieutenant-Colonel H. W. Bowie.

Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms ..... L. C. Panet.

*Editor of Debates ..... A. C. Campbell.

Associate Editor of Debates ..... George Simpson.

Official Reporters of Debates:—

English: Earl C. Young, F. W. S. Galbraith, H. E. Oliver, W. H. Dickson, Frederick Berryman, T. S. Hubbard, M. F. Johnston.

French: Marcel Gabard, J. H. Mackay.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES:

Messieurs: Ballantyne, Chabot, Devlin, Elkin, Foster (Sir George), Hocken, Kay, Lemieux, McKenzie, Marcil (Bonaventure), Munson, Richardson, Rinfret.

Chairman: R. L. Richardson.

* Thomas P. Owens, Editor of Debates, died February 24, 1921.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fifth Session—Thirteenth Parliament

1921

ALLAN, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg, S. Riding.
* AMES, SIR HERBERT BROWN, Kt.—St. Antoine.
ANDERSON, ROBERT KING—Halton.
ANDREWS, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg Centre.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Verchères.
ARGUE, IRA EUGENE—Swift Current.
ARMSTRONG, JOHN A. MACDONALD—York, N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH EMMANUEL—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead.
BALLANTYNE, HON. CHARLES COLQUHOUN—St. Lawrence-St. George.
BALL, ROBERT JAMES—Grey, Southeast Riding.
BÉLAND, HON. HENRI SEVERIN—Beauce.
BEST, JOHN—Dufferin.
BLAIR, WILLIAM JOHN—Battle River.
BLAKE, MATTHEW ROBERT—Winnipeg, N. Riding.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.
BOLTON, FERRIS—Lisgar.
BONNELL, SAUL—Kootenay, E. Riding.
BORDEN, RT. HON. SIR ROBERT LAIRD, G.C.M.G—King's (N.S.)
BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Levis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, N. Riding.
BOYCE, GEORGE—Carleton.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRIEN, JOHN WESLEY—Essex, S. Riding.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BROUILLARD, JOSEPH OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASBURY—Lethbridge.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BUTTS, ROBERT H.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

CAHILL, FRANK S.—Pontiac.
CALDER, HON. JAMES ALEXANDER—Moosejaw.
CALDWELL, THOMAS W.—Victoria and Carleton (N.B.)
CAMPBELL, J. A.—Nelson.
CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.
CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANCOIS—Charlevoix-Montmorency.
CASSELMAN, ORREN D.—Dundas.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, WILLIAM A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Alberni.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
COOPER, RICHARD CLIVE—Vancouver, S. Riding.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmoreland.
COWAN, WALTER DAVY—Regina.
CRERAR, HON. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.
CRONYN, HUME—London.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CROWE, SANFORD JOHNSTON—Burrard.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

d'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAUS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.
DAVIDSON, AVARD LONGLEY—Digby and Annapolis.
DAVIS, FRED LANGDON—Neepawa.
DÉCHÊNE, AIMÉ MIVILLE—Montmagny.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS MARIE JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.
DENIS, JEAN J.—Joliette.
DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.
DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.
* DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, RT. HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—St. Ann.

* Resigned, 14th February, 1921.
* Died, August 30, 1921.

DOUGLAS, JAMES McCRIE—Strathcona.
DOUGLAS, JOHN C.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.
DRAYTON, HON. SIR HENRY, Kt.—Kingston.
DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenburg.
DUTREMBLAY, PAMPHILE RÉAL—Laurier-Outremont.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELKIN, STANLEY EDWARD—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.
EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.

FAFARD, J. FERNAND—L'Islet.
FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queens.
FINLEY, ALBERT ERNEST—Souris.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADELARD—Labelle.
FOSTER, RT. HON. SIR GEORGE EULAS, G.C.M.G.—Toronto, N. Riding.
FOSTER, THOMAS—York, E. Riding.
FOURNIER, C. A.—Bellechasse.
FRASER, EVAN E.—Welland.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.
FULTON, FREDERICK JOHN—Cariboo.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH—St. Hyacinthe-Rouville.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERVAIS, THÉODORE—Berthier.
GLASS, SAMUEL FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GORDON, GEORGE NEWCOMBE—Peterborough, W. Riding.
GOULD, OLIVER ROBERT—Assiniboia.
GREEN, ROBERT FRANCIS—Kootenay, W. Riding.
GRIESBACH, WILLIAM ANTROBUS—Edmonton, W. Riding.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALBERT, ROBERT H.—Ontario, N. Riding.
HALLADAY, HOWARD H.—Bow River.
HAROLD, JOHN—Brant.
HARRISON, CHARLES ROBERT—Nipissing.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAY, THOMAS—Selkirk.
HENDERS, RICHARD COE—Macdonald.
HEPBURN, WILLIAM BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, W. Riding.
* HUGHES, HON. SIR SAM, K.C.B.—Victoria.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERIC—Missisquoi.
KEEFER, FRANCIS HENRY—Port Arthur and Kenora.
KEMP, HON. SIR EDWARD, K.C.M.G.—Toronto, East.
KENNEDY, JOHN WILFRED—Glengarry and Stormont.
KENNEDY, WILLIAM COSTELLO—Essex, N. Riding.
KING, HON. W. L. MACKENZIE—Prince (P.E.I.)
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.

LAFORTUNE, DAVID ARTHUR—Jacques Cartier.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
LANG, NORMAN—Humboldt.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Québec East.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec county.
LEDUC, J. ALFRED—Westmount-St. Henry.
LEGER, AUGUSTE THÉOPHILE—Kent (N.B.)
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Maisonneuve-Gaspé.
LESAGE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Hochelaga.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland (N.B.)
LONG, CHARLES EDWIN—North Battleford.

MACKELVIE, JOHN A.—Yale.
MACKIE, HENRY ARTHUR—Edmonton, E. Riding.
MACKIE, HERBERT J.—Renfrew, N. Riding.
MACLEAN, HON. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent (O.)
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, HON. FLEMING BLANCHARD—Colchester.
MCDERMAND, SYDNEY S.—Elgin, E. Riding.
MCDONALD, ANGUS—Timiskaming.
MCGIBBON, PETER—Muskoka.
MCGIBBON, PETER ROBT.—Argenteuil.
MCGREGOR, ALEXANDER—Pictou.
MCINTOSH, JOHN CHARLES—Nanaimo.
MCISAAC, JAMES—Kings (P.E.I.)
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Royal.
†MCLEOD, HARRY FULTON—York-Sunbury.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
§MAHARG, JOHN A.—Maple Creek.
MANION, ROBERT JAMES—Fort William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTIN, PETER FRANCIS—Halifax.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGHEN, RT. HON. ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MEWBURN, HON SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MOWAT, HERBERT MACDONALD—Parkdale.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, Ont.

* Died, August 23, 1921.
† Died, January 7, 1921.
§ Resigned, May 20, 1921.

MURPHY, HON CHARLES—Russell.
MYERS, EDWARD THOMAS WORDEN—Kindersley.

NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queen's (P.E.I.)
NICHOLSON, GEORGE BRECKEN—Algoma, E. Riding.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PECK, CYRUS WESLEY—Skeena.
PEDLOW, ISAAC ELLIS—Renfrew, S. Riding.
PELLETIER, FRANCOIS JEAN—Matane.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, S. Riding.
PREVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

REDMAN, DANIEL LEE—Calgary, E. Riding.
REID, HON. JOHN DOWSLEY—Grenville.
REID, JOHN FLAWS—Mackenzie.
RHODES, HON. EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDSON, ROBERT LORNE—Springfield.
RINFRET, FERNAND—St. James.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Chateauguay-Huntingdon.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.
* ROWELL, HON. NEWTON WESLEY—Durham.

SAVARD, EDMOND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—Waterloo, S. Riding.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SEXSMITH, JOHN ALBERT—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHAW, HUGH MURRAY—Macleod.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, S. Riding.
† SIFTON, RT. HON. ARTHUR LEWIS—Medicine Hat.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Antigonish and Guysborough.
SINCLAIR, JOHN EWEN—Queen's (P.E.I.)
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SPINNEY, HON. EDGAR KEITH—Yarmouth and Clare.
STACEY, FRANK BAINARD—Fraser Valley.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEIN, ADOLPHE—Kamouraska.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver, Centre.
STEWART, JOHN A.—Lanark.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, W. Riding.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon.
THOMPSON, RICHARD FREDERICK—Weyburn.
THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, HON. SIMON FRASER—Victoria (B.C.)
TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.
TREMAIN, HADLEY BROWN—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TUDHOPE, JAMES BROCKETT—Simcoe, E. Riding.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TWEEDIE, THOMAS MITCHELL MARCH—Calgary, W. Riding.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—St. Denis.
VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbinière.

* WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, W. Riding.
WHIDDEN, HOWARD PRIMROSE—Brandon.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria (Alta.)
† WHITE, RT. HON. SIR THOMAS, K.C.M.G.—Leeds.
WIGMORE, RUPERT WILSON—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WILSON, JAMES ROBERT—Saskatoon.
WRIGHT, H. O.—Battleford.

* Resigned, May 31, 1921.
† Died January 21, 1921.

* Died February 20, 1921.
† Resigned, April 6, 1921.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

Constituencies of the House of Commons

Fifth Session—Thirteenth Parliament

1921

ALGOMA EAST—George Brecken Nicholson.
ALGOMA, WEST—Thomas Edward Simpson.
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—John H. Sinclair.
ARGENTEUIL—Robert P. McGibbon.
ASSINIBOIA—Oliver Robert Gould.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Henry Oswald Wright.
BATTLE RIVER—William John Blair.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis Joseph Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—C. A. Fournier.
BERTHIER—Theodore Gervais.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BOW RIVER—Howard Haden Halladay.
BRANDON—Howard Primrose Whidden.
BRANT—John Harold.
BRANTFORD—William Foster Cockshutt.
BROME—Andrew Ross McMaster.
BRUCE, NORTH—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, SOUTH—Reuben E. Truax.
BURRARD—Sandford Johnston Crowe.

CALGARY, EAST—Daniel Lee Redman.
CALGARY, WEST—Thomas Mitchell March Tweedie.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—John C. Douglas, Robert H. Butts.
CARIBOO—Frederick John Fulton.
CARLETON—George Boyce.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Joseph Archambault.
CHAMPLAIN—Arthur L. Desaulniers.
CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY—Pierre Francois Casgrain.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Edmond Savard.
COLCHESTER—Hon. Fleming Blanchard McCurdy.
COMOX-ALBERNI—Herbert Sylvester Clements.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Avard Longley Davidson.
DORCHESTER—Lucien Cannon.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John Best.
DUNDAS—Orren D. Casselman.
* DURHAM—Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell.

EDMONTON, EAST—Henry Arthur Mackie.
EDMONTON, WEST—William Antrobus Griesbach.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—Sydney S. McDermand.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—William Costello Kennedy.
ESSEX S. RIDING—John Wesley Brien.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Robert James Manion.
FRASER VALLEY—Frank Bainard Stacey.
FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Samuel William Jacobs.
GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—John Wilfred Kennedy.
GLOUCESTER—Onesiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Robert James Ball.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Hon. A. K. Maclean, Peter Francis Martin.
HALTON—Robert King Anderson.
HAMILTON, E. RIDING—Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn.
HAMILTON, W. RIDING—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley Brown Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thomas Henry Thompson.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Joseph Edmond Lesage.
HULL—Joseph Eloi Fontaine.
HUMBOLDT—Norman Lang.

* Resigned, May 31, 1921.

HURON, N. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—Jonathan Joseph Merner.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—David Arthur Lafortune.
JOLIETTE—Jean J. Denis.

KAMOURASKA—Adolphe Stein.
KENT (N.B.)—Auguste T. Leger.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINDERSLEY—Edward Thomas Wordon Myers.
KING'S (N.S.)—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—James McIsaac.
KINGSTON—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton, Kt.
KOOTENAY, E. RIDING—Saul Bonnell.
KOOTENAY, W. RIDING—Robert Francis Green.

LABELLE—Hyacinthe Adelard Fortier.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph Emmanuel Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK—John A. Stewart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Paul Arthur Séguin.
LAST MOUNTAIN—John Frederick Johnston.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Pamphile Real DuTremblay.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier.
§LEEDS—Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—William James Paul.
LETHBRIDGE—William Ashbury Buchanan.
LEVIS—Joseph Boutin Bourassa.
LINCOLN—James Dew Chaplin.
LISGAR—Ferris Bolton.
L'ISLET—J. Fernand Fafard.
LONDON—Hume Cronyn.
LOTBINIERE—Thomas Vien.
LUNENBURG—William Duff.

MACDONALD—Richard Coe Henders.
MACKENZIE—John Flaws Reid.
MACLEOD—Hugh Murray Shaw.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
* MAPLE CREEK—John Archibald Maharg.
MARQUETTE—Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MATANE—François Jean Pelletier.
† MEDICINE HAT—
MEGANTIC—Lucien Turcotte Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Samuel Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—William Frederic Kay.
MONTMAGNY—Aimè Miville Déchêne.
MOOSEJAW—Hon. James Alexander Calder.
MUSKOKA—Peter McGibbon.

NANAIMO—John Charles McIntosh.
NEEPAWA—Fred Langdon Davis.
NELSON—J. A. Campbell.
NEW WESTMINSTER—William Garland McQuarrie.
NICOLET—Arthur Trahan.
NIPISSING—Charles Robert Harrison.
NORFOLK—William Andrew Charlton.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Charles Edwin Long.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—William S. Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND (ONT.)—Charles Arthur Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Robert A. Halbert.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA—Alfred Ernest Fripp, John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARKDALE—Herbert Macdonald Mowat.
PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Samuel Charters.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Hugh Boulton Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Albert Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—George Newcombe Gordon.
PICTOU—Alexander McGregor.
PONTIAC—Frank S. Cahill.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Francis Henry Keefer.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Andrew Knox.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Bernard Rickart Hepburn.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)—Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC COUNTY—Henri E. Lavigueur.
QUEBEC, EAST—Ernest Lapointe.
QUEBEC, SOUTH—Charles Gavan Power.
QUEBEC, WEST—George Parent.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—Donald Nicholson, John Ewen Sinclair.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—Walter Davy Cowan.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Herbert John Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Isaac Ellis Pedlow.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Pius Michaud.
RICHELIEU—Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel d'Anjou.
ROYAL—Hugh Havelock McLean.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. ANN—Rt. Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty.
ST. ANTOINE—Sir Herbert Brown Ames, Kt.
ST. DENIS—Alphonse Verville.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Louis Joseph Gauthier.
ST. JAMES—Fernand Rinfret.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Stanley Edward Elkin, Hon. Rupert Wilson Wigmore.

§ Resigned, April 6, 1921.
* Resigned, May 20, 1921.
† Robert Gardiner, elected June 27, 1921.

ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—Marie Joseph Demers.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ST. GEORGE—Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
ST. MARY—Hermas Deslauriers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—James Robert Wilson.
SELKIRK—Thomas Hay.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Francis N. McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—James Brockett Tudhope.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—William Alves Boys.
SKEENA—Cyrus Wesley Peck.
SOURIS—Albert Ernest Finley.
SPRINGFIELD—Robert Lorne Richardson.
STANSTEAD—Willis Keith Baldwin.
STRATHCONA—James McCrie Douglas.
SWIFT CURRENT—Ira Eugene Argue.

TÉMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Jules Edouard Prevost.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TIMISKAMING—Angus McDonald.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO, EAST—Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, NORTH—Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, G.C.M.G.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Charles Sheard.
TORONTO, WEST—Horatio Clarence Hocken.

VANCOUVER, CENTRE—Herbert Henry Stevens.
VANCOUVER, SOUTH—Richard Clive Cooper.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA (ALTA.)—William Henry White.
VICTORIA (O.)—Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON (N.B.)—Thomas Wakem Caldwell.
VICTORIA CITY (B.C.)—Hon. Simon Fraser Tolmie.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William D. Euler.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—Evan E. Fraser.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—William Aurelius Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hon. Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon Crooks Wilson.
WESTMORELAND—Arthur Bliss Copp.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRY—Joseph Alfred Leduc.
WEYBURN—Richard Frederick Thompson.
WINNIPEG, CENTRE—George William Andrews.
WINNIPEG, NORTH—Matthew Robert Blake.
WINNIPEG, SOUTH—George William Allan.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.
YALE—John A. MacKelvie.
* YAMASKA—
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Hon. Edgar Keith Spinney.
YORK, E. RIDING—Thomas Foster.
YORK, N. RIDING—John Alexander Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
§ YORK, W. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
† YORK-SUNBURY—
YUKON—Alfred Thompson.

* W. E. E. A. Boucher, elected May 28, 1921.

§ Died February 20, 1921.
† Richard B. Hanson, elected May 28, 1921.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, February 14th, 1921.

FIFTH SESSION, THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 14th day of February, 1921, met this day at Ottawa for the despatch of business.

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

Mr. Speaker read a communication from Mr. O. M. Balfour, Acting Military Secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate Chamber at three p.m., on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

VACANCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that during the recess I received communications from several members, notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz:

Of John Hampden Burnham, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of Peterborough, by resignation.

Of Hon. Rupert Wilson Wigmore, member for the Electoral District of St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Hon. Fleming Blanchard McCurdy, member for the Electoral District of Colchester, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Hon. Martin Burrell, member for the Electoral District of Yale, owing to the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out new writs of election for the said Electoral Districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Chief Electoral Officer has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election and return of the following members, viz:

Of Hon. Rupert Wilson Wigmore, for the Electoral District of St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.

Of Hon. Fleming Blanchard McCurdy, for the Electoral District of Colchester.

Of Sydney Smith McDermand, Esq., for the Electoral District of Elgin East.

Of John Armstrong MacKelvie, Esq., for the Electoral District of Yale.

NEW MEMBERS INTRODUCED

Hon. Fleming Blanchard McCurdy, member for the Electoral District of Colchester, introduced by Right Hon. Sir George Foster and Mr. P. F. Martin.

Hon. Rupert Wilson Wigmore, member for the Electoral District of St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert, introduced by Hon. C. C. Ballantyne and Mr. S. E. Elkin.

Sydney S. McDermand, Esq., member for the Electoral District of East Elgin, introduced by Mr. Michael Clark (Red Deer) and Mr. R. H. Halbert.

John A. MacKelvie, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Yale, introduced by Hon. S. F. Tolmie and Mr. R. F. Green.

OATHS OF OFFICE

Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of Oaths of Office, introduced and read the first time.—Right Hon. Arthur Meighen.

REVISED EDITION

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

On your return to your Parliamentary duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the relative prosperity of the country and its comparative freedom from the feeling of unrest which has agitated countries not so fortunately situated. Following the conditions of expansion due to the war, a period of contraction was inevitable. Restriction of credit involving a certain limitation of production and business has been universal, but this Dominion has been less affected than other countries, and a feeling of confidence prevails. A general reduction of the cost of living has set in, and the country, save in certain limited areas, has been blessed with a bountiful harvest.

In spite of this contraction, the annual revenue of the country has been well maintained, and my advisers considered that certain taxes, imposed in part to check extravagant purchasing, had fulfilled their purpose and might be withdrawn. Accordingly, with a few exceptions, these taxes have been remitted, freeing industry and business and thus promoting employment.

Unemployment, the world-wide result of the conditions to which I have referred, though less widespread in Canada than elsewhere, has received the most anxious consideration. Of the charges for the relief of general unemployment, measures have been taken to bear a substantial share, and special measures have been taken to assist disabled and partially disabled ex-service men. These will be submitted to you for approval.

An investigation is being conducted by the Department of Labour into systems of Unemployment Insurance and Old Age Pensions.

There will be submitted to you for approval the important agreement concluded last year with the Governments of the British West Indian Colonies for the purpose of drawing still closer the trade relations between Canada and these Colonies and of improving the means of communication and intercourse.

The First Assembly of the League of Nations was recently held at Geneva. Representatives of forty-one nations, including those of Canada, met and deliberated together in a spirit of harmony that promises much for this great experiment. Much time was necessarily devoted to the work of organization, but other measures were also agreed upon which are calculated to promote stability and good-will in international intercourse. Most important of these is the draft scheme for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice which will be submitted to you for approval at an early date.

My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs tariff. In order to secure the most complete information a committee has conducted an extensive and thorough inquiry, and has secured the views of all parties and interests in every province. The hearings necessary for this purpose have now been completed, and the conclusions founded thereon will be submitted to you in due course. It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained; but that the Customs duties imposed to that end should be no higher than is essential to ensure good standards of living among our working population and to retain and make possible the normal expansion of the industries in which they find employment.

A Bill for the repeal of the Conservation Act will be submitted to you, there being provision made for carrying on the essential functions of the Commission of Conservation in the appropriate department of the Government. This measure will, therefore, avoid very considerable duplication of services, and permit consequent saving of expense without detriment to the public advantage.

A Bill amending the Dominion Elections Act to provide for necessary revision of the electoral lists applicable to the vote shortly to be held in the province of Ontario respecting the Canada Temperance Act will be submitted to you.

Bills relating to copyrights, the simplification and consolidation of the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and amending Acts, scientific research and other matters will be submitted to you.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts of the last fiscal year will be laid before you. Estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted at an early date, making provision for the various services of government. These have been formed with a view to strict economy, having due regard to the obligations of the country and the exigencies of the public service, and any possible contraction, following the expansion of the period of the war, has been diligently sought.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In inviting your careful consideration of the important matters which will engage your attention, I pray that Divine Providence may direct and prosper all your consultations to the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and this Dominion.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move, seconded by Sir George Foster:

That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Tuesday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Stand-

ing Committees of this House under rule 10, said Committee to be composed of Messieurs Reid (Grenville), Calder, McCurdy, Middlebro, King, Lemieux and Crerar, and that that portion of rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS

Report of the Chief Electoral Officer in conformity with the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Speaker.

Joint Report of the Librarians of Parliament.—Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Sergeant-at-Arms, with my approval, has appointed Louis Charles Panet, Esquire, to be his deputy during the present session of Parliament.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to present a communication from His Excellency the Governor General approving a minute of the Privy Council appointing Right Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice; Hon. J. D. Reid, Minister of Railways and Canals; Hon. J. A. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonization and President of the Privy Council; and Hon. E. K. Spinney, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, entitled "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

On motion of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; Annual Report of the Department of Naval Service.—Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works.—Hon. F. B. McCurdy.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED MEMBERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire, and I think the House would wish me to do so, to make some reference to the vacancies that have occurred in our midst by death since we last met together. The number whose loss we have to lament on this occasion is even larger than is usually the case, although seldom it is that we meet in these halls without having to lament the taking away of some of our numbers.

The first to whom I wish to refer is the late member for the electoral division of Medicine Hat, and Secretary of State, the Right Hon. Mr. Sifton. Mr. Sifton's services to his country were in a larger variety of fields and in posts of uniformly higher dignity than falls to the lot of most public men in Canada. He was first a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories; he was a member of the Territorial Government in the early life of that country; and subsequently was Chief Justice of the Northwest Territories. Following upon that and an intervening period during which he engaged in the practice of law, he again became Chief Justice of Alberta, and after that was Premier of his province. From that post of distinction he came to this House some three years and a half ago and has occupied three positions in the Cabinet of Canada, all with acceptability—indeed, with distinction. The dominant—or, at least, the most outstanding—characteristic of Mr. Sifton was the swiftness and directness of his intellect, the capacity he had for reaching to the centre of a problem at first grasp, and of coming to his conclusions surely and firmly and almost invariably correctly. In this House he was not often heard, and that was a matter of regret, I am sure, to us all; but when he spoke, what he said was a contribution to any discussion in which he took part. It was in the Council Chamber that he displayed his talents to the best advantage; it was there that the virility and energy of his mind stood out in such striking contrast to the quietness of his disposition and demeanour. I am sure I am only voicing the sentiments of all of us when I say that Canada has lost a distinguished servant and that his Colleagues have lost an able and most agreeable companion and co-worker.

The next hon. gentleman to whom I would refer is the late member for Yamaska, Mr. Gladu. With him I came less personally in contact, he being on the other side of the House, and not commingling here as much as some; but it was my duty and my pleasure

to read many of his speeches. I can well recall one of them in particular, delivered, I think, something over ten years ago, in which the grace and elegance of his diction was very clearly and impressively reflected, even in the English translation. He enjoyed that capacity of which so many of his race are possessed—of clear, forceful and easy expression; and I am sure all of us will agree that he was a distinct acquisition to Parliament and will mourn sincerely his loss.

Colonel Harry McLeod has also been taken away since last we met here. The member for York-Sunbury, too, served his country in more fields than one. For some years he represented a constituency in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, and for a short time he was a minister in the Government of that province. His interests were, perhaps, as much in the military field as in the political field. He was a student of military tactics and military matters generally, and attended manoeuvres in this and in other countries for purposes of study—and, indeed, in the late war, served in the fields of Europe. In this House he had, I think, more than the usual number of close friends, attracted to him by that quality of loyalty to his friends which all of us admire so much. His contributions to parliamentary discussions were not many; but they were valuable, and as a man chiefly and as a parliamentarian as well, we are sorry we shall see him no more here.

The mutations of time affect the complexion of every institution in the world; the hut of the poor and the palace of the rich are not exempt, nor is the hall of Parliament; the energy and usefulness of this House rest not only on the fidelity of its present members, but on the memory and virtues of those who have gone.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to join with my right hon. friend in paying a tribute to the memory of our deceased colleagues and in expressing the sympathy which this House as a unit will feel with the relatives and friends of the deceased members. As my right hon. friend has just said, the vacant places which greet us at the meeting of Parliament as we reassemble from year to year are more expressive in their mute eloquence than any words we are capable of uttering on an occasion such as this. But while our words are necessarily few, our sense of personal loss is very real and our sympathy for those who have been bereaved is deep and sincere.

In view of what my right hon. friend has already said of the hon. members who until but yesterday were to be numbered amongst his supporters, but little remains to be added by way of personal tribute to their memories. Both of them, as he has mentioned, were gentlemen who had played an important part not only in the public life of their respective provinces, but in the larger arena of federal politics and, indeed, in the still wider arena of world affairs.

The late Right Hon. Arthur Sifton's life was associated with the upbuilding of our Canadian West, in which he had lived for considerably over half a century. As a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories and as Commissioner of Works in the Haultain ministry, and later as Chief Justice and Prime Minister of the province of Alberta, he was permitted to play an exceptional part in laying the foundations of constitutional government in Western Canada. That he did so in a manner which will be an enduring monument to his ability is perhaps the highest tribute that could be paid to his memory. As my right hon. friend has said, we heard his voice but little in this House. Through ill-health he was prevented from taking much part in the affairs of this Parliament; but he was privileged to take a part in international transactions of the greatest magnitude, and in so doing to add further distinction to his own name and to that of his province.

The late hon. member for York-Sunbury, Colonel McLeod, had a career not altogether dissimilar, though cut prematurely short by ill-health consequent upon services rendered to his country overseas. Like the late Secretary of State, he was a distinguished member of the legal profession. Before entering this Parliament, he had been actively identified with the affairs of his province as a member of the local legislature and also as a member of the Government. When the war broke out, he raised a regiment in his native province and crossed the seas on active service in Europe with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. A life of such disinterested and patriotic public service speaks for itself.

Of the three members whose decease we deplore, the late hon. member for Yamaska, Mr. Oscar Gladu, had the longest association with this House. He was first returned to Parliament in 1904 and was re-elected in 1908. He was defeated at the general

elections of 1911, but was re-elected in 1917. It is true that he did not take a large part in the way of official position, but he nevertheless was actively identified with the political events of his province and of this country. He was essentially a tribune of the people and he spent his life in advocating their cause and espousing the principles of Liberalism for which he stood. Few men in Canadian public life have possessed in larger measure than Mr. Gladu the talent of popular oratory, the power to sway masses of men by the spoken word, and his gift in that direction has left for him an abiding place in the memory and affections of the people. To those of us on this side of the House who knew him intimately, he will ever be remembered as the most ardent of Liberals, the most loyal of supporters, and the most genial and devoted of friends.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY MOVED BY MR. JAMES McISAAC AND SECONDED BY MR. J. A. MacKELVIE

The House proceeded to the consideration of the speech of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the Session.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings P.E.I.) moved:

> That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of King's, I sincerely thank the Prime Minister for selecting their representative to move the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Highly as I appreciate the honour thus conferred, I am fully conscious of the importance and responsibility of the task, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I approach it with considerable diffidence and some trepidation of heart. I realize that the mover of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the parliamentary session, from one year to another, occupies a unique position; he enjoys much freedom in blazing his own trail and developing, in his own way, the theme of his discourse, and under your wise guidance is, to a very great degree, immune from the danger of trangressing the ordinary rules of Parliamentary debate. He is at liberty indeed to "pursue things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme." But this very freedom, this immunity, may constitute his difficulty and his danger. He may, perhaps, incline to too great reticence on the one hand or too great extravagance on the other. It is, therefore, the part of wisdom to adopt a middle course, for, as it is very concisely expressed in the Latin tongue, "medio tutissimus ibis."

Mr. Speaker, before referring to any of the important matters contained in the Speech from the Throne, I desire to tender my cordial congratulations to the right honourable leader of the House on his elevation to the important, exalted and honourable position of leader of the Government, and Prime Minister of the nation. The office of Prime Minister of Canada at any time requires talents and statesmanship of the very highest order; but at the present time, when so many onerous, difficult and intricate public questions present themselves, the need for intellectuality, wisdom and prudence is accentuated. These qualities, I believe, our Prime Minister amply possesses. In this connection I cannot refrain from giving expression to a thought that presses upon my mind, I wish to pay my profound tribute of respect and admiration for the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who led the Government of Canada safely and well through the dark and never-to-be-forgotten days of the world's tragedy, and who for our sakes, by his devotion to duty and self sacrifice for the exaltation of his country, has become a casualty of the war.

In the speech from the Throne it is stated:

> On your return to your Parliamentary duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the relative prosperity of the country and its comparative freedom from the feeling of unrest which has agitated countries not so fortunately situated. Following the conditions of expansion due to the war, a period of contraction was inevitable. Restriction of credit involving a certain limitation of production and business has been universal, but this Dominion has been less affected than other countries, and a feeling of confidence prevails. A general reduction of the cost of living has set in, and the country, save in certain limited areas, has been blessed with a bountiful harvest.

But, Mr. Speaker, what Canada has accomplished in the period following the war up to the present is in a sense not less remarkable than her marvelous achievements during that titantic struggle. By reason of the Government's wise and provident financial management during the war period, as well as by reason of increased production and rising war prices, the finances of the country were greatly augmented, and as a consequence Canada

emerged from the war in an exceedingly strong position industrially and financially. Our bank deposits had increased enormously, and by far the greater part of our loans was held by our own people, whose savings they represented. But scarcely had the armistice been signed when new and onerous obligations confronted the Government. The problems of demobilization, reconstruction and rehabilitation generally, had to be grappled with and solved. Industries in many instances had become dislocated, and in not a few cases the arteries of commerce had been destroyed or seriously impaired. All these problems, and many more, confronted the Government. Enormous sums of money had to be found to meet the interest on the war debt, for pensions to the wounded and maimed returned soldiers, and for the dependents of those who fell in the country's cause. These numerous and perplexing problems required the immediate attention of the ministry and had to be dealt with concurrently with the ordinary business of government. An era of extravagance and abnormality had set in, and a thousand and one circumstances intervened to render still more arduous the conduct of public business. When we bear these facts in mind, it is a source of extreme satisfaction to know that Canada has been able to be more generous in her military pensions than any other country in the world. She has met all her war obligations generously and promptly, and in that respect stands to-day in an enviable position as compared with any of the allied or associate nations. Her trade, manufactures, and banking business have all been splendidly sustained. The assets of Canadian banks amount to more than two-and-a-half billion dollars, and our national wealth per capita, based on bank figures, is $2,500, as compared with $2,400 in the United States is only $65.80 per head. investment in Victory bonds of $86, while the investment in Liberty bonds in the United States is only $65.80 per head. Canada leads the world in her per capita production of food material, and we still have 441 million acres of untilled arable land. Canada's foreign trade amounts to about $300 per head of population, whereas the per capita proportion of the foreign trade of the United States is only $87.

Canada does more business per capita than any other country in the world, and was the only country that maintained uninterrupted transcontinental transportation during the war. She has her own steamships on all trade routes of the seas. According to population, she leads all countries in transportation facilities, having one mile of railway for every 218 persons. Our nearest competitor is the United States, and that country has only one mile of railway for every 404 inhabitants. The transition period has set in, and the trend towards contraction is inevitable, but in this, as in other respects, we may confidently hope that Canada will be less affected than other countries, and that she will proceed by gradual steps towards a normal and permanent trade basis.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I referred to Canada's transportation development. I instanced the fact that she had her own steamships on all the trade routes of the seas. I wish to develop this point a little more. We who have been brought up by the sounding sea and whose ears have been early attuned to the thunder of its surge, are perhaps somewhat like Byron's Childe Harold—we love the ocean and find music in its roar. To turn from the sea and speak of the ships that sail thereon is simple and natural. I wish to refer to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. This enterprise was inaugurated by the Government under the immediate direction of the Hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) during the war period, when it was very difficult, if not impossible, to procure ships to connect with our railways in order to transport our products abroad. The enterprise had scarcely been started when it was confronted with a serious handicap. Steel shapes and plates for these ships had to come from American firms, and were supplied only when it suited the manufacturers. This caused long and annoying delays in the construction of Canadian steamships. To overcome this difficulty the Government of Canada, through the Minister of Marine, entered into an arrangement with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, at Sydney, Cape Breton, to establish a rolling-mill plant, with a capacity of 50,000 square feet of plate per day. In consequence of this arrangement, the building of the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine was rapidly advanced, and now a great fleet of splendid Canadian ships, built from Canadian material, by Canadian workmen, in Canadian yards, and manned by Canadian officers and men. sail the seas of the world, and some of them have already circumnavigated the globe.

These great argosies bear away to our antipodean cousins under the Southern Cross; to the distant East and to all corners of the civilized world, Canada's natural and manufactured products. Each one of these ships has incorporated as an affix to its name the word "Canadian", and all fly the white Canadian ensign. Apart altogether, Mr. Speaker, from the splendid part they play in Canadian transportation service, they constitute the grandest and most widely extended advertisement for Canada that could be conceived. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a national transportation enterprise for which the Government and the Minister of Marine deserve the sincere thanks of all Canadians. The speech from the throne refers to the matter of tariff revision as follows:

My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs tariff. In order to secure the most complete information a Committee has conducted an extensive and thorough inquiry, and has secured the views of all parties and interests in every Province. The hearings necessary for this purpose have now been completed, and the conclusions founded thereon will be submitted to you in due course. It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained; but that the Customs duties imposed to that end should be no higher than is essential to ensure good standards of living among our working population and to retain and make possible the normal expansion of the industry in which they find employment.

Mr. Speaker, the declaration set forth in this paragraph of the Speech indicates quite clearly the intention of the Government in relation to the tariff. A customs tariff such as we have in this country, of necessity requires revision from time to time. Changes in trade conditions, the springing up of new industrial centres, and many other circumstances, of their very nature render such adjustment imperative. In order to have a tariff established on an accurate and scientific basis, revision, following investigation, is necessary. The Government, therefore, acted wisely in appointing a cabinet committee to secure information all over the country. The revised tariff, which will be presented during the session as stated in the Speech, will be based on the principles of the national policy, having for its essential qualities the requirements of revenue and the principle of protection to Canadian labour and Canadian industries, including agriculture. This is the manner of customs tariff inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald, and which has prevailed in Canada for over forty years. Under this tariff, Canada's industries have developed and Canadian workpeople have found abundant and lucrative employment. This tariff assures commercial stability and affords a guarantee of security to investors in new enterprises. Our cities and urban centres have grown great and populous under the ægis of this tariff, and outside capital has sought investment within our national bounds. In consequence of this tariff, no fewer than six hundred branch factories have been established in Canada by American manufacturers, representing a capital investment of approximately $400,000,000 and affording employment to about 87,000 people. Surely a tariff that produces such results as these is the best and the only tariff for Canada, and should be perpetuated.

Mr. Speaker, from whatever view-point we survey the situation at present, in retrospect, or in outlook, the position of Canada must inspire confidence and optimism. Canada has passed through the crucible. She has been tried and has not been found wanting. The great deeds so splendidly achieved within the last six years, in war, in peace, in commerce and in finance, have placed our country in an enviable position and have made her the object of admiration and emulation by sister nations. Her splendid record of the past is sufficient guarantee of her capability to meet all emergencies in the future, but in order to do this Canadians must do their full duty, they must be true to themselves. The great dramatist put into the mouth of Polonius in his address to Laertes these memorable words: "This above all, to thine own self be true." Let Canadians be true to themselves, true to their country, true to the great heritage entrusted to them. Let them exhibit that same spirit of duty, service and sacrifice that characterized them during the dark and never-to-be-forgotten days of the war. Let them cultivate a vigorous and virile national sentiment. Let them stand together united in the bonds of national amity, and then there need be no question of our great nation's marching forward on the road of progress, prosperity and righteousness to the proud position she is destined to attain among the world's great nations.

Mr. JOHN A. MacKELVIE (Yale): Mr. Speaker, while, of course, I appreciate very greatly indeed the high honour that has been extended to the County of Yale in affording me this opportunity of seconding

the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I must confess that I approach the task with a feeling of diffidence bordering almost upon the point of reluctance; for no one can realize better than myself that my inexperience and ignorance of parliamentary procedure and usage may possibly lead me into errors which I would naturally desired to avoid. I feel further handicapped in being called upon to follow a gentleman who in such eloquent periods has so gracefully expressed sentiments which I am sure are concurred in by a large proportion of this House. I fully realize also the extent to which I must suffer in any attempt to hold the attention of this House by reason of the fact that my predecessor in the County of Yale was a gentleman who, I know, often gave expression to sentiments that were couched in the most graceful and forceful language that could enchain the attention of an assembly such as this. I sincerely trust, therefore, that hon. members will refrain from any comparison between my language and the utterances that from time to time fell from the lips of the former Secretary of State, the hon. Mr. Martin Burrell, whose retirement from active political life, I may say in passing, has caused very widespread regret throughout Yale, and, I feel sure, in other parts of the Dominion as well; and I believe I am but voicing the sentiments of this House when I say that that gentleman carries with him into his new position such knowledge and literary attainments as must eminently qualify him to fulfil the very high expectations of every member who was associated with him for so long in his valuable services in this House.

At this juncture, Sir, perhaps I may be permitted to express the very great satisfaction entertained in the West, and more particuarly in British Columbia, over the fact that another Western man has succeeded to the portfolio of Agriculture, at one time held by Mr. Burrell; and we, Sir, consider it a matter for great congratulation that the interests of our two great basic industries in Yale, farming and fruit growing are now in the experienced and capable hands of Hon. Dr. Tolmie, and will be under such competent and I know, succesful guidance.

It is for me a matter of personal inclination and a duty which I owe to a large section of my constituents to express in very sincere, but I fear very inadequate terms the sense—the deep sense—of appreciation that our people feel over the exaltation to the highest office in the gift of Canada of the Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen, whose clear-cut and forceful exposition of his policy as regards fiscal and other issues, during his tour of the West, gave very complete satisfaction indeed to the great majority of the constituency which I represent. In passing let me say that that constituency of Yale is perhaps one of the largest in the Dominion and as big, I suppose, as any five eastern counties. Its basic industries, as I have already intimated, are those of agriculture and horticulture; and you can realize, Sir, what satisfaction and what relief it afforded the men engaged in those activities to hear during the Prime Minister's tour through the constituency such unequivocal and lucid expressions as he uttered regarding the tariff in particular.

After listening to the very able and very comprehensive review of the Speech from the Throne which the mover has presented I feel that there is but little of interest or value to this House that I may be able to add. It is, apparent, I suppose, to all of us that these are times of particular strain and stress. We are passing through a period of unparalleled uncertainty and unrest. Wherever, outside this favoured country of Canada, we turn our eyes our vision seems darkened and disturbed by scenes of distress, poverty, and agitation of all kinds. For years to come, perhaps, it will be a matter of great difficulty for this old world of ours to shake itself down to a position at all approaching stability. War and carnage still stalk through a large portion of Europe. Turbulent agitators taking advantage of the times, are strenuously, actively and continually engaged in an attempt to guide men's minds into channels of revolutionary intent. I am sorry to say also that an active, a well conducted, and energetically pursued propaganda of hate and suspicion is being promulgated in order to create strife between labour and capital. These are problems, I suppose, that will require the attention of thinking men for many years to come. I am, Sir, I think, to be classed among the ranks of what we might term reasonable optimists. At least, I have the most profound and abiding faith in the potential greatness and glorious future of this country of ours, and in its manifold and magnificent resources which as yet have not been touched, by way of development, only on the outer fringes. But, nevertheless, I can see that there is a kind of shallow and superficial optimism which seems to be in the habit of closing its eyes

when difficulties or dangers of any kind present themselves, and which is always bound to be unprepared when a crisis or emergency arises. It is against this tendency of the times I think it behoves us all to guard ourselves.

Under such conditions as I have spoken of it is natural, that in Canada as elsewhere, one of the problems to which we have to give earnest consideration is that of unemployment. I am thankful to say that in the constituency which I represent that condition has not, as yet, become a very serious menace—though it is, of course, not entirely absent. I venture to say, Sir, owing to the very wise and very energetic course pursued by the Government in the demobilization of our troops and in the re-establishment of our men in civil life the fact is very largely to be attributed that the condition referred to is not more wide spread and more acute in Canada than is the case to-day. Surely, never was there a young country which staggered under a greater burden of responsibility in regard to measures necessary to re-establish our returned men in some way, and to provide pensions for themselves and the dependents of those who so gloriously and heroically upheld the honour of the nation and of the empire during the terrible period of the war. And surely, Sir, no Government on earth ever approached that problem with a more courageous, determined and sympathetic spirit. As we all know—if we are at all frank with ourselves—marvels have already been accomplished in regard to the re-establishing of our returned men. Of course there have been mistakes, there have been blunders and shortcomings in matters of detail; but I maintain that what has been accomplished constitutes a glorious achievement for Canada. While much still remains to be done I misjudge the temper of this House, and the temper of the citizens of Canada, if we begrudge anything further which can reasonably be done to relieve and assist these men of whom the nation has cause to feel so proud and whose devotion to duty and whose sacrifices have laid a debt upon the country which can never even partially be liquidated by material recompense.

In this connection too, I am glad to note in the Speech from the Throne that consideration is being given to the questions of old age pensions and unemployment insurance. I feel quite certain that the House will approach the consideration of these subjects with very sympathetic feelings knowing, as we all do, that a certain proportion of our population—very often through no fault of their own—labour under disabilities and burdens, and if anything can be done to relieve them it is our duty, I think, to make an effort to do so.

It will be acknowledged, I think, that the ability of this country to meet the obligations thrust upon us by the war, and, consequently, our progress and prosperity, are inseparably wrapped up with the tariff issue. This is a most important matter, and in a constituency such as that which I have the honour to represent, it is indeed a very vital matter. Fruit growing in the Okanagan and elsewhere throughout Yale has now reached a stage where it is become a very important industry. I can recall the days, Sir, probably about twenty years ago, when the first full car of fruit was shipped out of the Okanagan, and it was an occasion for celebration. This year I hope that we will be able to send forth an output of fruit exceeding 5,000 cars. The course towards this phenomenal growth and measure of success has been by no means an easy one. The road we have traversed was full of obstacles and difficulties, which at one time seemed almost insurmountable; and I am firmly convinced that had it not been for the well-advised action of the Borden administration in raising the duty on apples from 13 to 30 cents a box, the industry in the Okanagan to-day would have been almost extinct. I have no desire to enter largely at this time upon a subject which I know is fraught with so many contentious issues, but I know full well that my constituents would consider me a traitor to their interests did I not upon all occasions endeavour to combat with whatever energy in me lies any attempt to reduce or eliminate the duty on fruit, without which protection our industry could not live.

There were times during the lean years in the fruit growing industry when my office used to be invaded time and again by men who came to me for advice and who were in absolute despair. They thought that I was responsible for their coming to that country and investing their all in fruit lands, and perhaps in some instances they were right. Up to 1914 the industry was in such a languishing condition that nothing but ruin seemed to stare these men in the face. South of British Columbia lie the two great fruit-producing States of Washington and Oregon, and extending east of those States

are large and populous American cities affording the orchardists the best possible market for their No. 1 or fancy fruit; and it was their system to sell their fancy grades in that market and to send in their other grades on consignment to our prairie provinces—which are naturally the markets for the Okanagan fruit—at prices which meant ruinous competition for our growers, and which glutted the prairie markets until on some occasions not a box of British Columbia fruit could be sold. It was under these circumstances that the fruit growers of our district approached the Government as I have indicated and were successful in getting the tariff raised. In 1910 the production of fruit in British Columbia amounted to $250,000. By 1919 this had grown to such an extent that out of the Okanagan Valley alone was shipped fruit and its by-products, including canned and evaporated goods, amounting to over $7,000,000—an almost phenomenal growth in something short of ten years, due, as I have said before, to the protection given our industry by the tariff.

Speaking in a general way, Sir, on this tariff question, as far as I myself am concerned I belong to a class who are firmly convinced that the economic safety and prosperity of this Dominion depend upon following a similar course in regard to a protective tariff to that pursued in succession by Conservative, Liberal and Unionist Governments. I belong to a class that have perhaps two fundamental principles in regard to their political creed. First, as regards the larger realm of the British Empire, we believe most firmly in what we consider to be a sane system of Imperialism; we believe in maintaining the closest possible affiliations and associations with the Mother Country, while at the same time leaving Canada absolutely mistress in her own house. And as regards our domestic policy, we conceive that, to say the least, any deviation from the principle which underlies a protective tariff is a course of folly leading straight forward to disaster.

Now, Sir, I have noted some other points upon which I thought I might speak, but I think perhaps, in spite of the kind invitation to extend my remarks, I will not transgress further upon the good nature of the House. But there is just one other point to which I should like to make brief reference, and perhaps it is not altogether the most unimportant topic to which our attention might be directed. The remarks from the mover concerning the "sounding sea," reminded me that I too was privileged during my boyhood days to watch the tide come up the bay of Fundy—and although I saw the bore I did not, I hope, become one in consequence! But I was going to say that it was my privilege then to be associated in that country, which contains a very large French population, with a number of boy friends of that race, and the endearing associations then formed, and the respect and esteem in which I have held the French people ever since, have never been obliterated. I thought it was particularly fortunate that in his first political speech after being raised to the high position of Prime Minister, the leader of the Government expressed himself in such forceful terms on the necessity of fostering in this country every possible sentiment that would tend towards bringing about more amicable relations between the two great races which form the bulk of our population. I think he touched a chord then which must have found a deep response in every true Canadian breast.

I wish to remark in conclusion, that I hope nothing will occur during the course of this Parliament that will even in the very slightest degree tend to create any dissension between the two races. I wish I were capable of expressing the sentiments which I desire to convey in the beautiful French tongue, but I am debarred from that pleasure, and in rougher and less ready language I wish to say that it is my sincere hope that we will all with one accord endeavour to foster and stimulate everything tending towards an increase of amicable relations and deeper friendship between the two races, until in fact and in deed the time may come as far as Canada is concerned when the names French and English are merged into the more general and more comprehensive one of—Canadian.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to extend my congratulations to the hon. members who have just moved and seconded the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure that my hon. friend the member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac) will look upon this as a sort of field day for Prince Edward Island, inasmuch as he and I, comprising half the representation of that province, have been privileged to be the first speakers in this important debate. That his speech was very creditable to himself and to the Island, is, I think, the highest compliment that could be paid him. I hope he will not feel that

I speak at all ironically when I say that, having listened to his poetical quotations and classical allusions, I believe he might have applied to his own speech the words which he quoted from Byron's Childe Harold in reference to the ocean—that there was considerable music in its roar.

I must also congratulate the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) on the speech which he made in seconding the Address. As all hon. members know, this is his maiden speech, and usually the making of one's first speech in Parliament is not an easy matter. All who have had the privilege of listening to his address will, I am sure, feel that in the member for Yale the House has found an acquisition to its debating ability.

With many of the sentiments that have been expressed by both the mover and the seconder of the Address, we on this side of the House are in most hearty accord. There have been on the other hand references to some of the matters spoken of in the Speech from the Throne, there have been references to the present administration, with which I would take issue and which I would discuss at some length if this were the appropriate time and occasion. However, during the course of the debate there will be opportunity to take up matters of the kind.

In one respect, in particular, I find myself in hearty accord with the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne—I join with them in extending congratulations to my Right Honourable friend (Mr. Meighen) upon his attainment of the high and responsible position of Prime Minister.

Perhaps he will permit me to say in public what I have already said to him privately, that on personal grounds it was to me a source both of pride and of pleasure to learn that His Excellency had chosen as his first adviser one who in university days was a fellow undergraduate, and whose friendship, through a quarter of a century, had survived the vicissitudes of time, not excepting the differences of party warfare and acrimonies of political debate.

I realize, in the discharge of our public duties in the opposing positions in which we now stand in virtue of our respective political faiths, there is much that needs to be said that may bring a challenge to all the virtues we possess. I can promise him, however, that in seeking to fulfill the demands of public obligation, I shall strive with him to preserve the highest traditions of our public life, and to be governed in all things by its amenities, and never by its animosities.

Mr. Speaker, if I do not undertake to refer at any length to the Address which His Excellency has presented to the House, I hope it will not be thought of as being in any way discourteous to His Excellency. There is one matter which transcends all others in importance, and that is the present position of the Government and of this Parliament with respect to the will of the people. By what right by what authority, do my right honourable friend and the members of his ministry presume to carry on the Government of this country? That is the question which the Administration must answer to the satisfaction of Parliament and of the country, before consideration can be given to any of the lesser matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Can the will of the people be further ignored, and their rights in matters pertaining to legislation and administration be further usurped?

In the olden days of British history there was a time when the Crown, in order to find out under what authority certain gentlemen throughout the Kingdom exercised the rights and privileges of positions and offices they held, issued to such persons, a writ known as quo warranto, to discover by what right, by what warrant, they held the positions which they occupied. King Edward I served the barons of his day with this writ of quo warranto to discover by what warrant, by what right, they were enjoying certain privileges. Later the Crown made use of the same writ as a means of discovering by what warrant and by what right certain of the chartered cities of England exercised coveted privileges. It was used, I think, by other sovereigns in order to find out by what warrant and by what right certain sheriffs carried on the duties of their office. In the name of the people of this country I should like to ask my right hon. friend, by what warrant, by what right, he attempts to carry on the government of Canada at the present time?

Since we last assembled in this Chamber, changes of far-reaching import and significance have taken place. The Government which was then in power has resigned and a new Government has been formed. In order that the situation may be fairly understood outside this House, may I direct attention to certain facts and circumstances. Since Parliament last assembled every member of the old administration has resigned his position; for the Prime Minis-

ter, in tendering his resignation, tendered also the resignation of every member of his Cabinet. Indeed, there was a time subsequent to the prorogation of Parliament last year—a brief moment it was, of course—when there was no ministry carrying on the government of this country. My right hon. friend selected one colleague on the day that he was sworn in; others he selected some three days later, and others later still.

The ministry which we met when Parliament was last assembled was a Unionist administration. It was a Government that had been formed from each of the historic political parties on a basis of assumed equality in numbers and talent. It was formed with relation to a particular issue arising out of the war which was then in progress. It purported to be a war administration, concerned solely with the successful prosecution and termination of the war and problems incidental thereto. Upon its character, its personnel, and its purpose in these particulars, it made its appeal to the electorate and won the support which returned it to power.

The Government which meets Parliament to-day is an entirely new and different Government. Will my right hon. friend contend that in character his is a Union Government? Will he contend that it is a coalition composed of members of both the old political parties, chosen because they are supposed to be of equality in talent as well as in numbers? Will he contend for a moment that it is a war Government with a mandate from the people of this country to carry on their business? Those are questions which I want my right hon. friend to answer when he rises to address the House. The ministry has, as I have said, changed in character, in personnel, and in purpose from the Government formed in 1917.

Permit me to enlarge for a minute on these several points. As I have already said, the ministry which meets Parliament to-day has an entirely different character from the ministry which we met when Parliament was last assembled. That ministry was a Unionist ministry. My right hon. friend will hardly contend that his ministry is a Unionist ministry. He was the first to destroy the word "Unionist"; he absolutely cut it out of the vocabulary of his Government. He will hardly say that his ministry is composed of the members of the old historic parties. He, almost more than anyone else in this country, has been doing all he can to destroy the reputations of the old political parties and to say that they have outlived their usefulness. Surely he does not believe that any one is deceived as to the character of the present administration through the use of the name "National Liberal and Conservative" which, despite his abuse of the historic parties, he has chosen as that of his administration. Was there ever such a jumble of inconsistencies and insincerities!

My right hon. friend will probably contend that the situation thus created was not dissimilar to situations which arose after the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, when Sir John was succeeded in June, 1891, by Sir John Abbott; when Sir John Thompson succeeded Sir John Abbott in December, 1892; when Sir Mackenzie Bowell succeeded Sir John Thompson in December, 1894; and lastly when Sir Charles Tupper succeeded Sir Mackenzie Bowell in May, 1896. In other words, he will probably contend that in the course of one Parliament one ministry has a right to succeed another as in that period between 1891 and 1896. I presume my right hon. friend will attempt to have the House believe that the succession in office of his ministry to the previous ministry is a case parallel to the cases which I have just mentioned. As a matter of fact, there is no parallel.

The governments of which I have just spoken between 1891 and 1896 were all Tory Governments, holding office by virtue of a policy upon which the electors had passed in March, 1891, in normal times and under normal conditions. They were one in character, in purpose and in aim. The Government which my right hon. friend has formed cannot lay claim to any succession of that kind. The Government which he succeeded was a Unionist Government; the Government that he has formed to-day is a reactionary Tory administration; it is a reversion back to a type of Toryism such as this country has not known for a great many years. Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend will hardly contend that there is anything of a coalitionist character in his administration. The former Government was a coalition Government, or so-called at all events; it pretended to be such; but the Government of my right hon. friend is wholly different in that respect.

One of two alternatives alone is possible. Either the Government of my right hon. friend is, as it purports to be, an entirely new Government, with a new name, a new Prime Minister, a new set of principles

and policies, and the support of a new party, the existence of which remains as yet to be discovered; or it is the soiled remnant and ragged edges of the old Unionist administration which it itself disowns, travelling under counterfeits and aliases, and purporting in all things to be what in reality it is not.

Take whichever alternative you will, the consequence is one and the same. The Government is without authority from the people of this country to conduct its affairs, and stands as a usurper of their political rights even in the eyes of multitudes of those who helped to return to power the previous administration.

But, Sir, lest there should be any doubt as regards the character of the present administration, may I refer to the personnel of the two administrations? It is necessary to do this in order to bring out one of the points which I think it is of importance to bring out, namely, the difference between the basis on which the Government of my right hon. friend was formed and that on which the previous administration was formed. Aliases, disguises and counterfeits aside, the character of the two administrations is to be determined by the respective personnels. Here is a list of the names of those who composed the ministry of the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) at the time that it made its appeal to the people. I think I am in order in quoting the names at this moment:

The Prime Minister, Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden.
Minister of Trade and Commerce, Rt. Hon. Sir Geo. E. Foster.
Minister of Finance, Hon. Sir Thomas White.
Minister of Justice, Hon. Chas. J. Doherty.
Minister of Labour, Hon. T. W. Crothers.
Minister of Railways and Canals, Hon. J. D. Reid.
Minister of Overseas Military Forces, Hon. Sir A. E. Kemp.
Secretary of State, Hon. Martin Burrell.
Postmaster General, Hon. P. E. Blondin.
Minister of Interior, Hon. Arthur Meighen.
Minister of Inland Revenue, Hon. A. Sevigny.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Naval Service, Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.
Minister of Customs, Hon. A. L. Sifton.
Minister of Immigration and Colonisation, Hon. J. A. Calder.
President of Privy Council, Hon. N. W. Rowell.
Minister of Militia, Hon. S. C. Mewburn.
Minister of Agriculture, Hon. T. A. Crerar.
Minister of Public Works, Hon. F. B. Carvell.
Ministers without Portfolio: Hon, Frank Cochrane, Hon. Sir Jas. A. Lougheed, Hon. A. K. Maclean, Hon. G. D. Robertson.
Solicitor General, Hon. Hugh Guthrie.

In looking over that list one is struck first of all by its coalitionist complexion as it was held out in evidence before the people at the time. There were four ministers without portfolio, the Solicitor General adding one more to the ministry. There were eighteen other ministers, seven of whom were chosen from the ranks of the Liberal party. If we add the name of one of the ministers without portfolio, that would mean eight of one complexion politically, and ten of the other, so as to make what the people were led to believe at that time was a sort of fifty-fifty administration. Of those members, the following have ceased to be members of the administration, either through death or resignation:

The late Hon. Frank Cochrane.
Sir Robert Borden.
Hon. Sir Thomas White.
Hon. T. W. Crothers.
Hon. Martin Burrell.
Hon. A. Sevigny.
Hon. T. A. Crerar.
Hon. F. B. Carvell.
Hon. S. C. Mewburn.
Hon. A. K. Maclean.
Hon. N. W. Rowell.
The late Hon. A. L. Sifton.

In other words, twelve of the members of the Administration which went before the country in 1917 have ceased to be members of the present Administration. I am prepared to admit that the personnel might to a limited extent be expected to change with time; but there is this significant point to be noted in connection with the changes that have taken place in the Administration, that for the most part the resignations have been of those hon members who entered the ministry at the time they did because they believed it to be a ministry formed for war purposes, and who joined the ministry to give that Liberal complexion which a real coalition was expected to have. With these hon. gentlemen having resigned from the Government in the numbers they have, I ask my right hon. friend how does he presume to regard his ministry as in any sense a legitimate successor to the one which preceded it?

My right hon. friend in his speeches throughout the country has had a good deal to say about the war record of the late Administration. He has urged that record as a ground why his Administration should have the confidence of the people of this country. I would ask him, has he observed that the Ministers, who, for the most part—there are one or two exceptions, I admit—were responsible for such record as the Government made during the war are the ones who have since left, and are not

members of his Administration? Either he has no confidence in them, or they have no confidence in him. Will my right hon. friend presume to say that none of the credit of the late Administration in the carrying on of the war was due to the hon. gentlemen who are not members of his Administration at the present time? Let us take one or two names. We were told that the Hon. F. B. Carvell was a strength to the whole Government because of his personality. Will my right hon. friend say that his ministry has not been weakened through the loss of a member like the Hon. Mr. Carvell? Take the case of the present member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Is he not entitled to any credit in the late Administration for the winning of the war, as my right hon. friend likes to put it? Surely my right hon. friend has no right to seek credit for his Administration on account of the services of the hon. member for East Hamilton, who is not in the ministry at the present time. Take, similarly, the case of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). There was a gentleman representing the agricultural interests of this country, as well as one who was a strong liberal at the time he was taken into the Administration. His name was given out to the public as that of one who lent strength to the Administration because of those circumstances. He is not in my right hon. friend's Administration at the present time. He is directly opposed to him. How can my right hon. friend lay claim to any public confidence in his Administration on account of what the hon. member for Marquette did in helping forward the work of the Government during the period of the war? Then there is the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). Though he was a Minister without portfolio, he was Chairman of several important committees, and rendered valuable service. He is not in my right hon. friend's ministry, but is sitting opposite to him at the present time. How can my right hon. friend possibly claim that his ministry is entitled to carry on by virtue of the services which the hon. member for Halifax rendered during the period of the war? Then there is the Hon. N. W. Rowell, the former President of the Privy Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I think, was quite in order in referring to the personnel of the ministry to give their names, but in referring to hon. gentlemen individually who are at the moment members of the House, it would be better, and most certainly the correct practice, if he would refer to them by the names of their constituencies.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very pleased to defer to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I recognize to be quite proper. The point I wish to make plain is that as respects the Unionist Administration the personality of the gentlemen composing it was an all important consideration. The name of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), the former President of the Privy Council, was put forward all over this country as that of one who led the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, and it was put forward particularly to support the claims of the Government on Liberals in Ontario. How can my right hon. friend claim for himself any expression of confidence on the part of the people in virtue of the presence in the former Administration of the hon. member for Durham? He is no longer a member of the ministry.

Then I would ask my right hon. friend, what about the former Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White). His name and his reputation stood high in this country at that time. Surely he is entitled to some of the credit of the late ministry in the matter of the winning of the war. Can my right hon. friend lay claim to any of that credit for his ministry? The hon. gentleman whom I have just mentioned is not today a member of the ministry. My right hon. friend has been unable to induce him to come into his Government.

Lastly, I ask my right hon. friend, is no credit due to the former Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden? He had long and distinguished service in the position of Prime Minister, and his name and the circumstance of his experience was a factor in helping to win the confidence of the people for his Administration. How can my right hon. friend claim any credit for what was accomplished through the ex-Prime Minister's efforts in the winning of the war as a ground on which this ministry should have the confidence of the people at the present time, seeing that the ex-Prime Minister has resigned and is unwilling to come into my right hon. friend's ministry?

So I say, if we go over the personnel of the Cabinet as it existed at the time it made its appeal to the people of Canada as a Unionist Administration and compare it with the present Government, we find the

two so different in character and in personnel that it is presumption, to say the least, for my right hon. friend to assume that he is entitled to any credit for work which the previous Government carried on, or to any continuance of confidence from the people of Canada as a result.

May I ask my right hon. friend this question, and I hope he will answer it—Does he believe that if he himself had been called upon to form a Unionist Administration in 1917, he would have been able to do it? Does he mean to say that if he instead of the ex-Prime Minister had gone before the country as Prime Minister seeking support for a ministry at that time that the people would have given to him the confidence which was given to the late Prime Minister and the colleagues he had about him? Unless he is prepared to stand up and say that he was just as capable of forming a ministry as the ex-Prime Minister and that the people have just as much confidence in him and his present colleagues as in the ex-Prime Minister and the group that surrounded him, by what authority does he presume to carry on government, as one holding the confidence of the people of this country?

But, Sir, not only is the character and the personnel of the ministry changed, as I have described, but what is most important of all, the aims and purposes of the two ministries are entirely different. The Unionist Administration went before the people of this country as a war Administration, for the purpose of carrying on the war and dealing with the problems of the war. Will my right hon. friend say that this is a war Administration? Unless he is prepared to say that he is entitled to the confidence of the people of this country at the present time as the leader of a war Administration, by what authority does he presume to carry on the Government of this country?

I might quote at considerable length from the statements which were given to the people of this country at the time as to the purposes of the late ministry. I shall not take up the time of the House in quoting at any great length from the different statements made; two or three will, I think, be pertinent enough. As to the purpose of the previous Unionist Administration, I shall quote only from the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), who formed that Government, and from my right hon. friend who is leading the Government at the present time, and I will ask my hon. friend after he has listened to these statements, to be good enough to say whether he is prepared to stand up in this Parliament and affirm that the ministry which he is leading to-day is the same in aim and purpose as the ministry which was formed in 1917.

Here are one or two statements made by the ex-Prime Minister at the time the Unionist Administration was formed. Speaking at Toronto on November 21st, 1917—the quotation will be found in the Mail and Empire of the following day—the then Prime Minister, the present member for Kings, said:

> My purpose in forming a Union Government was to bring within it such a personnel as would be thoroughly representative of all those elements of the population of Canada that were willing to stand behind the Government in its efforts to win this war, and to fight the battle for humanity, for civilization and the fate of the world.

Speaking at Oshawa on Nov. 26, 1917, as quoted from the Toronto Globe of the following date, the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) said:

> Union Government—does any man know of any reason why there should not be union and national unity in this country when national peril confronts us? The issue is whether the war effort of Canada is to be maintained, or whether Canada is to get out of this war. That is the issue.

That was what the right hon. the then Prime Minister of this country told the people at the time of the last election. He distinctly stated that the issue was whether the war effort of Canada was to be maintained or whether Canada was to get out of the war. Can my right hon. friend who is now leading the Government (Right Hon. Arthur Meighen) describe the issue before the country at the present time in those terms? Can he find anything which will justify him in maintaining an administration on the basis on which the Unionist Government was returned at the last election?

Speaking at Milton on November 29, 1917, as will be seen from the Toronto Star of November 30, my right hon. friend the member for Kings, the then Prime Minister, made a statement which is to be found quoted in several papers. I shall quote from two because they are significant:

> "There is only one issue after all in this campaign," said Sir Robert, "whether we shall keep our pledge or bond given to those men at the front, or whether we shall abandon them when they need our help most".

I will ask my right hon. friend to pay particular attention to these words, which are taken from the Toronto Star:

"There is only one issue in this campaign, whether we shall keep our pledge, etc."

The Mail and Empire, referring to the same speech, quotes the right hon. gentleman in these terms:

There is only one issue in this campaign—only one that I can see to-day—

Observe, Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend repeated the statement—only one.

—whether Canada shall maintain her effort in the war and support the men who have gone forth on the pledge of her honour, or whether Canada shall relax her effort, withdraw from the war, and practically leave these men to consider themselves abandoned and betrayed.

I submit that when the people of this country were told by the then Prime Minister that there was only one issue—only one—in such plain terms that every man, woman and child in this country could understand the nature and meaning of it, the services of the administration elected on that issue were at an end when the issue ceased to exist; and when a Government comes along two years after the war is over and attempts to carry on the affairs of this country without appealing to the electorate for any vindication of its position, it is usurping the authority of the people. I ask my right hon. friend what becomes of the theory that government is carried on in virtue of the consent of the governed? The governed gave their consent on one issue, an issue which has long since passed. Yet the hon. gentleman presumes to carry on to-day without even consulting the electorate. He ignores them in the most flagrant manner.

The Prime Minister of that day, however, was not the only one who described to the people of this country what the issue was. My right hon. friend himself made a good many speeches during that campaign. He and two of his colleagues at the time were, I think, the first to address a large public meeting in Canada, the one that was supposed, to use his own words, "to sound the appeal of the new government." That meeting, as he may recall, was held in the City of Winnipeg. It was largely attended, and an account of it is given in the Manitoba Free Press of October 23, 1917. A three-page report appears in that issue of the Manitoba Free Press, and it was quoted all over this country. The hon. member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar) was one of those who spoke along with my right hon. friend, and the Hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization, who is also President of the Privy Council at the present time (Hon. J. A. Calder). They were all present, and these are the words of my right hon. friend. He said that his purpose, and that of the colleagues appearing with him on the platform was to present the principle and to show forth the spirit that had brought them together, and "to sound the appeal of the new government." He was dealing both with the principle and with the spirit of the new Government. As he listens to his own words, I want to ask him whether he thinks that principle and that spirit apply to his administration at the present time. I will not quote the whole of his speech; I shall merely give extracts:

"Our Government, for which we stand to-night, is founded on the rock of compulsory service, and on that rock we will still build it.

Will he stand up in this Parliament and say at the present time that his Government is founded on the rock of compulsory service? and that on that rock he is still building?

Mr. BUREAU: It is merely an aggregation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To continue:

I want to make it as clear as I can that the only way Canada can give the verdict of "carry on" is to vote for the Union Government. We can only vote for or against the Government.

In other words, he describes the issue as being that of "carrying on". I admit that the phrase to carry on might be used as a cry for his present administration, but I think he had a different purpose in mind at that time. I do not think my right hon. friend intended to have that cry serve a double purpose. Then he said further:

We can only vote for Borden and Union administration, or vote for a man who, no matter under what flag he may be running will be a follower of an administration headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. This vote for Borden or Laurier is a vote to carry on the war or to quit.

Now, may I ask my right hon. friend when he tells the country that the whole question at that time was between Borden and Laurier, whether that is the question before the country at the present time? Between Borden and Laurier? Where, may I ask my right hon. friend, does he come in? My right hon. friend was modest at that time. He was careful to exclude himself. He did not presume to stand along side of those distinguished gentlemen as being equal to them in political stature. But he has changed his attitude since. Here is another sentence from the speech he delivered then, and I would call his attention particularly to it. He said:

There never was a clearer issue before the people than today. It is simply an issue of Union Government and a vigourous prosecution of the war, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Canada's virtual withdrawal from the war.

I think my hon. friend knew better than to say what he did say in reference to Sir Wilfrid Laurier at that time, but apart from that portion of the quotation, let me repeat what he said as to the issue itself:

It is simply an issue of Union Government and a vigorous prosecution of the war.

Is that the issue at the present time? I am sure my right hon. friend cannot lay claim to office in virtue of those terms. My right hon. friend concluded his speech with this reference which is interesting:

I appeal to the people of Manitoba, I appeal to the people here, to give to this Government its mission, to the Prime Minister of this country his mission, to carry on. He is the man who will perform the task.

Now what was my right hon. friend aiming at in that remark, when he said that day, speaking about the Prime Minister, "He is the man?" He did not then say "I am the man"; but that is what he is saying to-day. He is telling the people of Canada to-day that the verdict which was given in 1917 was a mandate to him to carry on the Government of this country. Now I say that unless he is prepared to stand up and make that statement here, in the presence of his colleagues and the members of the House generally, neither he nor his Government has any authority to carry out what they propose to do and they are acting in direct violation of the spirit of the constitution of the country.

Mr. Speaker, there is a matter to which I wish particularly to refer in this connection. I notice that in the Speech of His Excellency to Parliament reference is made to the Customs Tariff. That reference begins:

My advisors are convinced of the necessity for the revision of the Customs Tariff.

Well, they have got along thus far but it has taken them a long time. We told them year after year there was need for that revision. It is interesting to notice that my right hon. friend now admits that there is need for revision; but I want to ask him by what right he and his ministry are presuming to undertake the revision of the tariff? That is the question that should be answered I think before we discuse the tariff one way or another in this House. My right hon. friend knows, or ought to know that when an appeal was made to the people of Canada in 1917 there were certain questions, certain subjects, which were expressly excluded from consideration by the electorate and by the Parliament that was to be returned that year. It was recognized it would not only be difficult but that it would be impossible to form a Government if certain questions were to be considered by the parliament then to be elected. The tariff was one of those questions and I now say to my right hon. friend that when the Government of 1917 was formed it was with the distinct understanding that the tariff would not be brought up in parliament under that administration. Therefore he has no right and no authority to introduce that subject for discussion at the present time; it should remain for the consideration of a parliament that is truly representative of the people of Canada.

Let me make perfectly clear to the House just how far my right hon. friend and the colleagues who were associated with him at that time went in expressly excluding the tariff from any consideration by this parliament. I shall take first the speech that was delivered by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Here is the statement of that hon. gentleman made at the meeting at which my right hon. friend was one of the speakers:

After I had taken my seat in the Cabinet, a friend of mine in Ontario, one of the most intelligent among the eastern farmers, met me in Toronto. The first thing he said to me was, "What concessions did you get on the tariff?" I told him that I had not got any, and that I had not asked any. That is not to say that I did not feel strongly on the tariff, but I feel that the present issue is not the tariff, but the winning of the War, and to prosecute that great purpose this Government has been formed, and old political opponents like the gentlemen you see here on the platform have struck hands across the Cabinet table of the nation and are going to guide the nation's destiny in this time of peril.

I ask my right hon. friend if he hears those words? Let me repeat them again:

That is not to say that I do not feel strongly on the tariff, but I feel the present issue is not the tariff but the winning of the war.

Could there be a clearer statement than that made by a member of the Government at the time? The hon. member for Marquette was speaking as a member of the Government. He was speaking as a member of the Government of which my right hon. friend was at the time a member, and he said at that time that the tariff would

not be considered. On the basis of that assurance he made his appeal to the electors of western Canada, and of other parts of the Dominion as well. In the face of that I ask my right hon. friend how can he presume to deny to the people of Canada the right to return a representative parliament to deal with that issue when the time comes for it to be taken up.

The hon. member for Marquette was not the only minister who spoke in that way at that time. A member of the present administration—the Minister of Immigration and Colonization —(Mr. Calder)—also gave his word to the electors of Canada as to what would be done by the administration. I now ask my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) how he reconciles his remaining as a member of the Government which contemplates a revision of the tariff with the statements which I am about to read to him—statements made at a time when the Minister of Immigration and Colonization gave his word of honour as a public man to the people of Canada as to the grounds on which the administration should be returned in 1917. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization said:

It is because we are in the war, and all that it means, that we three men happen to sit just where we are to-day. The one main issue is whether we are to carry on or not. We have simply consented to union for the immediate purpose of this war and the solution of the problems arising out of the war and we are prepared—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KING: I hear hon. gentlemen opposite applauding the statement as to dealing with the issues that grew out of the war. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that the tariff is an issue that grew out of the war? If so they can place any issue under heaven in a similar category. If my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) now holds such a view, he surely entertains an entirely different mental attitude from what he did at the time to which I refer, when he declared that the tariff was to be excluded from consideration by the Government. In 1917 my hon. friend was very careful to say that the tariff would not be a matter to be considered.

My hon. friend (Mr. Calder) went on to say:

We were prepared for the time being to sink our differences of opinion in so far as many of the domestic and local problems which we have are concerned. We must do that to get union. Just imagine what would have happened if Mr. Crerar had sat down with Sir Thomas White to try and get together on questions of tariff.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Let me repeat: the hon. minister said:

Just imagine what would happen if Mr. Crerar had sat down with Sir Thomas White and tried to get together on the question of the tariff.

I ask my hon. friends opposite who applauded the idea of the tariff being an issue growing out of the war whether they will applaud that remark? Unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to do so they have no right to presume that the tariff is a question with which they can deal to the exclusion of a parliament so empowered by the people. My hon. friend went on to say:

We would never have had Union if one of the requirements was that it had to be reached on the question of the tariff.

I ask my hon. friend, as a member of the present Government and as a member of the Government speaking at that time, whether he meant what he said on that occasion.

An hon. MEMBER: He was only joking.

Mr. KING: Was my hon. friend telling the people the truth at that time or had he something else in his mind? Was he quite sincere in what he said then? I find difficulty in reconciling his utterances with his remaining at the present time in a ministry which is attempting to deal with the tariff. Let me read the sentence again:

We would never have had Union if one of the requirements was that it had to be reached on the question of the tariff.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who said that?

Mr. KING: The Minister of Immigration and Colonization, the present President of the Privy Council. He went on to say:

We found it absolutely necessary on both sides, on the Conservative Party's part and our own, to sink all differences of opinion in connection with these domestic problems. So far as I am concerned, on the questions of tariff, banking, agricultural credit, land settlement, and all those problems affecting our western people, I stand where I stood three weeks ago, and I am certain my friend (Mr. Crerar) does not stand far from that position. But for the time being, we let them go by the board, and we go into this union with an entirely different purpose.

Again, may I ask, in the face of such an appeal to the electorate, the bonafides of which were vouched for by his presence on the platform, and with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization still one of the ministers in his own administration, how dare my right hon. friend presume to say that his Government is justified in dealing with this all-important question, without first giving to the people of Canada

an opportunity to return to Parliament a House of Commons that will give a proper expression to their views?

At that time the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and my right hon. friend were standing side by side; to-day they are standing directly opposite to each other, taking directly opposite positions. And why did my hon. friend for Marquette leave the ministry of which he was a member? He left it because he felt it was formed for a particular purpose, and when that purpose was fulfilled, that was as far as it had any right or authority to go. He took exactly the same position that my hon. friend has taken here, that the tariff was not an issue with which this Parliament could deal one way or the other. Under these circumstances I ask my right hon. friend, when he retains in his cabinet a colleague who has given a pledge of that kind to the people, how does he presume to suggest to His Excellency that the tariff is a question for discussion at this particular session of Parliament?

But the honourable member for Marquette and the honourable the Minister of Immigration and Colonization were not the only speakers who expressly excluded legislation with respect to the tariff from the jurisdiction of the Unionist Government, or who gave assurances, which the Canadian public were justified in taking as final and authoritative, that the tariff would not be dealt with until some subsequent appeal were made to the electorate with specific reference to domestic issues. The right hon. the Prime Minister himself also spoke with special reference to the tariff. I have already quoted the nature of his appeal on the general issue. Here is what he had to say more particularly with reference to the tariff:

> In time of peace we can afford to support a candidate with a reservation, but in time of war they are a menace to a nation. I make no imperious demands. I only ask the people of this country to see the issue as it is, and to rise to a certainty that a vote in opposition to the new administration is a vote which will imperil the conditions under which we work for the war. We ask from no man and from no woman a reversal or abnegation of his or her convictions on fiscal matters or tariff matters or any other subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend says "hear, hear." I would ask him: Will he presume to say that his ministry in attempting to legislate on the tariff in the present session is not obliging the men and women of this country to forego an expression of their views on the tariff question? If my right hon. friend will say that he intends to appeal to the people, then I am quite prepared to admit that he may not be denying them that right which he then said he would not take from them. But if he presumes in this session to attempt to deal with the tariff, the people will hold him guilty of as great a breach of faith as it is possible for a public man to commit.

> We only ask that they postpone the prosecution of those opinions and convictions, and subordinate them to the infinitely greater necessity until we get through these abnormal times. This is all the appeal we make. The accepted basis of union was the only basis on which union was possible at the present time. What Mr. Calder, Mr. Crerar and I ask is that the people of this country unite on the same basis that the Government of the country united.

In the quotations I have cited, you have heard from the lips of the then Minister of Agriculture and the present Minister of Immigration and Colonization what the accepted basis of union was. They have both said that it expressly excluded any dealings with the tariff. My right hon. friend joins with them in an appeal on that ground. Again, I ask, how dare my right honourable friend presume to say that his Government is justified in dealing with this all-important question, without first giving to the people of Canada an opportunity to return to Parliament a House of Commons that will give a proper expression to their views?

Well, Mr. Speaker, one is almost at a loss to imagine what my right hon. friend can say in reply in view of the statements which I have just quoted.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do not worry; you will know soon enough.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I know already what he will say. He and his colleagues in different parts of the country have apparently found it necessary to work out a defence for their position, they realize they are on the defensive in this matter, and when addressing different meetings they have attempted to make an explanation to the public, which they hope will be accepted. As far as I have been able to follow the remarks of my right hon. friend and his colleagues, there are broadly four grounds upon which an attempt will be made to justify the continuance of this Government. First of all he will seek refuge in the law and the constitution, in the limit of time permitted a Parliament by the British North America Act; in the right of a ministry to exist so long as it has

a following in the House of Commons, or, in other words, the plenary powers of Parliament to legislate as it pleases. Next, he will seek to defend his position on grounds of literal interpretation. He will contend that no pledge was given by the Government of my right honourable friend, the ex-Prime Minister, that it would hold office only for war purposes, or, to use his own words, that the Government "did not commit itself"; and, finally, he may make mention of personal considerations, and repeat what he has also said elsewhere, namely, that the Leader of the Opposition does not want a general election.

Let me briefly examine each of these several contentions. First, my right hon. friend will argue that his right is based on the law and the constitution. He will no doubt quote to this House section 50 of the British North America Act, which is as follows:

> Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House (subject to be sooner dissolved by the Governor General), and no longer.

He will tell the people that inasmuch as Parliament has the right by the constitution to sit for five years, therefore it is entitled to sit for that length of period. Let me say to my right hon. friend, what I am sure he knows quite well, that a legal right does not constitute a legal or moral obligation to continue the term of Parliament for five years under the limit of time fixed by the constitution. More than that, as my right hon. friend knows, the main purpose of the constitution in limiting the time is to place a limit on ministries such as his, which would continue in office forever in the absence of any time limit.

If my right hon. friend will look to British parliamentary procedure, as well as to the procedure of our own Parliament in the past, he will find that the constitutional practice all along has been not to exhaust the full limit of time, but rather to have regard to the issues which come before the people, and to dissolve Parliament when the old issues have been settled and new issues arise. Let me cite to my right hon. friend by way of exact reference the British Parliamentary practice under a rule which is similar to ours.

There was a period when the time of the British Parliament was not limited; it could sit indefinitely. Then it became necessary to limit the parliamentary period, and it was first fixed for seven and afterwards for five years, similar to the limit which is to be found in our own constitution. The position in the case of the British Parliament under that legislation was exactly the same as the position of this Parliament under the British North America Act.

Before the Triennial Act, 1694 (6 Will and Mary C. 2) there was no constitutional limit to the continuance of Parliament but the will of the Crown. Under the Septennial Act, 1715 (1 Geo. 1st 2C. 38) it ceased to exist after seven years from the day on which, by the Writ of Summons, it was appointed to meet, a period which was reduced to five years by the Parliament Act, 1911—May's "Parliamentary Practice," 12th Ed., p. 53).

Now, let us examine for a moment the duration of the various British Parliaments from 1865 up to 1911, during which period the limit fixed by the constitution was seven years.

The Parliament elected in Great Britain in 1865 lasted for 2 years and 9 months.

The Parliament elected in 1868 lasted for 5 years and 1 month.

The Parliament elected in 1874 lasted for 6 years.

The Parliament elected in 1880 lasted for 5 years and 6 months.

The Parliament elected in 1885 lasted for 5 months.

The Parliament elected in 1886 lasted for 5 years and 10 months.

The Parliament elected in 1892 lasted for 2 years and 11 months.

The Parliament elected in 1895 lasted for 5 years and 1 month.

The Parliament elected in 1900 lasted for 5 years and 1 month.

The Parliament elected in 1906 lasted for 3 years and 11 months.

The Parliament elected in 1910 (Jan.) lasted for 9 months.

The Parliament elected in December, 1910, passed the Parliament Act, 1911, which reduced the parliamentary period to five years. On account of the War, this period was extended from year to year, until after the termination of the War, and in December, 1918, a general election was held.

This record shows us that with one single exception no British Parliament from 1865 down to the present time has run within a year of the full period of the term allowed by the constitution. It shows, too, that about one half of all the parliaments that met in Great Britain subsequent to 1865 used only one half of the period of time provided by the time limit of the constitution. Why has that been the case? The answer is simply this: The spirit of the constitution is much more important than the letter of it. The letter of the constitution

provides a limit beyond which the term of Parliament may not run, but having regard to the rights of the people the parliaments of Great Britain have for the most part found it desirable and necessary to exhaust only about one-half, some of them two-thirds, of the full period which the constitution allows.

Take, next, the history of our own Parliament since Confederation. In Canada, notwithstanding the 5 year limit fixed by the British North America Act, the duration of the several Parliaments since Confederation, has been as follows:

The 1st Parliament dissolved July 8, 1872, 4 years, 9 months, 15 days.
The 2nd Parliament dissolved January 2, 1874, 1 year, 4 months.
The 3rd Parliament dissolved August 17, 1878, 4 years, 5 months, 24 days.
The 4th Parliament dissolved May 18, 1882, 3 years, 5 months, 27 days.
The 5th Parliament dissolved January 15, 1887, 4 years, 5 months, 8 days.
The 6th Parliament dissolved February 3, 1891, 3 years, 9 months, 28 days.
The 7th Parliament dissolved April 24, 1896, 4 years, 11 months, 30 days.
The 8th Parliament dissolved October 9, 1900, 4 years, 2 months, 26 days.
The 9th Parliament dissolved September 29, 1904, 3 years, 11 months, 20 days.
The 10th Parliament dissolved September 17, 1908, 3 years, 11 months, 18 days.
The 11th Parliament dissolved July 29, 1911, 2 years, 10 months, 20 days.
The 12th Parliament (the War Parliament) dissolved October 6, 1917, 6 years, 3 months, 17 days.
The 13th Parliament, until February 14, 1921, 3 years, 3 months, 27 days.

The seventh Parliament ran to within one day of the time limit. There was in power at that time a Tory administration like the present, which was doomed, and the members of which knew it. I suppose my right hon. friend and his colleagues, being similarly situated will regard this as the precedent they should follow and will endeavour if possible to hold out, not to the last day but one, but the very last, if that is at all possible. The Thirteenth Parliament, this present Parliament, has lasted for three years and three months; it has already lasted longer than some of the other Parliaments which have assembled in Canada. The Parliament that was dissolved in 1908 lasted for three years and eleven months; the Parliament that was dissolved in 1911 had lasted for only two years and ten months.

These figures afford ground for some interesting reflections. In the first place, it will be observed that this very Parliament has already had a longer existence than the Parliament which was dissolved on July 29, 1911. The late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had the same legal rights under the constitution as my Right Hon. friend. He had a much more powerful following in Parliament. His appreciation of the spirit of the British constitution and his sense of public duty and obligation to the electorate were, however, a little higher and keener than those of my right hon. friend. He recognized the rights of the people as superior to those afforded his Government under the constitution. He believed that Government should be carried on only with the consent of the governed. He dissolved Parliament to afford to the people their constitutional right of passing upon a great issue which was an issue other than that of the elections of 1908.

It will be further observed that the existing life of this Parliament, joined to that of its predecessor, already comes within less than three months of exhausting the time limit of two consecutive Parliaments enjoying the full length of term permitted by the constitution: also that, already, it is within less than a year and three months of the duration of the preceding three Parliaments of the Liberal Administration.

When it is recalled that since 1911 the people of this country have had no opportunity to pass upon distinctly Canadian issues, and that in the interval men who fought for their country overseas have been denied all privilege of even hearing these issues discussed at a general election, that only a fraction of the women of the country have had a voice in government though all have since been admitted to the franchise; that hundreds of thousands of citizens were disfranchised in 1917; and that practically all young men between the ages of 21 and 31 have never yet had opportunity of recording their votes with respect to matters of vital domestic concern, the injustice to the electorate, of attempting further to prolong the life of this Parliament, must be apparent to all.

If we are to have regard for the spirit of the constitution, rather than the letter, it is perfectly clear that it is the rights of the people, with respect to important national issues, which is the determining factor in deciding the length of time for which a Parliament should sit—issues upon which a ministry has been returned to power, and new issues upon which the people have a right to be consulted, and to make their will known. Clearly, the spirit of the constitution demands at the present time, both as respects the issue upon which the Government of 1917 was

returned to power, and which has ceased to be an issue, and the domestic problems which have arisen in this post-war period, and which present new and far-reaching considerations requiring immediate solution, that the present Parliament should not exhaust the period of time which the legal limit permits, but that the people should be entitled without further delay to an expression of their will at the polls.

The next contention of my right honourable friend will be that Parliament is supreme; that so long as the Government is in a position to command a majority in the House of Commons, it is all-powerful, and that its rights and powers to legislate cannot be curtailed in any particular.

Here, again, may I say that no one will question the supremacy of Parliament where Parliament is duly constituted. But once more, it is to the spirit of the constitution, not to the letter of the law, that, in existing circumstances, we must look for a fair and just interpretation of the rights and duties of Parliament.

The theory of the supremacy of Parliament, as it is understood in our day, is based upon the assumption that Parliament represents the will of the people as expressed through representation effected under a franchise which preserves the people in their full right of control over Parliament. Will my right hon. friend maintain that such can be said of the existing representation in this House of Commons? No one knows quite so well as my right hon. friend that the franchise under which the representation of the present Parliament was effected was anything but of that nature; that, as a matter of fact, it was a franchise so framed and brought into being and administered as to constitute the worst betrayal of the rights of the people which this country has ever known. Except that the nation was at war at the time, it would not have been tolerated even by those who were ready to profit by its unjust provisions, and their still more unjust manipulation at home and across the seas.

What was the ground upon which the late Sir Wilfrid, then leader of the Opposition, and the Liberals in Parliament consented to an extension of the term of Parliament for one year in 1916? It was that the rights of the people in the matter of their control over Parliament were in no particular being abridged. Sir Wilfrid made it very clear and distinct that he would not consent to an extension—and the Prime Minister had already said that he would not attempt to get an extension unless Sir Wilfrid Laurier agreed to it—if the people were being robbed of their control over Parliament one way or the other.

Here are the late Sir Wilfrid's words as expressed at that time:

> I would observe, first of all, that it is not proposed here to alter the principle of the constitution. It is not proposed to override the control which the people have over Parliament. It is simply proposed to suspend for the time being the operation of the constitution. If it were proposed to make away altogether with that principle which is embodied in the constitution, certainly I would oppose such an attempt with all my might. But no such thing is proposed. This measure simply proposes that the constitution shall be suspended for twelve months, at the expiration of which time it will resume its full force.

Well, how were the rights of the people in the matter of their control over Parliament secured at that time? One instrument was the then existing franchise, embodied in the Dominion Elections Act, 1898, under which the Government of the day, as well as its predecessors of an opposite political faith, had been returned to power. Is it conceivable that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and those who surrounded him at the time, would have agreed to the extension had they believed that during the period of that extension the people would have been robbed in so large measure of the provisions of a law specially framed to preserve them in their right of control over Parliament; that in its stead an Act would be placed on our statutes which would take away from thousands of electors whose approval of the extension was taken for granted on grounds of patriotism at the time it was made, the political rights of citizens which they then enjoyed; and give to other thousands of women, specially favoured, political rights not previously enjoyed and withheld from all other loyal and devoted women in the country.

When the Franchise Act as it existed at the time the extension of Parliament took place, was changed, the representative character of Parliament was doomed from the very outset, and the Parliament which was returned under the different election Acts, Acts framed for war purposes, cannot be said to represent the will of the people at the present time. I think my right hon. friend must admit that the franchise under which this Parliament was returned was a franchise framed only for war purposes. The two Acts under which this particular Parliament has come into being are the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act. Under the War-time Elec-

tions Act, rights were, as I have said, taken away from large numbers of people of this country; they were disfranchised; they lost their control of Parliament. Since that time they have been taxed without any representation in Parliament one way or the other, so that there has been a direct violation of the spirit of the constitution in that regard. I will not enlarge upon the different iniquities of that measure, but amongst the Government's own supporters of the day it would never have passed except for the fact that we were in the midst of a war at that time and the War-time Elections Act was excused as a war measure for war purposes only. How can my right hon. friend contend that a Parliament returned under a measure such as that can be of a representative character at the present time?

The Military Voters' Act was a measure passed by this Parliament for the purpose, not of defeating the will of the electorate, but of giving expression to it. My right hon. friend knows, perhaps more than anyone else in this House, that that Act was used to effect the representation in this particular Parliament. I shall spare the House a recital of that disgraceful chapter in our national history, whereby advantage was taken of the Military Voters' Act to coerce, in the matter of their political rights, thousands of the young men of this country who were serving their country and the cause of freedom overseas, and whereby their votes, together with the votes of hundreds of men and women who had never seen Canada, were poured by emissaries of the Government into specially selected constituencies, with no object other than that of ensuring the defeat of candidates opposed to the Administration, a course of action which, by the way, has been openly defended and commended by my right hon. friend on the very floor of Parliament. My right hon. friend knows quite well that there are sitting in this House of Commons to-day many members who would not be sitting here at the present time if the election had taken place under the old Dominion Franchise Act instead of under those particular Acts.

Unless we have a representative Parliament, what becomes of any theory of the supremacy of Parliament? The supremacy of Parliament is based in every particular upon the circumstance that Parliament is supposed to be truly representative of the will of the people. I have not, however, mentioned these two particular measures for the purpose of enlarging upon the iniquities which helped to disgrace the record of our Canadian history at the time; my purpose is to draw the attention of Parliament to the circumstance that both those Acts have been repealed, and that we have at the present time upon the Statutes a new Franchise Act which was passed by this Parliament at the last session. The meaning of that is simply this, that this Parliament recognized that the franchise under which the members of the present Parliament had been returned was not a franchise which adequately represented the views of the people of this country at the present time. They recognized that that was a franchise permissible only for war purposes and that its ends were served when the war was over. When we have a new Franchise Act passed by this Parliament which gives the right of the ballot to thousands of citizens who had not that right previously, for the Government to continue to carry on in view of the support that it is getting from representation effected under those old methods, constitutes, I maintain, a direct usurpation of popular government in this country.

That brings me to the third point on which I think my right hon. friend has already attempted to justify his carrying on of the Government of the country. He has attempted to justify it on a literal interpretation of what was said in the campaign of 1917. He has said that the then Prime Minister gave no pledge at that time; that the Government of that day did not commit itself. That line of defence implies such colossal deception that I do not think any ministry could feel itself so unworthy as to come before the people on such a ground.

Does my right hon. friend wish it to be assumed that when he and his distinguished predecessor in the high office of Prime Minister of Canada were appealing in the name of patriotism to men and women of all classes to forget party and party considerations, when they were appealing to mothers for their support that an end might the more speedily be made to the sacrifice of their sons, and the slaughter of human lives, that all the time they were cherishing a mental reservation which looked beyond the winning of the war to personal aggrandizement and the maintenance of political power when the war was won, regardless altogether of the nature of their appeal. The thought is too abhorrent even to entertain. I refuse to believe any thing so unworthy of my fellow countrymen, and least of all of those who have come to occupy a distinguished position in our public life.

I do not wish to take up too much time in discussing this matter further. I might, however, direct the attention of my right hon. friend to a very important circumstance, namely, that fortunately some of his former colleagues in the late ministry view their obligations to the people in a different way from that in which he is prepared to view his obligations at present. We have had five resignations by Liberal members of the previous ministry, and I think all of them have been on the ground that the hon. members who resigned felt that when they entered the Unionist administration the public believed they were entering a war administration and that when that administration had served its purpose, their right to continue longer in office was at an end. On June 4, 1919, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) resigned; on August 2, 1919, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Carvell) resigned; on January 1, 1920, the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mewburn), then Minister of Militia and Defence, resigned; on February 23, 1920, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) resigned, and on July 8, 1920 the then President of the Privy Council, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) resigned. All of these gentlemen have read their obligations to the people in terms wholly different from those in which my right hon. friend is reading his obligations at the present time. They, at least, did not have any mental reservations one way or the other in what they were leading the people to believe at the time they entered the Unionist administration and appealed to the country.

I have mentioned certain members of the late Government who have read their obligation in a different way. There is one other member of the Government that I should like to quote in the matter of obligation, because he happens to be a member of my right hon. friend's administration. I think there are only two of the original so-called Liberal members of the day who went into the Union Administration who are now in my right hon. friend's ministry. I have here a quotation from a speech made by my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) in this Parliament at the time the hon. member for Marquette resigned from the Government, and perhaps it will be worth while to give it just to show how my hon. friend viewed the matter of resignations at that time. Here is what he said (Hansard, p. 3341):

> Let me ask hon. members of this House what would be the consequences if we all followed the course taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Suppose the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) resigned, and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), and the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maclean), and myself and others should resign—

at which point there was some interruption, when my hon. friend continued:

> Do not be too sure, my friends, the task of carrying on government in this country and the responsibilities that are thrown upon public men are not so alluring as some hon. gentlemen seem to think. I say that if those resignations did take place there would immediately be a political crisis in this country, and one thing, and one thing only, could happen: either the Prime Minister would have to appeal to the country, or he would have to advise the Governor General to call upon my friend who leads the Opposition to form a new Government.—(Hansard, p. 3341).

Well, all these resignations, and others, save alone that of my hon. friend, have taken place. Are we to assume, then, that he is the slender thread on which the fate of the ministry hangs; that it is to his presence in the ministry we owe the aversion of a political crisis, and the one thing and one thing only that could happen? If that be so, let me assure my hon. friend that the greatest service he can render the country is to drop out of the ministry just as speedily as possible.

I come now to the last mentioned of the arguments enunciated, namely, that the leader of the Opposition himself does not desire an election. I would hesitate to make mention of this contention, since it is so puerile, were it not that my right hon. friend himself has put it forward on different occasions, and one or two of his colleagues have busied themselves whispering it about.

What, may I ask, have my wishes or desires to do with this matter, or, for that matter, the wishes or desires of my right hon. friend, or any other member of this House on either side of you, Mr. Speaker?

It is not a matter of wish or desire; it is a matter of right and duty: the right of the people to self-government, and the duty of their representatives in Parliament to be scrupulous in the defence of that right whenever it appears to be infringed. It is the basis of all our liberty, and our one sure defence against arbitrary behaviour and revolutionary tendencies in matters of government.

My right honourable friend says he has been all over Canada and has heard no demand for a general election. That only proves that his hearing is not as good as my own. I may tell him that I also have

crossed the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and everywhere I have gone, it is the one demand I have heard.

But if he has not heard it, perhaps he has seen it in the record of the by-elections which have been held since the termination of the War. They reveal an overwhelming public opinion against the Government.

Whilst a general election has been refused the by-elections show an overwhelming public opinion against the Government. The Government's record in the by-elections is a tale of defeat, a story, for the most part, of enormous majorities wiped out, and enormous majorities recorded against them. Since the armistice was signed there have been in all sixteen by-elections. These are divisible into three groups: by-elections of hon. members opposite who are in the ministry; by-elections held in constituencies that were won by the Liberals in 1917; and by-elections in constituencies that were won by the Unionist Administration in 1917.

Take the case first of by-elections of Ministers. We all know that constituencies normally are gratified to see their members made Ministers of the Crown. It requires a strong wave of popular indignation to defeat a minister; usually his return is by acclamation. That was so in the case of my honourable friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). It was recognized by the country that at this, of all times, it was important the country should have a Minister of Finance, and that he should be as free from embarrassment in the discharge of his duties as possible. So my honourable friend from Kingston was permitted to take his seat unopposed. It was not the same, however, with the other honourable ministers. In the case of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Tolmie) his majority as a Minister was reduced, in the city of Victoria, from 8,764 which he obtained when returned as a private member, to 2,134 when returned with the prestige of a Minister. In the case of the present Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore) as my hon. friends know, he was only opposed at the last moment and a good deal was said and promised by my hon. friend and others to encourage the electors of that constituency during the campaign. His majority was reduced, in the city of St. John and the counties of St. John and Albert, from 7,917 when returned as a private member, to 4,155 when returned as a Minister of the Crown. Then, in the case of the present Minister of Public Works, (Mr. McCurdy) in the county of Colchester he was elected by acclamation as a private member in 1917; but in the by-election, running as a member of the present Administration, he was strongly opposed.

Let it not be forgotten that in the case of all the ministerial by-elections, the Government had the choosing of the constituencies and the opening of all of them. They were careful to select what they conceived to be their strongholds in the respective provinces. In all these elections, they only retained seats previously held.

Coming now to by-elections of the second group, what does the record show? In the case of constituencies won by the Liberals in 1917, not one has been lost.

There was the constituency of Prince, P.E.I., which was contested in the general elections. The by-election there was won by acclamation. In Quebec East an election was fought in 1917, but the Government did not dare to put up a candidate against my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) in the by-election. In Kamouraska, where there had been an election in 1917, my hon. friend (Mr. Stein) was returned by acclamation in the by-election. In St. James, Montreal, in that great metropolis and industrial centre, my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret) was elected without opposition from a Government candidate.

That is the record in regard to the voice of the people in the case of hon. members who were returned for constituencies held by the Liberals in 1917. Contrast that with the constituencies won by the Government in 1917 and see what the voice of the people is when it gets the only expression possible. We have been denied general elections but the by-elections serve to give some indication of the will and wishes of the people.

There have been eight by-elections held in constituencies that were won by the Government in 1917.

Of the eight they have retained one, and lost seven. The one retained was Yale. In the by-election which was held in that constituency this year the Government received only 389 of a majority, whereas their candidate, a minister, in the general election in 1917, had been returned by acclamation. That is all they received. Now what about the other constituencies? Here are the results so far as the Government is concerned. In Glengarry and Stormont an election was held on the 27th of October, 1919. In the general elections of 1917 the Government's candidate was returned by acclamation: in the by-election there was a majority vote of 2,376 against the Government. In Assiniboia the Government's can-

didate received, in the election of 1917, a majority of 4,524. In the by-election there was no Government candidate. In Victoria-Carleton where in the general election of 1917 a Minister was returned by acclamation, there was a majority against the Government in the by-election on October 27th, 1919, of 3,544. In Timiskaming, in the elections of 1917, the Government candidate was returned by a majority of 2,150. In the by-election on April 7th, 1920, there were three candidates running ; the Government candidate came in at the foot of the poll, a total vote of 5,316 having been registered against him. In North Ontario, in the general elections, the Government candidate received a majority of 1,555 while in the election on December 9, 1919, the Government lost the constituency which was carried by an Opposition candidate by a majority of 185.

Now we come to the period since the assumption of office by my right hon. friend. Two by-elections have been held since he has become Prime Minister in each of which he has made a special appeal to the people for support and confidence in his government. In 1917 the Government candidate in the constituency of East Elgin received a majority of 308. In the by-election, as my hon. friend will remember, there were three candidates running, and the total majority against the Government was 2,263. Then there is West Peterborough, in which there were five candidates. In that riding the Government candidate, in the election of 1917, had a majority of 3,418. In the election just concluded, as my right hon. friend knows, the combined majority of the four candidates against the Government was 7,331. I ask my right hon. friend to say whether it is possible to have a plainer expression of public opinion than that evidenced in these several by-elections?

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that since the armistice Canada is the only country among the nations of the British Empire and among the countries that form the associated and allied powers wherein the Government has denied to its people the right of a general election in order that they might return a representative parliament? I think my right hon. friend, if he has not given attention to that aspect of the question, will find it perhaps the most serious of all. Of all the self-governing countries that compose the British Empire, including the United Kingdom, the governments have permitted their people, since the armistice, to return representative parliaments. The people of Canada alone have been denied that right by their government. Of all the countries of the allied and associated powers, that took part in the war, this is the only one in which the people have not been accorded the right of returning a representative Parliament. Not only that, Sir; even countries in the Orient and in South America, even enemy countries, have given to their peoples the right to choose representative parliaments since the signing of the armistice.

Let me give my right honourable friend the record in this respect. In the United Kingdom a general election was held in 1918. Is the example of the British Parliament not one worthy of being emulated here? The people in the Old Country were not more interested in after war conditions than we are. The Government that had been formed and carried on in England during the war was a Unionist Administration, but the Prime Minister of England had a very different sense of obligation to the people from that which my right honourable friend has shown, because he did not lose any time before he gave the people a right to return a new parliament to deal with post-war questions. In Australia a general election was held in December, 1919. Are the people of Canada so inferior to those of Australia that they cannot be given the same right to return a representative parliament? Are they not to be trusted as much as the Australians to choose representatives who will do their duty by the public? Come to New Zealand. General elections were held there in December, 1919. Again, I ask, are the people of this Dominion not to be given the same right as the people of New Zealand in this respect? What about South Africa, the latest country to come within the Empire? South Africa has had not one but two elections since the signing of the armistice. The first election was held in February, 1920, and the other has been concluded within the past week. Are our people so inferior in calibre and in appreciation of the rights and duties of citizenship, so incapable of administering their own affairs, that they are not to be trusted in the same way as the citizens of South Africa? Take the island of Newfoundland. It had its general elections in November, 1919. Why should our people be denied that right?

Now, let us go outside of the British Empire and look at the nations that compose the allied and associated powers.

France suffered in the war, and she has her post-war problems to deal with. She had a general election in November, 1919. Italy had a general election in November, 1919; Belgium had a general election in November, 1919; The United States had a general election in November, 1920. Japan had a general election in November, 1920. Every one of the countries that comprise the allied and associated powers has given to its people rights which have been denied the people of this country by the present administration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Even Mexico has given the people that right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Even Mexico, as my honourable friend states. But we may go further and say even China. China in 1917 had a general election; Argentina in 1918; Denmark in 1918 and 1920; and Greece and Germany in 1920. Yet my right hon. friend denies the citizens of this country rights which even enemy countries have granted their peoples.

In addition to that, there is not a single province in this Dominion—with the exception of Alberta and Saskatchewan which provinces had their elections a little prior to the signing of the Armistice—that has not had an election since the signing of the Armistice. The electors throughout the country are the same people, for Federal purposes, and if the Provincial Governments have found it possible to appeal to the people, on what ground does my right hon. friend presume to say that the electorate of Canada, taken collectively, are not to be accorded the same right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me when the elections took place in Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. KING: I stated, but the Prime Minister apparently did not hear me, that all the provinces had held their elections shortly after the Armistice, with the exception of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not hear the hon. gentleman state the exception.

Mr. KING: The elections in Alberta and Saskatchewan, I believe, were held in July 1917.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This House was elected in December, 1917.

Mr. KING: Yes, but I am speaking now of the period subsequent to the signing of the Armistice. It was a short time before the signing of the Armistice when these particular provinces had their elections. Does my right hon friend think that the people of the different provinces are so inferior that they are not to be entitled to a general election? The Government of which he is the head is denying to the people of Canada rights which every Government that has a real appreciation of its duty to the people, has long since conceded. May I say to my right hon. friend that I think he will find that the only Governments which have not allowed their people a general election are those of Canada and Russia.

My right hon. friend, in his public addresses, has had a good deal to say about Bolshevism. He seems to regard all those who are not of his way of thinking as Bolshevist. Let me ask him what is Bolshevism other than the usurpation of government by a group, through some act of violence which defies the laws, usages, and customs which constitutional procedure has devised to preserve representative institutions. So long as the consequences, in robbing the people of their rights, are the same, it matters but little what the method employed may be. The only fundamental difference between the usurpation of the powers of popular government in Russia and its usurpation by the present administration in Canada, is that in Russia physical violence has been the instrument used by the usurpers to effect their purpose, while in Canada it has been legislative violence.

When a comparison of this kind is even remotely possible, it is evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the lengths we have drifted away from the spirit of our constitution, from the responsible self-government which is the very foundation of our political freedom.

It was not alone our Parliament buildings which suffered partial destruction during the period of the war; our parliamentary institutions suffered destruction in large measure along with the rest. Customs usages and practices, intended to preserve the free, representative, self-governing character of our Parliament and the responsible character of its ministry, were one by one temporarily set aside, one by one ignored, until to-day we are witnessing open defiance of the most fundamental of all principles of free government, namely: the right of the people to control their own Parliament.

What matters it if we preserve the form and letter of the law and of the constitution if the spirit is lacking? "for the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life".

We have reconstructed our Parliament Buildings and made of them a glorious edifice, of which as a nation we are justly proud. But unless we can restore the spirit of our forefathers, which made the constitution what it is; unless we can make of these halls of parliament a citadel of a people's liberties, we will have erected over the sacrifices of the war only a whited sepulchre, a thing in form and appearance outwardly beautiful, but within a charnel house of disillusionment full of intrigues and deceptions, full of broken pledges, of shattered ideals, of lost visions, of vanished faiths, and containing the seeds of a nation's decay.

What is it, Mr. Speaker, that works havoc in human lives, that destroys the noblest of friendships, that blights all that is most sacred in our human relations? It is the loss of confidence that comes through disillusionment, through the broken pledges, the shattered ideals, the lost visions, the vanished faiths. Cruel, indeed, it is when that breach in confidence comes between man and man, between friend and friend, between race and race, between nation and nation; but when it comes between a people and its Government, there is no saying what injury it may ultimately work.

What we need to-day is to seek to restore to the people faith in our parliamentary institutions, through conceding their right of control over the Parliament of the country. We know that there are rights under the law; that there are powers under the constitution; these we are prepared to concede to the limit. But is there no such thing in our national economy as public morality? Is there nothing binding in conscience and in honour between those who rule a people and those who have permitted them to rule?

The people know, they do not have to be informed upon the grounds of the support given by them to Union Government in 1917. It was demanded of them in words of patriotism; it was engraven upon their hearts in terms of human sacrifice. Confidence in the patriotic motives of the members of the Government was the essence of their support. That confidence has gone. The people thought they were returning patriots to power. They find in office to-day only office seekers, and office holders, those who love the loaves and the fishes, who make broad their phylacteries, who enlarge the border of their garments, who love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, who make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within are full of extortion and excess.

Confidence in government, Mr. Speaker, will never be restored till the people regain the control over Parliament and the executive which they have lost. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that the following be added to the Address:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's present advisers do not possess the confidence of this House or of the country, and that their retention of office constitutes a usurpation of the powers of popular government.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a few moments remain before six o'clock in which I may at least undertake the task of complimenting, in terms and in spirit sincere, the efforts of the mover and seconder of this Address, and of acknowledging some of the personal references that have passed from the previous speakers.

The mover of the Address has not only done credit to himself and to his province, but has contributed to this debate a literary charm that constitutes, to the present point at least, one of its main excellences. The seconder is a new member, and I only speak the mind of all the hon. members here when I say that he has disclosed an ability and a grasp of Canadian affairs that constitute him at once a real asset to Parliament, an acquisition to debate, and an honour to his constituency and to his province.

I have to thank both of them for their kindly references to my accession to this office, and having done that, I pass to acknowledge, in the spirit in which I know it was meant, the very generous terms in which personally the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to myself, and to the hope he expressed that the conflicts of parliamentary life and debate will not disturb the long standing friendship that has existed between us, nor in any way perturb the amenities of our personal, or, indeed, of our public intercourse. I am under no temptation whatever at the present time to believe that his hope will not be realized to the full. I have known the leader of the Opposition for, I think, something over a quarter of a century. I think I understand his public opinions and I think I can clearly get the meaning of his speeches; and I assure him here and now that if the essential humour of his addresses is always to be so thinly

covered by a veil of argument and satire, as it was this afternoon our relations will never be distured in Parliament.

In the meantime, until the House resumes the debate, I will attempt to discover and then to answer what there is of matter in his address.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (continuing): Mr. Speaker, my desire is to extract as fairly as I can what there is of substance in the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) in the way of an attack on the position assumed by the present Government—to extract it and place it before the House in such form that at least the House can understand what the attack means and what was the argument by which it was sought to support that attack. I will have to drag the substance from under a mass of hyperbole, but the effort must be made.

I may have the aspiration—but if I have I certainly have not the talent—to rival my hon. friend in the power of declamation, a power that he has exercised throughout most of his life and which he has brought to some degree of perfection. All I aim to do in my humble way is to place before this House, in understandable terms, and through this House, before the country, the position this Government honestly takes; and the position which it believes it is in duty bound to take in the interests of the people.

My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) places before the House an amendment to the Address, in which he declares that this Government, has not the confidence of this House. Well, if that is the whole purpose of the amendment, it has no purpose at all. If the motion for the Address is defeated, that means that the House has no confidence in the Government. So the first question that arises in one's mind is: Why is this motion before the House at all? Why is this amendment here? It serves no purpose in the world—that is to say, so far as getting an expression of opinion on the part of this House is concerned as to confidence in the Government. I do not think I will proceed very far before the House will understand just what my hon. friend had in mind in bringing up this naked amendment for discussion. It was not so much to throw an issue into Parliament as to see that Parliament did not get an issue at all.

Last session we had this same amendment—or, rather, we had an amendment calling for a dissolution, which my hon. friend says is still his persistent object and purpose. But he had the grace last session to embody in the amendment some reasons why in his judgment dissolution should take place. Last session he read the following as the reasons why the House should dissolve and an appeal to the people should be made:

> The regrettable protracted absence of the Prime Minister, the widely accepted belief that it is not his intention to return to the duties of his office, the makeshift arrangements for the direction of important departments to which no minister has been regularly appointed, the attempt to carry on the public business when the three eastern Maritime Provinces are entirely unrepresented in the Cabinet—these and other things—
>
> The other things being all unspecified—
>
> —operate to produce a condition of uncertainty and instability from which a vigorous and efficient administration of the Dominion's affairs cannot be expected.

And those reasons are absent from this amendment. Why? Because they all ceased to be true. The very opposite is the fact in every instance, and my hon. friend, in search for some reasons that he could append to and embody in his amendment, finds none at all; so he simply comes forward with no reasons and states that the House should express its lack of confidence in the Government.

He wants to know by what right this Government is in office. By the sane right that every government is in office in Canada to-day or has ever been in office in this country—by the right of the confidence of a majority of the Parliament elected by a majority of the people. My hon. friend thought we had no right to be in office last session, but on every vote the government was sustained by a large majority, particularly on the vote in which he wished to declare that a dissolution should take place, "Oh", he says, "you may have a majority in Parliament, but you should not be there because you have a new Prime Minister and a new Government". Did not all the members of the old Government, he says, go out of office with the Prime Minister? Why certainly they did. Did they not all declare allegiance to the new Prime Minister and the new Government and take the oath of office again? Certainly

they did; that is the case with the advent of every new Prime Minister in the history of every country. That was the case in the instance recited by my hon. friend of Sir John Abbott and Sir John Thompson. It was also the case when the present member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) resigned the post of Premier of Nova Scotia and was succeeded by Mr. Murray. It was the case when Mr. Hardy became Premier of Ontario. It was the case when Mr. Martin, the present Premier of Saskatchewan took office there. It was the case when Mr. Stewart, the present Premier of Alberta, took office in that Province. It was the case when Mr. Oliver, the present Premier of British Columbia, took office in his Province. In every case all the members of the old government went out when a new government came in.

But, my hon. friend says, I would concede you the right if only in point of character, in point of purpose and in point of aim you agreed with the government whose place you took. Well, I tell my hon. friend that in point of character, in point of purpose, and in point of aim, we are in full accord and harmony with the government we succeeded, in every respect and to the last jot and tittle. In purpose and in policy we are the same. In every respect we are a continuation of that government—in every respect in which Mr. Hardy's government was a continuation of that of Sir Oliver Mowat; in every respect in which Mr. Murray's government was a continuation of that of the hon. Mr. Fielding at that time; in every respect in which Mr. Martin's government is a continuation of the government of Mr. Walter Scott. In all these respects we follow in the direct line of the government whose place we take in office. Did my hon. friend refer to the policy of this government in seeking to show that there was a divergence and departure from the course pursued by the late administration? He never refered to policy at all. The policy is published and is well known; in no particular does it diverge; in no particular is there a departure; this Government is a legitimate successor and continuation of the government which it succeeded.

What, then, does my hon. friend resort to in order to show that we have no right to be in office notwithstanding the fact that we enjoy the confidence of a majority of Parliament and notwithstanding that our term of office is still some two years from its expiration? "Oh," he said, "you

came into office in 1917 on the basis of a union, and you are a union no more." I try to put it in some understandable form. He argued, in substance: You are not, in point of the constitution of your government, in line with, in accord with, or the same as, the Government you succeeded. Well, how do we differ? He reads the names of members of the Government who have gone—members of the Government led by the hon. member for King's N.S. (Sir Robert Borden) and shows that some of them have retired from office; and he wants to know how it is that we assume the virtues of those who have retired. Well, really, I am not able to put that in understandable form at all. It is true that some have retired from office; I suppose six or seven or eight have done so. But of all those who have retired, only one, retired because of any difference in principle or policy from the Government from which he departed—only one who after his retirement failed to support the Government of which he had been a member, and did not continue the support of that Government in this House. Because men retire from office feeling that for reasons of their own they cannot longer give the kind of public service and the great labor required of public office, does that mean that the character of the Government is altered? Does that mean that the Government lacks public confidence? Why, one might just as well argue that if a member of the Government dies it is evidence that public confidence is gone. Never in the history of this country has a government sat in office with so many ex-ministers of the Crown sitting behind it in full accord with its policies and principles. And, forsooth, that is the government my hon. friend refers to in language of unparalleled exaggeration as composed of merely office-seekers and office-holders, eager to draw the salaries of ministers of the Crown, filled with all manner of scriptural vices and extortion and excess. Rather than draw the fruits of office and engage in the responsibility and continued labours that the enjoyment of office entails, there have gone from this Government, one after another, men who are not only in full accord with the policy of the Administration, and with all members of the Administration, but whose belief and expressed belief it was that the duty of the Government was to carry on as before.

My hon. friend tells us that in 1917 when this Government was elected, the issue was

the carrying on of the war, and he is right. That was the great issue of the 1917 contest, not only great but overwhelmingly great: that was the issue that overshadowed all others, and in the main was the reason for the vast popular majority which this Government succeeded in obtaining. But does that mean that this Government has no duty save to carry on the war? But if it had no duty save what my hon. friend himself is willing to accord it, namely the duty of dealing with the problems of war and the problems that succeed and grow out of the war, this Government's duty is not yet done. Is there an hon. member who will argue that we in Canada are even substantially past the problems of the war? There is not a problem that confronts us now, not a difficulty that we have to surmount, not a mountain that we have to scale, that is not placed where it is and is not of the magnitude that it is by reason of the war, and is not directly, in point of character and origin, related to the problems of the war and growing out of the war itself. Is re-establishment complete? I agree, very much has been done; I believe more has been achieved in this country than in any other. But to say that all the problems of re-establishment are solved is to utter language that undoubtedly argues a lack of acquaintance with conditions in Canada at this hour. But, though the war and the problems of the war were the first duty of the Government, though the carrying on of the war was the great overwhelming issue in the contest that elected this Government, the duties of this Government were just as wide and sweeping in their scope, just as inclusive of everything that pertains to Government in Canada as were the duties of any Government ever entrusted with power. In the platform on which we appealed to the electors in 1917, though it was set out in the plainest terms that the carrying on of the war was the great purpose of that campaign, there are no less than thirteen or more other distinct duties which the Government set itself to perform; some of them related to the war, many of them only remotely related to the war, many of them not so much connected with the war as are the problems that now confront us. This Government set itself the task of carrying those duties out.

Was this Government absolved from the duty, yea, the necessity, of dealing with every question that ordinarily comes within the scope of the functions of a Government? If we were so circumscribed, if we were so restrained, who was to carry on this work who was to be responsible? Was nobody to attend to it? Did we not have to attend to it? "Ah," my hon. friend says; "you have no business to touch the tariff at all; you should not touch anything except something connected with the war." Does he know that during the very first year after the Government was elected and while the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was a member of the Government and all the elected members of the Government were there, the tariff was affected, the tariff was, indeed, reduced? And the following year the same? In every year of our existence the necessities of the tariff situation were attended to. No general revision was brought on, but that was because the time had not come when a general revision could be made with advantage to this country, when the necessary information could be obtained and when we would be in a position to lay before Parliament the terms of a revision that would be sufficiently studied and thought out. But in relation not only to the tariff, but to every other subject, the Government had dealt with these problems in the same way as it would deal with the war or any problem arising out of the war. It is true that in the concert of principles upon which the members of the Government came to common ground in the fall of 1917 we did not then agree on any matters of permanent tariff policy for Canada, and the words of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) quoted by my hon. friend this afternoon were true and apt words: they spoke no more than what was the fact. But because it was not necessary to agree upon that issue for the purpose of union at that time, did that preclude us from agreement at any time on what should be the lines of tariff policy in this country during the constitutional term of office of this Government? The Minister of Immigration and Colonization did not say so. My hon. friend himself never thought so until very lately. Why, when, did it occur to him that this Parliament had no right to deal with the tariff? That is a new thought that was born in his mind in the course of the Peterborough election. Will the House believe that it is not yet twelve months since the Leader of the Opposition seconded a motion in this House demanding that the Government deal with the tariff at once? But let me come back to the argument that I did not fully complete, namely, that the composition of the Government is different in that those who

came from the Liberal party are not so numerous as they were before. My hon. friend quotes some six or seven; he claims, I think, that there were eight who were there. Well there are five to-day, and there is one who has been deceased for only a very few days, so that it seems to me it is straining a little too much to say that a reduction from eight to six is such a breach of the whole constitution of this country that we are landed now in chaos.

When my hon. friend was being carried away with the magnificence of his own declamation, particularly in those last fifty awful sentences, surely the thought came to his mind—and if it did not, it must have come to the minds of many of those who sit around him—that he was overdrawing the picture; that even if everything he had argued for was right, even if the little points he made had driven him to the conclusion that he sought, he had wholly overstated the consequence and so grossly exaggerated it that it was becoming pretty close to the absurd. Is the whole moral structure of this country going to go to pieces, because a Government retains office when Parliament has by no means run its full term but when in the main the great issue upon which it was elected has been decided? Even if he is right in his contention, does it necessarily follow that there has been some terrible, vicious, vile, and permanently destructive act perpetrated against the people of the country?

But in the first place, when did the doctrine first arise that after the great, say even the only, issue upon which an election is fought is decided, the government ceases to function? When was that subscribed to by any writer on constitutional law or history? When was it subscribed to even by hon. gentlemen opposite? In the history of this country there have been many elections in which there was virtually one issue, and one issue alone, upon which the verdict of the people was obtained. That was the case in 1891. That was the case in 1878. That was the case in 1904, when the late leader of the Liberal party in this country, assisted without a doubt by my hon. friend, went to the electors of Canada on the issue of building the ill-fated Transcontinental railway. When he was returned, with the help of my hon. friend upon that issue, and when, in pursuance of the mandate which they said they had obtained, they went on with the construction of that railway, did the fact that they did so mean that their functions were ended? Were they then believers in the theory that they had no mandate from the people of this country to do anything else except to build the Transcontinental railway? And in 1911, when honorable gentlemen opposite were defeated on the issue of reciprocity, when there was indeed a new and big departure in public policy proposed in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, and when the country was appealed to on that issue, and as a consequence reciprocity was defeated, did it follow that the Government should not continue—that they had no power for example, to deal with other grave issues that confronted the country? And even if the Prime Minister through stress of circumstances should be compelled to resign and a new Prime Minister should come, does it mean that the new Prime Minister is a usurper, and guilty of all the crimes ascribed to me by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Mackenzie King)?

Then he told us we were the only Government in the civilized world that had denied the people the right to elect a new parliament after the Armistice. Well, I do not know that we need be very much disturbed as to the precedent that may be set in China, or even in Germany, or Austria, or Russia, but if there is anything in my hon. friend's contention that can be argued from precedent set in any of the Dominions or the Motherland, then possibly he would have said something that would have given colour to his contention. But is that the case? One would have thought by his reference to Australia that their position was quite analogous to ours, and by his reference to New Zealand that the case was the same there. Is he aware that in New Zealand the Government there was elected in 1914, and that although by the constitution of that Dominion they had only a three-year term for their Assembly, actually, by extending the life of Parliament, they went until December 1919, over six years, and then appealed to the country? And because, after more than six years—when their term was three—they went to the country, my hon. friend argues that in this country, after three years,—yea, a year ago, he said, after two years—when our term is five and when our election was held in December 1917, we must by virtue of the example of New Zealand, go to the country too. In the case of Australia, the facts are very similar, although there was no extension there. In the case of Great Britain, the Lloyd George government, which was the successor of the Asquith administration, but which did not feel that because Mr. Asquith retired it must appeal to the country at once, carried on for some years.

It did appeal to the country late in the winter of 1918, I think, but only after that Parliament speaking from memory, for seven or eight years, whereas its term by constitutional practice is about five years. There is therefore no argument to be drawn from any British case.

Here in this country we were elected on a war issue, we actually went to the country in war time. The British Government did nothing of the sort. They did not go to the country at all until after the war was over. The war being over they appealed to the country, whereas we went to the country just shortly before the war was over; that is the difference between us and the British Government.

My hon. friend says: You went into power as a war Government, and now that it is peace time it is your business to step out. If that is the case, a peace Government that is elected in peace time should step out when war comes. Does my hon. friend remember the hue and cry he himself raised and that his leader and the members of his party raised, when, in 1914 after the outbreak of war, the Government then in office, a peace Government, elected in peace time, was complained of for even contemplating an election at that time. Why, they fairly tore the purple off the clouds for fear we would go to the people, although we, a peace Government, were then confronted with the difficulties of war. My hon. friend's argument, if there was anything in it, would work both ways.

The fact is both the spirit and the letter of the constitution of this country may be defined thus: The term is five years; the usual practice is four years; the Government is entitled to hold office during that term, provided it maintains the confidence of the representatives of the people as reflected in the parliament elected. In the history of this country or any other that I have any knowledge of the only departure from such a practice has been on occasions where some overwhelmingly important issue has arisen, where a departure of policy of major consequence is proposed by the Administration, and when, as a result, it is desirable that the will of the people as to that departure be known. Those occasions have arisen in Great Britain; they have arisen in Australia. Will my hon. friend say that they now have arisen here? Is there a great, sharp issue of public policy dividing this House? Is there, Mr. Speaker? Did you hear anything of it in the speech of my hon. friend? I would like if such an issue could be raised, but we do not propose any radical departure of public policy in the first place. We do not propose to give the people of this country anything save what they have voted for almost times without number in this country.

Where, I ask again, is the great issue that has arisen? Oh, my hon. friend says, the only issue is that you should not be there—that I should be there instead of you. Well, what would be the issue in the country if we dissolved Parliament? The issue my hon. friend raises would be settled once dissolution took place. He says we should appeal just for the sake of an appeal, that we should have an election just for the sake of an election. Well, you have an election once you dissolve Parliament, but on what are you going to fight the election in this case?

If a big issue does arise, if it is clear-cut and unmistakable, if it goes to the very fundamentals of public policy, then there is justification for a government laying down the reins of office which the people have entrusted to them, even before the full maturity of its term. But until that does arise, and in that form, while a government maintains the confidence of Parliament, it is recreant to its duty to depart from office and abandon the trust reposed in it and be stampeded by the voice of a party press or a party leader, whoever he may be. The hon. member quotes words used by myself in Winnipeg in 1917. By every word of that speech, by every word of that appeal, I stand. I invite the honourable gentleman to quote more from that speech; I do not think it will detract at all from the quality of his own. He quotes as well from speeches of the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. Mr. Calder), by whose remarks also I stand. Undoubtedly, if three, four, or five members of a government retired at the same time and for the cause assigned by the honourable member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar), that is a blow from which perhaps no administration could recover. That is one thing. For one minister to retire merely because he disagrees on a point of public policy—not, mark you, because he does not think we should touch the tariff, but because he thinks we did not touch it enough, for that is why he retired—that is a very different thing from many men retiring at the same time because of a divergence of views on a great issue of public policy. It is one thing for one to retire at one time and another at another time merely because they cannot give more

of their time to public service; but it is a wholly different thing for all to retire in a section from the Administration on a point of principle and policy. Now, I hope my honourable friend apprehends that difference; if he does not I should be glad to try at least to emphasize it more.

I was endeavouring a moment ago to indicate to this House that my honourable friend had a reason for placing this amendment in the naked shape in which it appears before Parliament. I intimated that in my judgment it was anything at all but because he was anxious to throw before the electorate of Canada a clear issue for discussion and decision. It was rather because he was intensely anxious to see that no clear issue got before the electors at all. He says that all that it is appropriate to discuss now is whether the Government should be in office or not. Last year he told us that the House should dissolve as well. This year he tells us that we should not discuss the tariff at all, but last year he complained because we had nothing about the tariff in the address. Last year he bewailed the fact that there was no declaration of principle in that address as to the policy of the Government. Let me read what the hon. gentleman said. Reciting one complaint after another in regard to the address that had just been delivered from the Throne, he used these words:

> But, Sir, there is a further limitation in the speech from the Throne which serves to reflect the mind of the Government in another particular. The speech discloses an entire absence of any policy on the part of the administration in regard to the economic, social, and political questions which are uppermost in this country at the present time.

Complaining that the Government had not declared in the announcement from the Throne at that time its position in regard to the great economic questions which he declared then divided the country, he proceeded in the next paragraph to complain because, instead of proposing a reduction of duties on foods, we had dared to insert in the address a reference to a solution of the opium problem. He said:

> I submit that the people of this country are much more concerned at this time with the question of foods than the question of drugs, and that it would have been much better if the Ministry in advising His Excellency what should be brought before this Parliament for discussion, had propounded some policy which would help to relieve the high cost of living instead of skirting about that great issue and dragging in small affairs such as legislation for regulating the sale of drugs.

It did not seem to be in the mind of the hon. gentleman then that the Government elected in 1917 had no authority to deal with the tariff. If did not seem to be in his mind that the Government so elected had nothing to do with questions extraneous entirely from the war. Indeed, he complained because no explicit declaration of policy and principle was included in the speech from the Throne; and later in the session, in the debate on the budget, instead of contending then that Parliament had no right at that time to revise the tariff, he complained in his speech that the revision that had been promised had not been brought down before, and urged this House that, pending the completion of the work of the committee which was to investigate tariff matters, pending the completion of that work and the revision that would ensue, the House should then, at the last session, revise the tariff in the manner described in his resolution, that resolution was rather vague, it is true, but which was intended to give the people of the country the impression that there should be a revision right there and then with a view to reducing the cost of foodstuffs and the costs of implements of production and some other things that were vaguely embraced in the resolution he proposed.

Now, will the hon. gentleman tell me how it is that if last session was too late to revise the tariff, this session is too soon? Will he tell me how a Parliament elected in 1917 had power last session to revise the tariff and has not that power now? Will be explain the constitutional principle upon which he distinguishes the one from the other? Will be tell me how it is that, if Parliament last session had revised the tariff, that if the same parliament that sits here now had done what he decided it ought to do and had the right to do, the constitution would have remained inviolate and chaste, whereas, should we dare to touch the tariff now, in so far as even a single article is concerned, the whole thing would go to smash?

I think I can explain the change that has come over the dream of the hon. gentleman. In the last few paragraphs of his speech, he referred to certain by-elections. He referred to some that took place a year ago, some that took place a year and a half ago, and others that took place more recently. He had been contending for a long while that we could not lay any claim to the virtues of the administration of the hon. member for Kings, Nova Scotia (Right

Hon. Sir Robert Borden); and having laid down that proposition and established it, as he thought, to perfection, he then proceeded to ascribe to us all the misfortunes that had befallen that administration. It would be interesting indeed if the hon. gentleman would tell us by what process of reasoning he strips us of any credit for what that administration did and then attributes to us all the misfortunes which he says befell it? The fact is that very little attention was given by that Government to by-elections or any other elections once it was made certain that there was a majority behind it in this House determined to carry through to a successful conclusion the vital programme laid before the people in 1917. This Government came to power with the support of almost seventy of a majority in this Parliament and its first, almost its exclusive, function was to carry on the duties of office, and it was negligible, even indeed if it were a duty at all, to seek Government support in by-elections. As time went on the condition modified gradually, as would naturally be the case, and we have been able of recent months to give more time to those contests. Since this Government came into office there have been five by-elections, in every one of which this Government was represented by a candidate standing for what the Government stood for. In the by-elections in St. John and Colchester we had such candidates. We thought it was at least of importance that the people of those counties should know well what we were standing for, and should have some one to vote for who represented those principles. I see a smile on the face of the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe), and I am reminded of a similar smile that swept over his countenance just about a year ago, when he pointed to the fact that, except for the Prime Minister, there was no representative in the Cabinet fo the bereft Maritime Provinces and when he told the House that the reason there was none was because we dared not open a constituency there. That is the last occasion that I remember seeing the same vivid smile on the face of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the Prime Minister must have been blind for a long time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, we had a contest in those two constituencies, and the leader of the Opposition proclaims in this House the total lack of confidence in the present administration in the city of St. John because the Minister of Customs was elected only by a majority of a little over four thousand. Why, he said, we (the Opposition) only put in a candidate at the last moment. Why at the last moment? What was the matter with the first moment? I can remember well when that seat was opened. I can remember well when the challenge of the member for East Quebec was accepted. I remember well when the leader of the Opposition announced through the press of this country that there would be no election by acclamation there; that he would see to it that the Government was confronted with a real candidate in the constituency. But, somehow or other, he was not able to carry out his threat until very close to the contest. It was not possible even then for him to get a candidate to stand in the county of St. John for what he stood for. At last when one did appear he tried to at least bring some show of success by proclaiming that rather than be a Liberal he would be an "independent Liberal," and in that capacity he ran.

In the county of Colchester my hon. friend (Mr. King) and his party had no representative at all. Not a man in the county of Colchester represented his party. Perhaps there was not a man in the county who knew what his policy was. There was a candidate of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) who is represented to-day by the distinguished member for Red Deer. There was a candidate of that party in the county of Colchester and they had some rather questionable support — support from men who advocated very strange doctrines, very strange doctrines, indeed, doctrines put into practice in only one country in the world that I know of. But that party had a candidate and its candidate was buried under a majority of some fifteen hundred voters.

Then there came an election in the County of Yale and in the County of Elgin on the same day. Did my hon. friend have a candidate in the County of Yale? I do not hear him say either yes or no. But he supported a candidate in the County of Yale. Now I am going to state the reason why it is that this amendment—in its naked form, stripped of all substance—is put before the House. My hon. friend supported a candidate in the County of Yale all right, but a candidate whose views had just as much relation to his own as the blood of a South African negro has to mine. Were the tariff views of that candidate in the County of Yale in accord

with those of my hon. friend? Had they the faintest resemblance to them? The only tariff view he had, or ever espoused, was the determination to see to it that there was sufficient protection on fruit. He did not care much about anything else so far as I heard, and I heard him make several speeches and I read his platform. He was determined that there should be sufficient protection on fruit anyway, and I suppose because of that he was supported by the Leader of the Opposition. Did my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) or the party that he represents have a candidate in the County of Yale?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I was not there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well the only affiliation of the candidate with the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clark's) party that I could discover was that he called himself a farmer. In point of platform, in point of argument, and in point of principle he was just as remote from the party led by my hon. friend from Red Deer as the South Pole is from the North.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I believe in cheap fruit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but that was not the chief desideratum of the candidate of the Farmer party in the County of Yale. Well, the result—very fortunately for this country, and fortunately for Yale and to the credit of the electorate—was the return of my hon. friend (Mr. McKelvie) who so happily seconded the Address this afternoon.

In the County of Elgin there was a candidate that stood, I think—although he was very chary about pronouncing his views—on something akin to the Liberal platform of 1919; but he too sought to evade the odium, or whatever it might be that attached to that platform, by declaring himself an independent Liberal. At all events, so near was he to my hon. friend in name at least, that he succeeded in being buried at the foot of the poll by some thousand or more votes below the second candidate; and the vote that in that county individually stands behind a policy that this Government frankly supports was divided in the Town of Aylmer and divided throughout the county between the so-called independent Liberal candidate, and the candidate that supported the Government, so the candidate following my hon. friend from Red Deer managed to be elected by a narrow majority. If there is consolation in that for the Leader of the Opposition, it is at least a striking demonstration of the contention that in certain circumstances consolation is not very hard to discover.

Now we will come to the election in Peterborough. I have been anxious to say a word about that election, mainly for the lesson that may be drawn from it by my hon. friends angularly across the way—they who have been courted by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), they whose affections have been sought to be engaged by the Leader of the Opposition, and a marriage with whom was the purpose of his extended trip through the prairies and on through the Rockies. I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friends to what took place in the County of Peterborough; to where my hon. friend stood in the County of Peterborough and to where his candidate stood; to the tactics pursued by the gentleman supported by my hon. friends in a contest in that county. Does anybody in this House know to-day on which side of this great issue, an issue which, a year ago, my hon. friend declared to be vital to the electorate of Canada, the successful candidate stood? One would think to hear the address of the leader of the Opposition that the people of Canada were not the least concerned about anything in the way of policy, that it really did not matter what the Government stood for, that it really did not matter what the Government had achieved in a great and prolonged crisis—that matters industrial, social and economic were not of the slightest concern to them, but that all they were concerned about was whether or not we or he should sit in the seats of power. That is what he endeavoured to contest West Peterborough on, and he then and there put himself in a position that he will find the utmost difficulty in extricating himself from just so long as he is a public man in Canada.

He supported, I said, a candidate in Yale who stood for protection on fruit—on foodstuffs; he supported a candidate in West Peterborough who stood for free trade on foodstuffs and protection on everything else; and my hon. friend expressed delight—a really most inscrutable delight—in the election of a candidate in the county of Elgin who stood for protection on nothing at all. My hon. friend also seeks a working alliance with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), and is very hopeful he is going to get it; he wants from hon. gentlemen angularly opposite nothing on earth but their votes to place him in power; he is ready to accept any candidate—even one of

them—as long as such candidate will support him, it does not matter what his principles or policy are, all those things count for nothing; the only thing that counts is whether the candidate will vote for the hon. member for Prince, the leader of the Opposition. Here is the candidate supported in West Peterborough, and this is the platform that he ran on, supported by the leader who declared throughout his whole speaking campaign in Western Canada that his policy was practically identical with that of the farmer's party—practically identical—that they were both great Liberal movements, both in full accord with these historic principles of Liberalism. I will read some of the "historic principles of Liberalism:"

I am not and never have been a free trader and do not support free trade.

"But," says my hon. friend, "may be he just wants a tariff for revenue." That is the camouflage that is often thrown over it. Well, see how he expresses it, if all he wants is a tariff for revenue. He declares that "I will stand by Canada's industry and Canada's labour until the last," in contradistinction to being a free trader. That is one of the "historic principles of Liberalism," fought for in the county of Peterborough, and supported by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) and by the leader of the Opposition. Then he goes on:

You know my record for the last fifteen years, and my policy has been, Peterborough First.

That is not all; perhaps there is something more direct than that. All this is from his own published advertisement, signed by the Liberal committee of the county of Peterborough, and consequently must be in ful harmony with the "principles of Liberalism." Here are a few more specimens of Liberalism:

I believe in the protection of industries—

That is pretty straight.

—and the protection of labour. I believe in a greater and more prosperous Peterborough. Can anyone dispute that belief when it is expresssed by a man whose very existence depends on the progress of industry and its consequent results? Mr. Gordon will be one of the first to suffer from the effects of industrial depression brought about by a lower tariff.

I know that is not all, and am sure my hon. friends opposite will have no difficulty at all in seeing how striking is the "issue that divides the electorate of Canada" on this tariff matter. Here is another specimen:

I stand for the protection of industry, and by that I mean the protection of labour. The standard of living and character of the working home are grand tests of civilization.

Such are the "historic principles of Liberalism" fought for in that county. I ask attention to those matters on the part of my hon. friend from Red Deer and all those who sit around him, whose affections are sought to be entwined by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and who know right well that they exist in his mind as public men for one purpose, and one only—to catch the low tariff vote in certain parts of Canada while he catches the high tariff vote in other parts of Canada, and by the numerical addition of the two tries to exalt himself to power.

This candidate in the Peterborough election declared that I was guilty of conduct unworthy a public man, that the tariff was not an issue, that he stood for protection, and that I would deserve all I might get for being so "shameless" as to obtrude the tariff issue there at all.

Now, I ask this House: Are we to be invited by the leader of the Opposition to dissolve Parliament and go to the country on this issue—because he told us last session it was the great issue, and I do not know what has arisen since—when no human being in this Dominion knows where the leader of the other party is on the issue, and when he is determined that no human being shall ever know? In the Speech from the Throne which we are discussing now there is a paragraph that defines clearly and definitely where the Government stands, a paragraph that states the principle in words that no man can fail to comprehend, a paragraph that in so stating our policy places it exactly where it stands in the published platform of the party. I should like to know how we are to get that issue to the people until my hon. friend does the same. And he has a chance now. May I ask you Mr. Speaker: Has he accepted the chance? Is there a single hon. gentleman in this House, on that side or on this or anywhere else—particularly among those whom I am addressing now, behind the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark)—is there one single hon. gentleman here who does not believe that the Leader of the Opposition, instead of accepting the issue laid down in the Speech from the Throne, will now commence a process of evasion and

dodging, a process that he has been carrying on for months in this country? Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who even has a suspicion that the Liberal platform of 1919 will ever be put into effect if the Liberals are returned to power? Did the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) give any reason for that hope in the speech he made to elect Mr. Gordon in Peterborough? The burden of his speech was just this: I am not quoting the Liberal platform, he told them; I have not a word to say about it; but you remember what was done in 1896—and we will just do the same old thing again. They would do the same thing again as was done in 1896 by the party whose leader declared in Western Canada that his principles were identical with those of hon. gentlemen behind the hon. member for Red Deer.

Now, will my hon. friends angularly opposite but draw the lesson from that? I have never disputed the honesty of the mind of my hon. friend from Red Deer—never disputed it for a moment. On this tariff issue would he prefer to support a party whose position he knows and knows to be consistently maintained, or would he rather support another party whose position he does not know from one week to another, and who, he in his heart believes would put into effect the principles and policies of this Government on the tariff if he were returned to power? I ask him to say, in allegiance to his conscience, which of the two he would rather support. Does he think that in the state of confusion that now prevails throughout this country, where the issue is evaded and avoided and dodged at every opportunity—as it is going to be dodged, if I mistake not, even in this debate—does he think that in these circumstances there is any possibility of a declaration on this issue on the part of the people of Canada?

We are not proposing any departure from the historic policy of this country pursued under this Government, under the late Government, under the Government of which the leader of the Opposition was himself a member. We are not proposing any departure. If we were we would not have the support of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. Mr. Calder)—the one man who, as between himself and the Leader of the Opposition and the members who sit around him, has been consistent on this tariff issue. He is standing where he stood when the Liberal Party were in power on the tariff issue; he is standing just where the member for Shelburne and Queen's (M. Fielding) intends to stand and said in Peterborough he would stand if the Liberal party got into power. The difference between him and them is this, that in the meantime he is not pretending to stand somewhere else whenever it suits a constituency so to pretend; that in the meantime he is not seeking an alliance with men whose principles are diametrically opposite, by camouflaging his own. That is the difference between the Minister of Immigration and hon. gentlemen opposite.

Right now, they have an opportunity to show the people just where they stand on this issue. Are they ready to abide by the platform of 1919? If they are, let this session not go by, let this debate not go by, until hon. gentlemen stand up squarely to the Speech from the Throne and tell the people of Canada that that is so. For such can be the only issue if a dissolution of this Parliament takes place.

My hon. friend tells us that we are usurpers, and all the rest of it, because we are holding power. Do you know what he has started already in Western Canada? Do you know the tactics pursued by his press—and a most subservient press it is? Why, they are declaring in those provinces to-day that if Parliament is dissolved at this time it is a "sharp trick" on the part of the Prime Minister. Does my hon. friend know that? If this House is dissolved, they say, at this time, before the western people are placed in a position by a redistribution bill to have their voice in the policies of this country; if we take the step of dissolving Parliament, it will be a sharp trick on the part of the Prime Minister. This is what the press of the West says, a press supporting my hon. friend. Well if they say that before we dissolve, what do you think they are going to say after we do? Do you think "sharp trick" would at all compare with the language they would use then? Why, from one end of the country to the other there would be a roar of protest from the Liberal press—in which the Leader of the Opposition would join, I have no doubt—on the ground that we had robbed the electorate of that country of their due voice in Parliament; that we had stifled it for five years merely to catch a chance verdict of the people. Let the leader of the Opposition look at the columns of the Calgary Albertan, a paper that supports him to the hilt—and let him see there a challenge to me to dissolve Parliament and deny the West their rights. I invite

the attention of hon. gentlemen angularly opposite to these facts. Do they want the West represented by a fraction of its proper and due representation in a Parliament that may last for five years? Do they think it is better to do that in order to get a verdict on the tariff issue in the state the tariff issue is in to-day by virtue of the manipulations of hon. gentlemen opposite? Does my hon. friend from Red Deer think it is worth while? Now, I would like him to say.

The West will be undoubtedly entitled under the census to from ten to twenty-five —no one knows how many more seats in this Parliament. If this House is dissolved before redistribution that representation is denied. If this House is dissolved nothing can be gained except a confused and utterly uninterpretable verdict on the tariff issue that can get no government anywhere and can be a mandate to no Government at all. Indeed, there can be no result whatever except the return of at least one consistent body to this House, large or small, and the deception of both wings of the other body. That is the only verdict that could be given under the conditions that obtain to-day. Consequently, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances that obtain now; under the conditions of public policy and the discussion of public principle that to-day obtain by reason of the statements and speeches of public men, the clear duty of this Government, for the present at all events, is to carry on and to carry out its policy so long as a majority of the members of this House repose confidence in the Administration.

That duty we intend to perform. That duty through three and a half years we have sought to discharge. I do not think that in the history of Canada any other government has more zealously held to its programme, more clearly, definitely and determinedly sought to carry out the mandate upon which it was elected, to discharge all the duties of government. In doing so, it neglected its party affairs and, indeed, by some of its policies, though they were in the public interest, shattered its party organization from coast to coast. That has been the record of this Government. From now on until the dissolution of this House we intend to pursue the duty that we have pursued until now. The course that we pursue will be submitted to this Parliament elected by the people of this country, and while we enjoy the confidence of the representatives of people of this country we do not intend to shrink from our course or to be stampeded from it by the declamation of the leader of the Opposition.

My last word is this. In the past few months since I have had the honour to discharge to the best of my ability the responsibility that now is mine, I have missed no opportunity to obtain from the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite specific and clear statements of their position on the issue which they say should be submitted to this country for decision. I regret to say that I have failed. In the speech from the Throne that great paramount issue and others as well are placed before this House for discussion. The position of the Government on that great issue is unmistakably clear and the opportunity is given to hon. gentlemen opposite, of all shades of opinion and from all parts of the country, to be equally frank in their statement of their position. Let them first discharge that duty and, until they do so, let them not say that there is sufficient issue for the country to decide.

On motion of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (Cape Breton North and Victoria) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of right hon. Arthur Meighen, the House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

Wednesday, February 16, 1921.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Statement of Governor General's Warrants issued since last Session.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Statement of Expenditures on Account of Miscellaneous Unforeseen Expenses from April 1, 1920, to February 15, 1921. —Sir Henry Drayton.

Statement of Temporary Loans issued and outstanding since the last Session of Parliament.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the National Battlefields Commission for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Statement of Civil Service Insurance for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the Superintendent of Insurance, on Life Insurance Companies covering business of the year 1919.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the Superintendent of Insurance, on Fire Insurance and Miscellaneous Companies covering the business of the year 1919.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Ship Building Industry, detailed account of endorsements or liabilities under Chapter 70, 10-11, George V, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Tuesday, February 15.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, now that I am becoming somewhat of a familiar figure in this House and more or less of an old member, and having, of course taken part year after year in the discussions of the House, I would much prefer on this occasion that the duty of replying to the Prime Minister would fall to some more competent and capable hands. As, however, it is my duty to undertake this task, I will set about to do it to the best of my ability and somewhat to the satisfaction, I hope, of at least some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the Chamber.

I must at once follow the time-honoured form of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address. It has always been desirable that this duty should be performed with ability and dignity becoming this time-honoured institution of Parliament, and I am pleased to be able to say that the gentlemen who had the duty in hand yesterday performed it at all events to my satisfaction. In the mover, (Mr. McIsaac) we have a more or less experienced gentleman in this House, but I was pleased indeed that the seconder, the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), though unused to Parliamentary practice and discussion acquitted himself so well. I am sure that speaking in this House for the first time is difficult enough under any circumstance, but it is more difficult when one is put up against the very important job of seconding the motion for an address in reply, as was the duty of the hon. member for Yale yesterday. I was sorry, however, to find some of the "old Adam" traditions handed down to the hon. member for Yale. I find that, while an excellent man in many respects. he has fallen victim to the pernicious effects of the apple as did his forefather many years ago. I am sorry to find that, while no doubt a free trader when he was watching the absolutely free-trade performance down in the Bay of Fundy, the tide going out and coming in on a waterfront unequalled in any part of the world—this would naturally lead one to be a free-trader with wide comprehensions of free trade—the hon. member for Yale in other circumstances, fell, as it was rather natural for him to do under the influence of the "apple" and the "apple tree." We hope however, that after he has been here for a while, he may forget those things and once more come back to the ideas which he inhaled by the seaside in the fair province of New Brunswick.

Let me further congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) upon the position of honour and responsibility to which he has attained. He is the successor of great men: he follows, in the same office and in the same chair in this great and free country, such men as the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, the Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden and others whose names are not so strikingly familiar. He will gain inspiration from consulting the record of those great men and I have no reason at all to doubt that with his ability, which is by no means small, he will do justice to the position which he now occupies.

I must also hasten to pay tribute to my own leader (Mr. King) for the very excellent speech which he delivered in this House yesterday. I am proud to say that we all realize more than ever, if that be possible, that we have a distinguished man at the head of the party, and most certainly he acquitted himself with the highest possible credit in the task which he had in hand.

Ever since the present Prime Minister came into this House, I have had a seat, part of the time on this side, and part of the time on the other side of the House supporting the then government. I have watched with interest and satisfaction the right hon. gentleman's style of argument and presentment of a case, and I have

always found him to make the very best possible case out of the material at his disposal. But yesterday I was disappointed in his speech. I did not expect to like it, but I do not like it even as much as I expected. I thought that he did not answer the arguments put forward by the leader of the Opposition. It was possibly because they were unanswerable. I will do the Prime Minister the full justice of saying that if anybody at all on that side of the House or in his party could have answered the arguments put forward for their own disappearance from this House by my leader yesterday, he himself would be the man. Yesterday, however, he did not display his usual masterly ability, and certainly he fell short of answering the arguments put forward. It is perhaps natural for a man to desire to hold on to power and to the high office in which he might find himself, and natural also for a party to be desirous of holding on to power; but let me say to the Prime Minister and to the Government that it is not in accord with democratic principles. We in this country are proud of saying that we are democrats to the hilt, that our Government is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that the voice of the people must prevail. The moment there are indications that we have lost the confidence of the people and no longer truly represent them, all the satisfaction and pride which goes with being in power vanishes, and if we still persist in holding office, then office brings no honour to ourselves or to those whom we once represented. When that stage is reached, I think it is the duty of the Government and of an individual to place himself in the hands of the country and say: I am at your disposal; if you want me continued in office, say so; but if you do not want me and my colleagues continued in office you have also the right to say so, and we shall bow to your verdict. That, in my judgment, should be the conduct of public men in this country, but I am sorry to find that it is not the disposition of the present Prime Minister or his Government so far as their attitude was indicated in the speech of the right hon. gentleman here yesterday.

A good many arguments were put forward by the right hon. gentleman in support of his retention of office. He particularly referred to the difficulty of going to the country before the census was taken and a redistribution Bill had been put through the House, and before the general housekeeping arrangements, so to speak, had been made. He laid stress upon the fact that the press of the Northwest cried aloud against anything tending towards a general election before these preliminaries had been settled. He mentiond one paper, the Calgary Morning Albertan, as will appear in the Hansard report of his speech, and invited us particularly to see what that paper said about the impropriety of going to the country before the census was taken and the provinces of the West had received their proper quota of representation. Now, I have in my hand the Morning Albertan, to which no doubt the right hon. gentleman has made reference, and I particularly invite my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice to listen to the quotation I shall give from that paper. From his experience on the bench he knows very well that when a lawyer stands up in court and quotes an authority, if it should turn out that that authority is directly against him, it is usually a bad knock-out for his case, and the judge usually tells him that his case is directly opposed to what he wishes to make out of it, and that if that authority is to be followed, he will have to decide against him. Well, the Prime Minister yesterday rested his case largely upon what the Morning Albertan said about an election. Now, this is what that paper says in its editorial of February 9, two days after the famous election in Peterborough.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Famous and fatal.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Both famous and fatal. This is what it says:

> What about an early December election? If the Meighen Government believes that it has any chance of winning, then it will go to the country at once. Then, and no sooner. Unless it is convinced that it has a fair chance of success, it will not risk an election.
>
> A Governement which without any mandate of any kind has kept control for two years after all excuse for continued existence has been exhausted, will not act from sentiment even if West Peterborough and East Elgin have called so loudly. The Government will continue in office as long as the law allows, or until it is defeated in the House, or until it believes that it has some advantage in an appeal to the country.
>
> The people of Western Canada have some objection to an early election, because it would mean the old representation. Our number would be enlarged if an election were postponed until after the census of the present year. However, it would be better for Western Canada to go under-represented for three or four years than that all of Canada should be under control of a

Government which has not the confidence of a majority of the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I merely wish to say, with the hon. gentleman's permission, that the editorial which he read from the Albertan is not the editorial to which I refer. The editorial to which I had reference was published about two months ago and used the exact language I used? If the Albertan is capable of changing that language, that is not my fault.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a revised edition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You are always revising.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now, we had reason to believe yesterday that my right hon. friend was right up-to-date and that he was not dealing in old garments of the Albertan. He was speaking yesterday, the 15th. instant, and this was published on the 8th.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They may change back again.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, they may, but I venture to submit that the people of Canada will not be satisfied that the editorials of the Albertan newspaper are sufficient justification for the Prime Minister to base his arguments upon. This only goes to show that when one is in a desperate situation he is ready to grasp at straws. I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that the astute mind of the Prime Minister was rather led astray by somebody who told him that there was such a thing in the Albertan, and he jumped at a fatal conclusion. And although he will not, I know, do it publicly, I should like the Prime Minister, privately at the first caucus of his party, to tell them that anything he said about the Albertan on which he bases his case is absolutely false and falls to the ground, and that for the present the case made out by the Leader of the Opposition is entirely undefended. It is quite possible that the Prime Minister will not be disposed to listen to anything we say on this side of the House. If he were well advised by his own friends and supporters, and if he felt that the country was behind him, he would heve a perfect right as a party leader to pay little or no heed to anything we might say on this side, although it is always well to take warning and accept admonition from whatever quarter it may come, and to consider carefully whatever observations may be made by even one's keenest enemies. One would have expected the Prime Minister, ere now, to have paid due attention to what his own best friends have said, and I think he would be wise hereafter to consider their opinions. Now, last year a dear old friend of his party, the Montreal Gazette, tendered some sage advice to them and expressed some opinions regarding the Government at that time. That paper said then:

> The art of government is most difficult under the best auspices; but a leaderless ministry, destitute of policy, must be the despair of its friends. The public memory is short, and public gratitude is an unknown quantiy. The electorate required a guide, a policy, an association with those who invite confidence, and the Government offers neither guidance, nor principles, nor familiarty with the people. The situation is not suddenly precipitated; it began with the conclusion of the war. Since then futile efforts at permanent coalition have more than once been made, and Minister after Minister has dropped out until the situation has become difficult for the Government, and despondent for its supporters.

That was the opinion of that newspaper about a year ago. Reference was made to the matter when the House opened last year, but the Prime Minister will probably tell me that that article has no bearing upon the present situation, that they might have been finding fault with the personnel of the Government and with the leadership of those days, but that the conditions that prevailed then have passed, a new leadership having been instituted and new members having entered the Cabinet; consequently—this is what he will no doubt contend—this criticism of last year does not apply at the present time. Well, that might be an argument. But here we are confronted with an opinion very lately expressed, and I would respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister that he burn a little more of the midnight oil and read the public press so that he may learn what his friends, at all events, are saying about him. The same friendly newspaper, the same newspaper that has always been, as far as I know, a tower of strength to the Tory party, has again spoken, as late as the 8th day of February, the day after the Government met its Waterloo at Peterborough. This is what it says:

> The Government has declared its intention to live out its term, and constitutionally has the right so to do. Its parliamentary majority may prolong its existence for nearly another two years, but will it continue as a strong ministry for that period? A majority somewhat perilous when parliament prorogued has been reduced. The by-elections won by the Government mean merely the retention of seats, and indicate no new feeling of confidence, while the contested

seats like East Elgin and West Peterborough have swung to the Opposition and weakened to that extent the strength of the ministry. Governments are not constitutionally upset by the loss of a by-election or two, but no government can disregard the hand-writing, and above all no Government can gain in the present nor survive in the future that does not owe its existence to popular support. It happens that at the moment the time is propitious for an election, save that supplies have not been voted. The creditors of the Crown, meaning civil servants and those who have performed service still unrepaid and still unprovided for, are entitled to payment for service without regard to the quarrels of politicians, with which they have no part. Parliament will meet within a week. Its first duty is to provide for the services and maturing debts. If time permitted a tariff might be introduced and the Government appeal to the country upon it. If more time permitted, Parliament might have another session and after a redistribution of seats dissolve the House. In ordinary course this would be the way of procedure, the way we have hoped would be persued. But in the circumstances of adverse results from the recent by-elections, the situation has changed, and the advice we have to give to the government is to proceed with the supply bill and then permit the electorate to express its preference for parties in order that stable administration and confident policy may be carried on.

The situation is now uncertain, the life of the Ministry hangs by a thread, and under this circumstance strong and effective administration of affairs is impossible.

That, Sir, is the same authority continued. It had given its opinion of the old Government under the leadership of the Right Hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who has gone out of office, and it has now tendered its advice and its opinion as to what the present Administration should do. This expression of opinion is added to the many authorities which were quoted here yesterday by the leader of the Opposition.

I am not fond of reading in this Chamber, for I am not a good reader, and although other quotations can be cited I will merely refer to them. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Ottawa Journal of February 9th, 1921, and in an editorial of that day practically the same language is indulged in, practically the same advice is given, and the Government is told that it should at once, in view of the result of the elections in Peterborough and other places, dissolve Parliament and go to the country. True it is held that there was a division of the vote in Peterborough and there was not a decided majority for any party, taking the vote as a whole; but the editor of the Journal—whom we all know to be a staunch supporter of the present Government, and of every Tory administration in this country for many years—tells the Government that whatever else the people wanted they did not want the present Administration. That is made perfectly evident. The Journal says the people may have voted for the Labour man, for the Farmer candidate, and for the Liberal—and they did vote extensively for those candidates—but the last thing on earth they wanted was to have anything to do with this Administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, that advice, coming from a friendly paper like the Ottawa Journal should have some weight with, and some hearing from, hon. gentlemen opposite; and it bears out, I think, the idea which I have expressed—that there is no pride or satisfaction in being the leader, or being a member, of a Government that has not the confidence of the people. The only source of satisfaction is when the man who is at the head of affairs, and those who sit with him in the Government, have the honour of representing the people. When that condition ceases there is no honour attached to the position, and the representation that the people and the country sould have is lost.

Since the advent of the Union Government to power the Winnipeg Free Press has been an ardent supporter of it, but now the Government is considered to be a sort of patch work. Somebody beside me suggests, "a crazy patch work," but I would not go so far as to say that. At all events the Government is a makeshift for the time being, and a sort of amalgamation of some of the material which formed the old Administration. I take it that the Winnipeg Free Press is friendly to the present Cabinet. I see nothing to lead to a contrary opinion, except that in its editorial of the fifth of February that journal undertakes to say what it thinks of the election in West Peterborough. Let me quote from an editorial of that date:

The result in West Peterborough is capable of no explanation which gives the least gleam of comfort to the Dominion Government. From whatever view point it is regarded it is a knock-down and a drag-out for the Administration.

The editorial is lengthy and I will merely read a few lines further from its closing observations:

Once Mr. Meighen is convinced—and we should think West Peterborough would remove the last of his illusions,—that there is nothing to be gained beyond the mere holding of office for a few additional months, from hanging on, he may decide that in the long run the interests of himself and his party will best be served by an immediate election. The Government will meet Parliament without authority of prestige. It will have a majority so precarious as to make it a highly dangerous

business for it to submit legislation of a controversial character; it will be subjected to the constant taunt which will embody the truth, that it is usurping a power which the country does not wish it to exercise—and the net result must be a steady dwindling of whatever strength it may have in parliament and country. It is quite possible that the Government will act upon the advice tendered it by the Montreal Gazette; and go to the country after securing the passage of the Supply Bill by Parliament, leaving tariff revision and other difficult questions to the new parliament the probable outcome of the West Peterborough by-election will be a general election in the early summer.

Sir, those are the quotations which I regard as being in point, quotations from papers which are entirely friendly to the Government and whose opinions should be regarded by the Prime Minister and his colleagues as worthy of the greatest possible consideration.

Yesterday we were told by the Prime Minister that there was no need to move an amendment to the Address but that there could be a division upon the Address as it stood. Let me say that I am not familiar with any practice by which a vote could be taken without some amendment to the Address; and I think the Prime Minister's suggestion to his followers in that regard is entirely wrong. Before an expression of opinion could be given on the Address it was necessary to have an amendment. We do not want to vote that the Address be not passed; we want to pass the Address with an amendment which expresses our views.

It was very noticeable throughout the speech of the Prime Minister yesterday that he was not exactly upon the ground that he wanted to be. He realized that if he could get us over on the ground of the tariff that would be a better fighting position, and therefore he was apparently very much dissatisfied at the omission to say anything about the tariff in the amendment. Last year gentlemen on this side did say something about the tariff in an amendment to the Address, and I remember well the then leader of the Government causing a great deal of merriment among his friends because we suggested that the Speech from the Throne should say something about the tariff, and that the subject should be discussed on the debate on the Address. The then Prime Minister found fault with us for even suggesting such a thing. Well, we have a right to suppose that there is a continuation of ideas on the other side, and therefore this year we do not trouble them about the tariff. But there is no hope of satisfying them; when you give them one thing they want another, and even if they got both they would not be satisfied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of discussing the tariff at this stage. I have been in this House for pretty well on to twenty years now, and during that time I have never shrunk from discussing the tariff, whether I was supporting my party while in power or in Opposition. When the proper time comes to express an opinion on the question of the tariff, if my opinion is worth anything, I shall be ready to express it. But six years ago we were promised by the Administration which immediately preceded the present one that an inquiry would be conducted throughout the country, which would be followed by a tearing down or a bolstering up of the tariff, as the case might require. That promise was not implemented until last year, when this Government appointed a tariff commission. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that the report of that commission will be submitted in due course. Does the right hon. the Prime Minister think that it would be fair to us to discuss the tariff before we have the advantage of considering that report? If so, why did he waste thousands of dollars of the people's money in sending a commission from the Atlantic to the Pacific to gather up what they are pleased to call information, which is to be put in the shape of a report and to be laid on the Table?—and, I hope, printed and distributed among hon. members so they may get the benefit of the peregrinations of the hon. the Minister of Finance.

But the Prime Minister says: Why wait for anything of that kind?—we are not going to pay any attention to it. In effect he will follow the advice that was once given by the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster), who now sits beside him, when he said that these commissions and their reports were as thick as blackberries and were all pigeon-holed, no further attention being paid to them. I suppose this is another blackberry that is being matured. Nevertheless, I think we are justified in waiting until that report is produced. It is at all events a courtesy to the Minister of Finance that we should wait. We will be more courteous to him and to his commision than was the Prime Minister, because the latter went from the Atlantic to the Pacific declaring what the tariff policy of the Government was going to be, notwithstanding anything that this

report might contain. That is hardly a justifiable course for him to take when his commissioners are collecting information on the fiscal question.

I am not going to make any attempt at the present time to discuss the tariff, but I am going to throw out an idea which I think must be acceptable to every broad-minded man, and to every man who has any sense of responsibility, as to what the government of this country must do. This is a vast country, over 3,000 miles wide, extending from the frozen zone down to the American line, a country equal to if not greater in size than the United States. We have varied interests and different classes of people, and no government can attempt to pass a tariff without giving consideration to the interests of the country as a whole. No government can expect to frame a tariff that will suit everybody; it is an impossible thing to do; but there is enough strength of thought in this Parliament and out of it to know that some happy medium can be reached by which the people's interests, both east and west, will receive due and proper consideration. That, Sir, is the line of action that I would take myself if I had any responsibilities in this matter; and while I am here I shall always have the responsibility of my vote. It is no use for any government to press home the idea that any particular section of the country is opposed to manufacturing and other interests which must necessarily exist here in order to maintain our national standing. Such a spirit is not abroad at all. But there are different ways of coming to conclusions, and we do say this Government has done reckless things, and that a better management and readjustment of matters could be accomplished by a government that had the confidence of the people and could act on its own initiative. I use the phrase "on its own initiative," Sir, because we on this side, at all events, believe that this Government never was its own master, is not its own master now, and will not be its own master while it continues with its present support in this House. We say that in 1911 it came into power backed up by many of the big interests, and that those big interests sent their man into the House as Minister of Finance because they would not trust anybody else with the handling of their money. He stayed here, Mr. Speaker, until the job was done, and then he moved out and told us to go to the cats as far as he was concerned, after they had got the last dollar of what was coming to them. That is what I mean when I say that this Government is not acting on its own initiative. It is acting as the schedule is prepared for it and as its path is blazed out by the big interests.

We are anxious to protect the big interests in a legitimate way, we are anxious that every man who has a dollar invested in this country shall be protected, and we are anxious that every industry shall prosper; but we are not anxious that the millionaire class shall have the people of this country by the throat and dictate the course of government. Such conditions are intolerable to a free people. Therefore, we purpose to wipe out this Government and to put in a government which will represent the people and will deal fairly and equitably with every man, whether he is a millionaire or a sidewalk cleaner, for we are all free and equal before the law.

I say without hesitation that we cannot get the confidence of the people in our parliamentary institutions restored while the present Administration remains in power. It may not be all true that this Government is so shackled by the big interests as the idea is abroad in the land, but the Great War Veterans, if you choose to begin with them, believe they have nothing to hope for from this Administration; the labouring classes do not believe they have anything to hope from this Administration; the farming comunities, as their representatives in this House show, do not believe in this Administration or in anything that will be initiated by it. Even the big interests themselves have no great confidence in their protege now, for they have withdrawn their representative in this House, which, diplomatically, is always a signal of war.

These, Sir, are reasons why there is no confidence in the country. The wheels of progress are not moving as rapidly as they ought to move, and, confidence being shattered, those who have money to invest will not invest it. Why?

Why? Because labour is at war with this Government; and what is the use of talking investment or progress unless labour and capital will work harmoniously together? This Government have placed themselves on the side of the capitalist. They thought that was all that was necessary, but they reckoned without their host. So far as the progress and prosperity of the country are concerned the capitalist is helpless without labour; both must work together. About two years ago we had an instance of

the degree of friendship that exists between the present Prime Minister and labour in this country. When the Peace Conference was in session at Paris the then Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) was psalm-singing with the rest of them down there and telling about all the great things they were going to do for labour—what a blessed lot the labour fellows were. At the same time we had the spectacle of the present Prime Minister, with a gang of policemen, breaking into the houses of poor labouring people in Winnipeg at the silent, dark hour of midnight, and hurrying them off to the Stony Mountain Penitentiary. That is one reason why labour in this country believe they cannot expect sympathy or justice from the present Prime Minister or the present Administration.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk as to what our attitude is as a party, as to what we shall do if we get back to power, and what the country is to expect from the Liberal Party. We have only to point, Sir, to fifteen years of power, fifteen years of administration the like of which there has not been in Canada since Confederation. There was nothing different in the Liberal policy then from what we have now; there was nothing different from what has been in existence since this Government came in. But we left the country in a splendid condition. So excellent was the condition of business in every department of the country's activities that the then leader of the Opposition, when he went to the country in 1911, found fault with us because we were talking about trade with the United States, and said: "Let well enough alone." Everything was in such splendid condition that he wanted nothing disturbed. All that we say, Sir, to the Government, and to the people of this country; all that we say to the West and to the East and to every part of Canada, is that the great Liberal Party have their interests at heart; that they have the same policy and the same principles, the same desire for the advancement, the freedom, the contentment and the happiness of the people of this country that they had during the fifteen years they were in power. There is not the slightest difference between our policies, our beliefs and our principles then and those which we stand by now; nor is our desire any the less to rule this country faithfully and properly and well. We have nothing else to offer to the people, but that we are prepared to offer to them; and we believe that when the opportunity is given to the people the present Administration will be wiped away, horse, foot and artillery, and the place that knows them now shall know them no more forever.

4 p.m.

Right hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that, following on the heels of custom, I had the impression that we were to meet to-day at three o'clock instead of at two; therefore I have been deprived of an opportunity to hear part of the eloquence of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. McKENZIE: On account of domestic conditions, my hon. friend will be excused.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I knew my hon. friend had a warm spot in his heart for me. However, I am pleased that I arrived in time to hear his eloquent peroration. I do not know what stronger arguments he made in the earlier part of his speech, but generally speaking I note that my hon. friend keeps his best until the last; so I suppose I have heard the strongest of his arguments.

The first argument that caught my ear was that we could not undertake to discuss tariff reform in the House until the report of the tariff commission was laid on the Table. The members of that commission have been gathering information, he says; they have been preparing that information and it has to be produced and put before the House in the form of a report, and when we get that and have plenty of time to digest it, we shall be in a position to discuss the tariff question, and not before. Now, my hon. friend has had quite a long experience in parliamentary life. What he has not himself seen, he has read of; and I am going to ask him if he ever knew of a case where information gathered by ministers of the Crown for their personal information and to serve as a basis for their calculations respecting the schedules of the tariff was presented to the House in the form of a report. I think my hon. friend will have no recollection of such a proceeding. The tariff inquiries made by the ministers are for the purpose of obtaining the necessary data upon which to prepare their schedules in the interests of the country; my hon. friend surely must have known that. Knowing this, my hon. friend has, therefore, gone even further than his leader. Not only has he postponed the discussion of the tariff question for a

shorter or longer period of time; but if old practice and custom prevail in the future in this respect as they have in the past he has put it off pretty nearly until the Day of Judgment. He has cut clear from it; he has gone one better than the leader of the Opposition.

But my hon. friend did strike upon a new policy, wonderfully vague in its definitions. Suppose the request of the leader of the Opposition were complied with by the House and we were declared to be usurpers and thrown out of our seats. Various policies would be put before the country upon which the people would have to decide. The indefiniteness of the policy of the leader of the Opposition, arising from its variations, would be exceeded only by the greater indefiniteness of the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie). The policy he would lay down, if such an issue were to come suddenly before the people, would be this: My policy—he would say to the electors—is to be a happy medium "happy medium" undefined. Well, it was a happy thought, but I wonder just what the electors would expect to get if they decided upon a policy put forth by the former leader of the Opposition in the form of "a happy medium", without definition.

My hon. friend said also that we came in in 1917 backed by the big interests.

Some hon. MEMBERS: In 1911.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He never said a truer word in his life. We did come in backed by the big interests of the country; and the big interests of the country, when we came into power in 1917, were the interests which were behind the war, the interests of every man, woman and child of a loyal disposition in this country, the big interests which were in favour of defending the Empire and the liberties of the people.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I said was 1911, not 1917.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend made a lapse and said "1911," he and others have said over and over again that we are in now by the lease and power and godwill of the big interests. They are always saying that. In 1917 we were put in power by the big interests of the country such as I have stated, and it is those interests which we are pursuing at the present time. Though the war is over in one sense of active militant operations, it is far from over in the other sense of healing the wounds and making the readjustments which are necessary as a sequence of the destruction, confusion and trouble which resulted and which follow in the trail of the war.

I am not going to follow my hon. friend any further in reference to the particular subject which he has debated, and I am not going to make any apology for bringing another subject to the attention of the House. The Speech from the Throne has many sections in it and deals with a variety of subjects, and I think the House would hardly be doing justice to itself or to the situation on the whole if it confined itself to the somewhat narrow discussion of different faiths and beliefs with reference to the tariff issue alone. I am, therefore, not going to apologize to the House for introducing an entirely new subject and one which I think it is well for Parliament at this particular stage and for the the country to take somewhat into consideration. I read as one of the sections of the Speech from the Throne:

> The First Assembly of the League of Nations was recently held at Geneva. Representatives of forty-one nations, including those of Canada, met and deliberated together in a spirit of harmony that promises much for this great experiment. Much time was necessarily devoted to the work of organization, but other measures were also agreed upon which are calculated to promote stability and good will in international intercourse. Most important of these is the draft scheme for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice which will be submitted to you for approval at an early date.

I am not going to try to give a large number of details to the House. I intend to approach the subject from a different angle with the idea of giving to the House, and through that to the country, a general view of the work and purposes of the League as so far developed. The note that is struck in that paragraph of the speech is a note of great importance and of singular breadth. It is indicative of a long line of progress which has at last developed into a political situation unequalled in the history of the world. It is indicative also of the progress of Canada from her childhood to the present time and of her future progress.

With what singular interest anyone who is really interested in the development of the individual life follows the boy from early childhood to matured manhood. The playthings and the trivialities of the boy gradually are shed, and from step to step he takes on the obligations, duties and work of maturing youth and maturing manhood. He goes from obligation to obligation, from duty to duty, from

strength to strength, as he develops. Long time afterwards, it happens that the boy who played with marbles and made his little constructions of mud huts and the like gets up amidst the big forces of the world and plays with those great currents of thought and enterprise which are the cardinal and principal currents of the world's history and the world's development. We do not pity the boy for that change. It is a mark of development and progress; we are delighted to see it, and none of us tries to put upon that development the bar of an exclamation like this: "Ah, well, he is undertaking greater responsibilities; he may fail."

What is interesting in the development of individual life is far more interesting when we view it with reference to the development of national life, and this about which I am speaking to-day marks one of the many stages of Canadian national life. Before Confederation there was potent, inherent, in these colonies in British North America, a unity which by and by might work out into greater distribution of power and strength and a great accession of development and progress. Confederation was one of the first steps in developing that latent potency for nationhood. After the confederation had been fairly rounded out, the relationship widened and we began to think more and more of the inter-related colonies and dependencies of the Empire, to make our acquaintance with them, to consider them as members of the same family, to consider between them and us joint interests and common ideals, and so to work from the merely national out into the broad expanse of the Empire as a community of young peoples and coming nations within the Empire itself. That broadened us; it gave us greater responsibilities; it put upon us greater obligations; but we did not regret it. After that we went still wider afield. The war in South Africa struck another note and gave another complexion and tone to the relations of Canada within the Empire itself. It was that note and tone which are given by the expenditure of blood and sacrifice and effort for a common purpose and a common ideal, and an impetus was given to that spirit, and wideness and breath to the development of that spirit within the Empire itself, by the South African war.

Then came later that hurricane of war in Europe, menaced by growing clouds for many months, maybe many years before, and in the midst of that hurricane of war Canadians found themselves, and Canada found herself, one with those who were sent forth to take their part in that war. That enlarged Canada her thought, her feeling, her ideals beyond the family, beyond the national, beyond the Imperial, and created a wider acquaintance, and a wider area of sympathy and effort with all the allied nations as against the common enemy we all were fighting.

The war over, and its sacrifices in an active way for the time being over, Canada's interest still proceeds. We entered into that war, not simply to destroy some crowned head, not simply to overthrow some military dynasty; we entered into that war to secure the liberty and the peace of the world, and every drop of blood we shed, every man that fell, and every bit of the dust of Canada's people that enriches the soil of those countries where they fought and died was a pledge for the future carrying out of the work begun and carried on by physical sacrifice in the war. We made our investment there, and every bit of treasure that we spent and every drop of blood that was shed, and every succeeding sacrifice that was made is not only a perpetual record of the work done by Canadians in the field for freedom and justice, but an undying reminder of the work that still remains to be done.

We have made an investment in the field of world peace. We have put in our treasure and our blood, and we propose to follow that investment to its completion, and to bring out of it in common with the other nations of the world, the rich rewards of enduring peace, freedom from war and all the dread burdens that follow as a consequence of war. Now in that work we are not simply related to the Empire, we are not simply related to the Allies; we are related to the world. We are a part of the world machinery now, with just that much wider sympathy, with just that much broadened, helpful feeling that binds us not merely to our own nation, not merely to the Empire, not merely to the Allies with whom we fought, but to the world itself which needs adjustment, and into which we have put our investment in order that peace and security may follow as the ripened harvest. So much then for that phase of the question.

When we sat in Paris after the conclusion of the war, and during the conferences of that long peace assembly, men from all the nations interested, their strongest and best intellects, were working on the problem of the Peace. What could

be assured as a constitution of Peace, as a realization of the hopes that war would be diminished, if not entirely banished from the world. These men were working with all their power and energy along that line, and the product of their labours was the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles, followed by the other treaties which embodied that covenant and which looked forward to gain by that covenant the fruits of the victory and compensation for the sacrifices in the world war. The Treaty of Peace, read just by title, has no great distinction from the hundreds of thousands of treaties of peace which had before been signed throughout the world and which are now filling the records of the different nations of the world. But this was more than an ordinary treaty of peace. It was a pledge and a covenant for the future. It was a reversal of the policy of six thousand years. It was a negation of war and an apothesis of peace and was signed and guaranteed by the thirty-two signatories to the covenant and the treaty, and since that time has been signed by thirteen states that were neutral, and by the six others which were admitted at Geneva. It has been signed by forty-seven countries of the world. Four that signed the Treaty of Peace did not ratify it. This accounts for the ultimate figure. It is a pledge of their proposals, of their wishes, of their desires, of their convictions, of their promise to fulfil. It may not be without importance, I think, to read in a few lines just what that pledge is. It is contained in the Preamble:

> The High Contracting Parties
>
> In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security
>
> by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,
>
> by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,
>
> by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another.
>
> Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

Forty-seven nations of the world have signed that. There is nothing that ever equalled that in the world's history. Treaties have been made between two countries, between three and four and sometimes half a dozen countries, but no treaty with signatories to a pledge for the abrogation of war and the employment of the arts of peace for the settlement of international disputes and difficulties has ever before been witnessed by the world with the majority of the world's nations behind it.

I have said that forty-seven nations have signed that pledge. That means that about 62 per cent of the whole of the territory of the world is embraced within that pledge. It means that 75 per cent of the whole population of the world is embraced within that pledge. That is significant. To my mind, it is something wonderful. Who are outside of that pledge to-day? Germany is outside, but if Germany for a few months will give the proper attention to her international obligations, and show a spirit of goodwill, she will be admitted to the League and will be welcomed. Mexico is outside of the League, and so is Soviet Russia, but there is hope for both Soviet Russia and Mexico.

The United States is without the League; but do not ever say that without coupling with it this other thought, that the spirit, the prayer, the hope, the overwhelming conviction of the people of the United States runs even with the ideas and purposes for which the League is formed. There may be some differences as to certain non-essentials which may have to be looked after and changed. But when you count the United States as not being in the League count also, of a surety, upon the fact that the vast majority of her people, with their prayers and hopes, are marching in the direction of the League of Nations as constituted.

Let us then in the next place consider the duties and obligations of the League. They are set forth in the covenant, which assigns those duties and obligations in certain directions and to certain organs of the League which are to be created. The League itself must operate through its own organs. The Supreme Council is not intended to carry out the purposes of the covenant of the League. It is simply an organization of the four or five great Powers. The League must have officiating organs of its own.

Let me for a few moment simply sketch what are the working organs of the League of Nations. Its first working organ is the Council, which is constituted by one member from each of the five great Powers; and as the United States has not yet ratified the covenant of the League, only four representatives are on the Council from the great Powers; that is to say, representing all of the five Powers

apart from the United States. The four other members of the Council are provided for by election by the Assembly, of which I shall speak a little later. Before the Assembly was called and nominated its four members to the Council, provision was made in the covenant by which four members to represent the other nations, members of the League, officiated, and their term of office closed when the Assembly took on its proper power of nominating its four members. So that you have as an organization, one of the first organs of the League, the Council, consisting at present of eight members, which may be augmented to nine if the United States becomes a member of the League. Of these, four of five represent the Great Powers, and the other four represent all the other Powers and are elected by the Assembly of the League.

Now, that Council must in the first place have unanimity in order to carry through its measures, and that condition appeared at first to be almost a block in the way of practical working. It has not been found so, however. It is better to have that as a condition of the conclusions being reached by the League than to have a mere majority trying at this particular time to force upon all the nations what it may think should be done. And in practice it has so worked out that no obstacle has appeared in the way of any line of conduct and action which the Council of the League has been carrying out during the time that it has been in existence. The ground is taken that trivial things should be allowed to go and conclusions should be reached in the spirit of the League with a unanimity that will carry conviction. And if sometimes the rough edges may perhaps be pared off of what some members of the Council might wish to see put through, thereby giving some indication of compromise, still it is a wise compromise and a wise provision, in my opinion, and it has worked out successfully so far.

The next organ of the League of Nations is the Assembly, which is constituted in this way. There are now three delegates for every nation a member of the League, whether that nation be small or large. There is one vote for every nation, and the leader of the delegation gives the vote when votes are called for. From the 41 nations which were represented by their delegations at Geneva on November 15, there were 110 delegates, some nations having two and some one; there was not the full number of three for each nation. That is the Assembly as it was constituted on November 15. As now constituted there will be a possible three delegates for every one of the 47 nations that now make up the membership of the League.

With the Assembly, just as with the Council, unanimity must prevail, unless it is otherwise designated in the covenant or in the treaties which assign obligations or duties to them. One would think that in an Assembly of 110 delegates—that is, the representatives of 41 nations—it would be found that the compulsory unanimity would work out detrimentally to practical business. Well, the proof is better than the supposition. That Assembly met and did its work for five weeks, and the question as to the condition of unanimity being a bar or block to its progress never once came to the front in any such way as to retard the real work of the Assembly. The men who represented the nations were there under the overpowering impulse and spirit of working for a League with ideals in which the selfish and the national must give place to the unselfish and the international. And however strongly opinions were held and presented and debated, in the end there was no withdrawal of any proposition on the ground that perfect unanimity was not obtainable. So much with reference to the proof of the practical, rather than to the theory which one may form as to what might be a bar or block to the working of the Assembly.

The Assembly and the Council have different duties put upon them; there is a difference of jurisdiction. There are some things which, under the covenant and in the treaties, are given to the Council alone, while there are other things that are delegated solely to the Assembly. That is to say, each has some absolute powers. They have co-ordinate powers where they work in concert one with the other in order to come to the desired result. And then the Assembly and the Council each has the right to take up anything that comes within the sphere of the League or that appertains to the peace of nations.

There are, and were, some who thought that there ought to be exact definitions, put down in black and white, of the duties of the Council and of the Assembly; but a little discussion of the matter made it plain to all concerned that that would be extremely unwise, and that it was far better to leave it to the good sense and the good spirit of co-ordinate bodies, working along

the same lines and for the same objects, rather than to attempt to exactly define the arrangement of their powers. Anyway, it worked out thus to the satisfaction of the members of both Council and League.

Then, in connection with the Assembly and the Council, there is of course the Secretariat. The Secretariat is really the staff of the Council and of the Assembly. The first secretary was provided for in the Covenant of the League of Nations. He was appointed by that Covenant for five years, and was selected by the Supreme Council of the League for that period. When the term expires the Secretary-General becomes the appointee of the Assembly of the League of Nations and the work goes on, as in Parliamentary circles, under the control of the Assembly, or what you might call the popular body. The Secretariat has a staff at the present time of some one hundred and fifty officials of different grades. On this staff more than eighteen different nations, members of the League are represented, showing the spirit of distributing this work as evenly and as well as might be, so that as many of the members of the League as possible shall be personally interested and shall be able, personally, to put forward their views with reference to the practical work of the Secretariat. Now these make the three great forces of the League in its operating capacity—the Council, the Assembly, and staff of the Secretariat, with the limitations that I have mentioned.

Having gone thus far, will the House allow me to say a word or two as to the general line of the duties. I cannot take the time to put them in detail but I will present them generally: They are for the reduction of the armaments of war, provided for in articles 1 to 8 in the Covenant. The lowest point, consistent with national safety and with the international obligations of the League, is the point set out to be attained in the future. To get to that as quickly as possible is the work of the League. Ten sections, or so, are then taken up with dealing with disputes between the nations and which up to the present time have been settled in the main, if diplomatic efforts failed, by the arbitrament of brute force. These cover a variety of plans for arbitration, for courts, for notices, pledges not to go to war within a certain time and until examination has been made, and safeguards against the violation of any of these pledges that were made.

Then there comes an article with reference to the registration of Treaties which, though simple in itself, is of paramount importance. It means that every Treaty which is concluded between members of the League is to be registered and ultimately to be published. What does that mean? It cuts straight across the customs of thousands of years when secret treaties were made between powers which aroused the suspicion and massed the resources of one set of powers against others, and not only led to suspicion but to lack of faith and confidence and ultimately to broils and to war. This marks the era of open diplomacy. Henceforward you can make your treaties but they are to be registered and, under the League, to see the light of day. That is a change that is stupendous in itself and which, if carefully worked out and adhered to, means a mighty important element and factor in the peace of the world for the future.

Then there is the system of Mandatories which also marks an absolute divergence from the methods of six thousand years. The individual who, in the olden time, was stronger than his neighbour took his cattle and made them his own. The nation which otherwise was stronger than its competitor took its territory and made it its own. Under the League of Nations the derelicts of war, the colonies and the parts of empires dismantled do not go to the victors to form additional parts of their territory and to constitute the elements of their future aggrandisement. These are placed under the Mandatories allocated by the Supreme Council, the terms and conditions of the Mandate to be prescribed by the Council of the League of Nations and the supervision to be under a Commission appointed by the League of Nations to which the Mandatories are to report each year and whose work may be reviewed by the Council and by the Assembly itself.

The element in the Mandatory principle is that these parts of territory and these peoples are not to be held as the adjuncts or slaves of the nations that have conquered, but are to be held in trust and to be administered by the Mandatory for the good of the people entrusted to their care; and the checks that I have mentioned are placed upon the Mandatories by the League in order to see that this trust is properly and reasonably executed. There you have a revolution, alongside another revolution, in the ways of the world for the last six thousand years and which point strongly—with the backing of forty-seven nations at present behind them to the better era when wars and their possibilities will be reduced to the minimum and the maximum of peace and security will be ensured.

But the League of Nations was wise in another thing. There are two ways in which you may bring about good international relations. One is by the reduction of the causes of war, by the compulsory reduction of armaments and another is by this allotment of Mandatories to prevent greed from being an impelling motive for war—that is greed of territories not at present enjoyed. All these things are good in their way, and are necessary, but there is another avenue. That is to get down to the common heart, the common impulses, the common interests of the nations, and working along humanitarian and economic lines for the good of all, one nation with another, to pave the way along that avenue for those feelings of amity, of help and of sacrifice, one for the other, and of commonness in ideal and purpose and benefits which will have a very strong effect in bringing about the desired results. And so there is your social and economic propaganda. A nation, China for instance, is plagued by the opium traffic. That nation buys itself free or struggles out from it; another nation—not China—sacrifices some of her interests and agrees with China; and you have the two principal nations concerned in agreement. But you never will stop the opium trade and the deleterious traffic in it and kindred drugs until you have the co-operation of all nations, because those who do not co-operate are the go-betweens, and they destroy the effect of the sacrifices of those who are primarily interested. Therefore the League comes in as a sort of liaison between the different nations in all these great humanitarian works of which I have cited one example, and by its counsels and its technical advisers it assists the nations to do more effective work: it exerts itself to influence nations to make similar conventions; it pleads with nations for the good of all to join these conventions; and it helps by its counsel and its supervision to gather the nations gradually into one world-whole.

When that has been done and effective supervision established, you strike a death blow, as far as you can, at these ills. There is the illicit traffic in women and children; there are the epidemic diseases which scourge primarily one country and which threaten to scourge the world out of that country as a centre and hot-bed of those diseases. All these are brought under co-ordinating influences in the different nations, and by means of the League of Nations they combine for supervision and for help in carrying out the world-purpose. There are a dozen or more of those great humanitarian, economic and financial organizations—technical organizations they are called—the duties of which are defined in the Covenant and in the operation of which are being negotiated by the League of Nations. That in brief gives you some idea of the nature of the work that is being carried on by the League of Nations.

Now with reference to the Assembly. That is the newest and therefore may perhaps be less known to most of us. Any way, I feel it my duty to say something with reference to the Assembly, to the end of interesting my fellow members in the work and purposes of the League, and, if possible, of arousing in Canada that force, moral and social, which must be the foundation of the success of the League of Nations, if it ever is to succeed. It is not Lloyd George, it is not Millerand, it is not the King or the Cabinet of Italy who in the main is going to make the League of Nations a success in the world. It is the Co-ordination of the prayers and wishes and hopes, the moral and political influence of the great body of humanity the wide world through which is to make that League successful. This is my excuse for bringing that matter forward today.

On the 15th day of November one hundred and ten delegates found themselves in the City of Geneva and in convocation at the Hall of Reformation, which, taking Genevan history into account, has some associations connected with it. People were wont to ask, and there was every excuse for their scepticism: What in the world will happen when forty-one different nations, of every colour, of every creed, of every language and traditions get together in one room down in Geneva? How are they going to understand each other? How will they ever make their views known to each other? Will they ever get down to business? There was ground for thought of that kind. Well, Sir, what happened? In brief, this. I have had some experience of political conventions; so has my hon. friend. I have seen them get together from one country—yes, from one province, and I have found them take a very long while in getting their rules of procedure and all that sort of thing fixed to their liking and settling down to real work. I never saw and never read of a convention, and certainly none on the scale of this one, which so soon got down to profitable and practical work as did the first Assembly of the League of Nations.

It is true there was all that disparity, there was all that variety of tendency and thought from generations and centuries behind each of these nationalities—all those conditions were there, but when humanity is inspired by a common spirit and a common ideal, overpowering in its nature, all these differentials are soon left to take care of themselves, and the human unit is the only thing that emerges into the foreground, and the worth of the human unit is the only thing that counts. That was exemplified in the first League of Nations. It was the spirit of the mission upon which they came, it was the height of the ideal which inspired their coming, it was for the great purpose possible of achievement that they were there, and they set themselves to become acquainted with each other, to get each other's viewpoint, and they vanquished all these seeming difficulties. They came together, and in six days' time they were working just as smoothly, and, I think, much more expeditiously than the committees in our own Parliament or in other Parliaments of constitutionally governed countries are carried on. So much then with reference to that as a matter of fact.

What did they have to do? Those one hundred and ten people met there without a president or presiding officer. That difficulty was quite easily got over. The Council of Nations had appointed one of its number to be temporary chairman, and he and the head of the Swiss Confederation made congratulatory addresses, and then came the election of a permanent president. It is a courtesy amongst those peoples that the first session of a convention like that shall take as its chairman a man from the country in which it meets. That honour might have been claimed by Switzerland, but it was not, and the president of the Swiss Confederation himself moved the nomination of Mr. Hyman of Belgium as the first president. He thus put Belgium and Switzerland into the best of accord one with the other, and avoided any bitterness that otherwise might have taken place. So we had our first president.

Then came the rules of procedure. The Council had drawn up provisional rules of procedure. We adopted those rules after a very short discussion, and then appointed a committee to amend, revise and bring down a permanent set of rules. The next step was how to carry on the work of the Assembly. That was solved in this way. Six great commissions or committees were formed, each consisting of forty-one members; that is, upon each of those commissions every member-state of the League had one representative, and those six commissions took the burden of the work which was referred to them. The first committee dealt with constitutional questions, the rules of procedure, the relative competence of the Council and of the League, and the election of members of the council. The second took up the matter of the technical organizations which I have already explained to the House. The third took up the matter of a permanent Court of Justice. The fourth took up the secretariat and the finances of the League —a very important subject indeed, which engrossed a very large amount of our attention. The fifth took up the question of admissions to the League; fourteen demands for admission were made and six out of the fourteen were admitted. The sixth committee took up the questions of mandates, armaments, and economic weapons. Every resolution and everything referring to the meetings and the work of the Assembly was transferred to its appropriate committee, was threshed out in that committee, and the conclusions of the committee were reported back and discussed, amended or approved, as might be, by the Assembly. That brought forty-one different nationalities of men into each committee, and solved very quickly the question of our getting acquainted with each other. They were thrown together around a common table for a common purpose. They made their views known and practically became as well acquainted in the course of a very short time as we on different sides of the House are with one another.

French and English were the two languages in which the debates of the Assembly were conducted and discussions in the committees carried on. The question came up very early in the course of the proceedings. There happened to be seventeen states whose national language was Spanish, and the question was mooted; If we have French and if we have English, why not Spanish as well? It was debated with great vigour, but in the end the overmastering spirit of the Convention solved that difficulty; the Spanish demand was withdrawn and the solution was found along this line, backed by the practical considerations which made it impossible that every nationality should have its own language as an official language. If one wished to speak Spanish, he had the right

to do it; he had the right to get an interpretation of his remarks, and that translation into either English or French was spread upon the minutes and took its place just the same as if the remarks had been made in French or in English. But a wonderful thing happened; among the delegates from those forty-seven nations there was scarcely one who was not able to express his views either in English or in French. So it was simply a process of double translation; if a man spoke in English his remarks were immediately translated into French; if he spoke in French it was immediately translated into English, and each had the advantage of the views of the other. Although it took time, the procedure was carried out with wonderful smoothness and rapidity.

May I mention one thing that particularly struck me in connection with the deliberations of the Assembly? We are a very courteous assembly here in this new hall. We try not to say anything deliberately which will wound another. We pay compliments sometimes—though not very often, I am afraid.

Mr. McMASTER: They are not always returned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, they are not. What struck me from beginning to end was the spirit of courtesy which characterized all the discussions of the Assembly. I did not hear a wrangle in the Committee or in the Assembly; no sharp things were said just for the purpose of wounding. Sharp arguments were used it is true, and were sharply clinched, but over all there was a universal spirit of courtesy. Is that because the dominant element in that Assembly was of the Latin race? Whatever may be the reason, it was a fact.

Another thing that struck me was this: from no country did higher or more advanced ideas emanate than from the countries of South America, nearly all of which are members of the League. Certainly in breadth and liberality—sometimes carried to the point of danger—their views and suggestions were in advance of those of the other delegations which were in attendance.

During that Assembly thirty-one plenary sessions were debated. Twenty-eight different resolutions debated and were passed in reference to important subjects sent from the Committees for discussion by the Assembly. But from first to last the discussion of that whole Assembly were characterized in an eminent degree by frankness, fulness, clearness and earnestness, directed to the sole purpose of getting at the best solutions possible.

I wish to say a word with reference to the position of the smaller nations. Every delegation has just the same rights in the Assembly and in the Committees as every other delegation. In speaking and in voting the small power has the same privileges as the large power. Much depends, of course, on the source from which the delegate speaks; in the discussion of certain questions one power may have an influence which is not present in the same degree in the case of a smaller nation. But as to discussion and voting the
5 p.m. privileges of the various nations represented in the Assembly are uniform,—an ideal the realization of which has long been sought. Indeed, that is what gives strength to the League; for the smaller nations feel that they approach the larger on a footing of equality and that they can exercise as much influence as the quality of their views entitle them to.

What has emanated from that Assembly? First, a plain proof that it is possible for a League of Nations constituting the majority of the countries of the world, and ultimately constituting all the countries of the world, to meet on a world platform and do effective, practical work. There was a forum upon which every nation could ventilate its ideals and put forward its position in a great gathering of internationals. There was a forum elevated before the world, watched by the press, the proceedings of which were telegraphed and written to every quarter of the globe; a gathering in which the foremost ideas of the foremost men of forty-seven nations of the world could find expression. There was a platform for the discussion of matters so brought up, for the formulating of views with regard to them, and for the impression of those views upon the world.

Do you mean to tell me that is not erecting in the world a method of procedure, a channel of influence, a means of propagation of the best thought of the nations of the world, a moral force and an intellectual force which will go further than armaments in righting the gross wrongs of the world and drawing the conscience and heart of the world to a contemplation of the higher, the better and the truer course? That, to my mind, if nothing else were accomplished, is a splendid accomplishment and worthy of the trouble and all that it cost.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the discussions of the League, there was some question as to the meetings being held in secret rather than in public. Would my right hon. friend speak of that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With reference to the Assembly, all meetings were in public. That is, the Salle de Reformation was not large enough to hold everyone, but everybody who could get in got in; representatives of the press were there and had a right to be there. The meetings of the Assembly were open to the public gaze; the world saw them; all heard and digested the discussions if they wished to. With reference to the committees, it was resolved that each committee should make its own determination whether it would hold private sessions or public sessions. But it was imperative that the proceedings of each committee should be taken down in extenso from day to day, published as they were the day after, put into the hands of every member of the Assembly and the results given to the press. In addition to that, a number of the meetings of those committees were advertised to be held publicly and the public were admitted to them, so that I do not think there is any reasonable ground for stricture in reference to that. Some things will occur in a committee where it is best that the matter should be threshed out amongst the members of the committee itself, and provision was made for that emergency. Otherwise, the light of day was shed into all the transactions of the Assembly. Let me say just here on that point, that the decisions of the Council have to be public as well.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I would like to ask a question or two with regard to the relative positions of the Council and the Assembly. Is the Council superior to the Assembly? Does the Council derive its force from the Assembly? Is the Council elected by the Assembly?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just a word on that. I touched upon a part of it, but now that the question has been asked a little more distinctly, I will give the answer. The Council has eight members upon it. Those eight members in the Council represent the Governments of the countries from which they come. Four of those members are elected by the Assembly, those four representing the other nations outside of the four great powers. In some cases, they have co-ordinate powers, Council and Assembly. They have to work together and come to an agreement in order to carry a thing. In other respects they have absolute powers conferred upon them by the covenant and they have each the general power that they can take up whatever comes within the sphere of the League and which pertains to the peace of nations; but the agreement between them is maintained—and it is the only sensible one—that no one works without an understanding with the other.

I think I touched upon the point that one great thing that was done by the Assembly, if it did nothing else, was that it met and organized itself and was successful in organizing itself upon a practical basis and that it finished the machinery of the League of Nations. The operating organs of the League of Nations are now complete, but each man, when he comes to measure up what has been done in this last year by Council or League must take this into account, namely, that the Council itself did not begin to officiate until the 16th of January, 1920; that the Secretariat did not commence to officiate until a month later or nearly that; that fully six months was taken up in getting any kind of an organization for the League that its operations were in Paris, in Brussels, in London and in other places; it had no abiding home. It now has its abiding home, and the later part of its work was in getting to that home and in fairly settling down, preparing for the Assembly of the League of Nations, getting its officers installed and ready for practical work, so that when you come to sum up what has been done last year, you must take that into account. Take into account also that neither the League nor the Council nor the Secretariat had real life in its bones until the Assembly was constituted, and the Assembly gave to it that foundation which made it possible for the superstructure to be a vital part of the whole edifice. The League of Nations with those organs of work relies primarily upon the Assembly which meets yearly. The members of that Assembly come fresh from every nation with the mandate of their government at that particular time. That Assembly holds the sources of supply, and the budgeting system which formed a large part of the work of that Assembly is now arranged upon a plan as good as the plan of budgeting which exists in any Assembly in the world. It is now based on proper principles and under control of proper guidance. Heretofore it

was but a part of an imperfect machine and it could not run smoothly nor perfectly. Now the whole machine is there with its controls and its powers of supervision, and the whole machine works together as a completed organism.

Mr. PROULX: Under article 10, if the Assembly comes to a certain decision, have the delegates from each country the power to commit their country by their votes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is for the delegates from each country to arrange with their government. If they have not done that before they have left, then they must get into communication with their government and do it. When they give their vote, they are supposed to be voicing their country's views, and not simply their own opinions; otherwise, we would not have a very strong Assembly. I think my hon. friend will see that.

I think I have covered the ground with one exception, and I am not going very deeply into that because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has in hand some legislation in regard to that, and he will go into particulars. The one outstanding work of the Assembly has, I think, been the constitution of a permanent court of international justice. Early in the year the Council called a committee of ten of the first jurists of the world, one of the number being Mr. Elihu Root of the United States. They met at The Hague and they were in conference for six weeks. They agreed with unanimity upon a proposal for a permanent court of international justice. That report went to the Council of the League, where it was revised, examined, debated and discussed by the Council of the League and with some amendments was sent to the Assembly. The Assembly, after making some few amendments, unanimously approved the proposition, and that proposition has been already approved by twenty-three of the member States of the League, amongst them the most foremost States of the League, and there is no doubt in my mind that the forty-seven member States of the League will agree thereto.

If they approve of it and ratify it, a permanent court is called into existence, which sits continuously, consisting of eleven judges and four deputy judges with power to take into account and settle disputes between States members of the League, disputes between States members of the League and other States not members of the League, and disputes between States which are outside the League, provided certain conditions are complied with which are set out in the statute constituting the court.

For the first time in the world's history we have agreement upon a method of choosing judges. In 1907 the convention at the Hague split on the rock of the choice of judges. One proposal was that every state in the convention should nominate one judge. That would have made an unwieldly number. Another proposal was that there should be seventeen or eighteen judges, of whom the Great Powers should nominate eight and the other Powers nine. The smaller States baulked at that. Then a system of rotation was discussed. Anyway, the negotiations fell through, because it was impossible to agree upon any one method. The Hague Permanent Court is a Court of Arbitration, nothing more, and nothing less. But once this Court of Justice is settled upon and goes into operation, you have already twenty-two of the foremost Powers that have pledged themselves to submit their cases to it, and before the year is out in my opinion, you will have forty-seven of the members of the League giving the same adhesion. Think of that for a moral force. It has a binding force over those who sign it, and it has a moral force over those that are outside.

Then take this other thing into account. On that proposition of a permanent Court of Justice the United States, though without the League, is exactly on all fours as to the principles and the purposes of a permanent court. So in that one way alone the League of Nations has brought about a reversion from the method of brute force for settling international disputes, to the method of settlement by a permanent tribunal of the first judges of the world, to which tribunal they have agreed to send their disputes for hearing and settlement.

Now, Mr. Speaker and fellow-members, I am very much obliged to you for the patient hearing you have given me.

Mr. NESBITT: How are the judges chosen?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are chosen by a somewhat ingenious method. The Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague has a system of groups of judges, or members of the Court. Each Power that belongs to the convention nominates four judges of certain calibre, as laid

down. These constitute the membership of that Permanent Court. A party comes up with a dispute and it and the other party to the dispute each chooses its own judge out of that panel, and the case goes before the judges so chosen for arbitration. The League of Nations has adopted that grouping system, and each nation that belongs to the League has four nominees. Each nation outside can also have its four nominees, so in that way you have a panel of possible judges. The Council and the Assembly together unite in choosing from that panel eleven permanent and four deputy judges. That is the system, and it appears to have given universal satisfaction, as being free from political influences.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: May I ask whether a dispute between South Africa and Great Britain could be referred to this court for hearing and settlement?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has asked a very close question. South Africa is a member of the League, and as a member has the right to nominate her four judges. Canada has that same right. I am not going to enter upon the field of these very close relationships between the different parts of the Empire or upon the legal features of the matter. I will leave that to the Minister of Justice.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Can the Minister answer as to a dispute, say, between Australia and Great Britain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That would be the same as a dispute between South Africa and Great Britain.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: May I ask an easier question? Is there any truth in the report that there was some friction or differences of opinion among the Canadian delegates, or between some of the Canadian delegation and the British delegates?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was driver of the team from Canada and I have no knowledge of any friction in the least. I can give a direct negative to that. We were like a band of brothers. Neither have I knowledge of any friction between any of the members of the British Empire delegations, and I do not believe that any existed. We did not always vote the same way, we did not always talk the same way. Each state was perfectly independent in giving its views, and in that way I think maybe a better accord and better results were obtained than if there had been any thought of acting as a unit or if there had been coercion in any way. But there was none of that.

Mr. DENIS: As the Minister is kind enough to allow questions, I should like to put one which is of some interest to us on this side of the House. He has said that there were some forty odd nations, and that the official languages were English and French. I should like to know whether the French language was made use of in that Assembly as much as the English language?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's knowledge of history and national characteristics might have answered that for him. There was more French speaking than English speaking, and no doubt there was more good French spoken by those who spoke French than by those who were English and tried to speak French. French was the dominant language. I could make quite an interesting disquisition on the preferences of some for English and some for French, outside entirely of the question of race. It was quite odd to see some of the currents running.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Did the representative of China speak French?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Their delegate is a model for my hon. friend in clear, terse, and vigorous English, coupled always with the greatest courtesy, especially when he was facing his Japanese friends.

Mr. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay a few odd compliments, but I remember the advice of a very old friend of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster). The late Sir Charles Tupper said that he always examined his conscience when a man from the other side of the House began to compliment him.

However, I do not think, Mr Speaker, I may be permitted to say, as immediately following the right hon. minister, that we are glad to see him back with renewed vigour and renewed strength, having performed his duties at the League of Nations, completing alliances upon the other side and forming a new one to adorn the social circles of our country. I shall not try to follow the hon. minister in the very able address he gave in regard to the work of the League of Nations. I could not help thinking, however, that he was taking a rather unfair advantage of his friend the ex-President of the Privy Council, the member for Durham (Hon. Mr. Rowell), who made a

statement in the newspapers and also to his electors that the only reason why he was remaining in Parliament was the fact that he desired to discuss the question of the League of Nations; and my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has simply proved today, in the masterly way in which he handled that question, that the usefulness of the hon. member for Durham no longer exists.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Wait and see.

Mr. DEVLIN: The second point which I desire immediately to take up is the reference which my right hon. friend made to the use of the English and French languages officially. The point was first introduced in this House in a different way in an excellent speech delivered by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie); and you will allow me, I hope, Mr. Speaker, to interject a remark at this juncture that both the mover and the seconder of the Address did themselves full justice in the speeches which they delivered. The member for Yale said that he was brought up amongst a French population and that he loved the French people. You will readily understand, Mr. Speaker, that we who speak English on this side of the House, and who come from the Province of Quebec, having been associated with French-Canadian friends, not only admire their language, but admire as well their judgment and their qualities. Perhaps if others in this country were equally favoured they might be able to say precisely the same thing. I simply say this in passing, however, as it has already been spoken of.

I want to refer at once to a paragraph in the speech from the Throne in which we are promised important legislation with reference to the League of Nations. I have no doubt that when that important legislation is brought down it will have the full attention of the hon. members on this side.

Now, may I say a word touching the speech delivered yesterday by the new Prime Minister of Canada (Rt. Hon. Mr. Meighen)? That right hon. gentleman did not refer to any constitutional authorities respecting the status of his Government. That, Sir, can easily be understood, for if there had been anything in the constitutional history either of England or of Canada offering a precedent for the present situation, my right hon. friend, who is a good reasoner and who is possessed of clear vision and sound judgment in addition to the fact that he is an excellent student of constitutional history, would have advanced it.

But in view of the speech which was delivered by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday, intimating to the Government that they were in office because they had usurped power, and quoting authority after authority to show that their position was contrary to every conception of responsible Government in this country—aye, and in England as well—my right hon. friend had perforce to remain mute on the subject of the constitution. Instead, that gentleman, who is so suave in manner and so calm in temper, got into a towering rage. I had never before seen him in such a rage in my life at the very suggestion that he should not be where he was, or that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition should change places with him.

Sir, to me it is a matter of indifference whether the Government remain where they are or whether the Opposition continue in their present position. One thing, however, I have very present in my mind, and it is this: I always try to keep before me the resolve that in this country autocracy shall not reign but that the rights of the people shall be respected. There is throughout the land a voice calling upon the Government to appeal to the people in order to ascertain whether it has their confidence. But that voice is answered by silence on the part of the Government. My right hon. friend asked the question: What are we going to the country upon? Well, we appeal to the Government to go to the country upon the one question: do they enjoy the confidence of the people? My right hon. friend says: What about the tariff? Why do you not speak upon the tariff? That is very clever, but, of course, one would naturally expect clever things from my right hon. friend. The tariff, according to a ruling delivered, if I mistake not, by yourself, Mr. Speaker, can be brought up only when the budget is under consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is in error. I know the ruling to which he has reference. It was merely an intimation to the House that it might be more desirable to have a budget debate upon the budget, but it by no means purported to preclude any reference to the question of the tariff.

Mr. BELAND: We shall observe your decision, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEVLIN: If you did not give the ruling as I have stated it, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will allow me to recall to your memory the fact that it has been the in-

variable practice for a great number of years in this House not to discuss tariff issues until the introduction of the budget; and that is a practice that has been observed in parliamentary procedure in Great Britain for a great number of years. The Prime Minister asks: Are the members on this side ready to stand by their tariff proposals of 1919? He knows full well that the Liberal party is ready to stand by everything that is liberal. He knows perfectly well that in intent and purpose the guiding spirit of liberalism in Canada in recent years was the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who is to-day ably followed by the present leader of the Opposition. Inspired by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and by what is best in liberalism, we upon this side intend to follow the letter and the spirit of liberal principles. The Prime Minister said nothing more that I could take note of, absolutely nothing. He wants to discuss a hundred and one questions and pleads: Do not discuss the right of the people of Canada to have a voice in the affairs of the country at the present time: we are still working on war measures and dealing with conditions in this country that have arisen from the war.

Financial, industrial, and agricultural conditions in Canada will be consequences of the war long after the Prime Minister and I have disappeared from the scene of this world's activities. There was a world revolution during the war but there was not such a revolution in parliamentary institutions in Canada as to deter the people from demanding that their sanction be obtained in order to carry on public affairs. I do not mean to speak at any great length but I wish to lay stress upon the fact that for some years back the people of Canada have been demanding a voice in the affairs of the dominion. The Government refused to give them that voice. The preceding administration deprived the people of their voice and governed Canada by Order in Council. They resorted to every possible means to stifle the popular voice; and now the present Prime Minister declares that he and his Government are going to follow in spirit and in letter the policy of their predecessors. If that be so, why did it become necessary for so many members of the Cabinet to resign, or did my right hon. friend put them out of the Cabinet? I think it is due to the people and to the members of this House that the Prime Minister should make a statement as to the position of those gentlemen who have resigned from the Cabinet.

The Prime Minister says: We are going to stand by protection in this country. Let me draw his attention to the fact that in 1918 the Government, taking advantage of the reciprocity statute had potatoes placed upon the free list. There was no protection about that measure neither in letter, word nor principle; it was absolute free trade in potatoes; and I warn my hon. friend from British Columbia that other measures of a similar character may be adopter even by the present Government, when it suits their purpose.

Following the kind references that have been made to my native province will you, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote a few statements from an article in the supplement of the Montreal Gazette for the year 1920 with reference to the Province of Quebec. The article in question states that Mr. Marquis, the head of the Provincial Bureau of Statistics, makes the statement that the value of the crops for Quebec in 1914 was $99,279,000. In 1919 it had grown to $307,044,000, an increase of 310 per cent, whilst in the Province of Ontario the increase was simply 190 per cent. The article goes on to say:

> Still another illustration of agricultural growth in Quebec is shown in Mr. Marquis' figures. The value of land is in keeping with what is raised thereon in crops and cattle. With the exception of British Columbia, where the specially rich fruit farms, and veritable gardens, have a very high value, Quebec leads the provinces in value of farm lands. The value in British Columbia is $174 per acre; Quebec, $72; Ontario, $66; Prince Edward Island $51; Nova Scotia, $41; Manitoba, $35; Saskatchewan, $32; New Brunswick, $32; and Alberta is last with a valuation of $29 per acre.

In other words, after making allowance for land values in British Columbia the Province of Quebec heads the list. The finances of that Province are in an admirable condition—in a better condition than that of any other Province. The laws of Quebec are sane, her people are contented and the best of feeling exists between the two races that people the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not follow any herring that is sought to be drawn across the trail, and permit myself to be diverted from the one question that now confronts this House—will the Government grant a general election or will they not?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I know many hon. members intend continuing the debate. I

believe the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Harold) follows.

Mr. McMASTER: I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I had no idea the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) who has just sat down had concluded his speech. I am not in a position to answer his question as I do not own the Government. But I was going to make some remarks on that very question. A great deal has been said throughout the country, and a great deal has been said in this House since the session opened, as to whether this Government should continue to function or not. I do not know what took place in other ridings at the time of the 1917 election, but I certainly know what took place in the riding that I have the honour to represent. There was never a word spoken that could convey the idea that this Government was not to be elected for a full term. So far as I was personally concerned, the only promise I make was that I would support the Union Coalition Government in all measures that it might consider were in the interests of the country. I have done so and purpose continuing to do so. Even if I should disagree with the Cabinet on any particular question, I see no reason why I should go over to the other side of the House. In my judgment—I may be wrong—it is our privilege when we are elected to vote on any question as we think wise. If that were not so, I would not care to be a representative in this Parliament; I would not care to be bound to follow any party or any government that introduced a measure that I thought to be not in the interests of the country, and I do not purpose doing so.

It is quite true that since the Union or Coalition Government was elected some members who were then sitting on this side of the House have gone over to the other side; that is their privilege. It is quite true that there has been a different grouping even among the Opposition. It is also quite true that the leader at that time of the then Union or Coalition Government has retired from the leadership. It is also just as true that the members and supporters of the Union Government have nominated a successor to that leader in a regular and constitutional way, as I understand—by the majority of votes of the supporters of that party or Government. I think that is the proper way. I may say quite frankly that I have never been in favour of choosing a leader at large conventions, because I think it is really the members of the House who have the best knowledge to choose their leader. I say again that the present leader of the Union Government was properly chosen, and I see no reason under our constitution the members of that Government should seek re-election until they are defeated in the House. I do not believe that because there happens to be a wave of feeling in favour of the Opposition or of the Government advantage should be taken of it to put the country to the expense of an election. There may be a popular wave on any question—and I have seen many popular waves that afterwards, with experience, became very unpopular—and therefore I do not see why the present Government should not continue to function until they bring in such legislation as the majority of the members do not agree with and they are defeated, or until their proper term expires.

A great deal has been said about the recent election in West Peterborough, particularly in reference to group government. Personally, I am opposed to group government, because I think, no matter who the leader may be, if he has to cater to groups to get support he is liable to pass legislation which is not in the interests of the country as a whole. We are all human; the leader of a party, from my experience, is just as human as any of his followers; and it is natural for him to continue in office if he reasonably can. Therefore, as far as I have been able to study them, the European countries that have group governments suffer under the disadvantage that the legislation passed is more in the particular interests of the groups than in the general interests of those countries, simply because their governments must cater to their group supporters if they are to retain power.

We had one benefit under the old two-party system, and that was that the successful candidate had at least the satisfaction of knowing that he was elected by a majority of those who voted. All the people may not have voted, but that was their own fault; they had the opportunity. He at least, let me repeat, had the satisfaction of knowing that he was elected by a majority in that constituency. The West Peterborough election shows that no matter how capable the candidate is who was elected there the other day—and I understand he is a most capable gentleman—after all he has not the satis-

faction of knowing that he secured a majority of the votes that were polled. That might not make any difference to some gentlemen, because I believe the vast majority of those who have sat in this House since I have been a member feel that when elected, although as the nominees of a certain party, they become the representatives of all their constituents. And further, so far as my experience has gone since I became a member, I think the majority of hon. members who have been in the House for some time realize that it is their duty not only to represent the views of all their own constituents, but, so far as they can judge, the views of all the people.

I think that is a feeling that ought to pervade the mind of every man who is elected to this Parliament. After all, this is a Dominion, not a provincial Parliament; we have to take into consideration the interests of the whole country, not of any particular section of the people exclusively. I do not agree that this Government should go to the country on the ground, as is urged by some, that they were elected only for the war and demobilization period. The only thing I heard before or during the campaign of 1917 that would bear on that contention was that when the War-time Elections Act was passed it was distinctly stated that that Act would remain in force only during the war and during demobilization. I sat on the opposite side of the House at that time. I was opposed to the War-time Elections Act and I would still be opposed to it if it were in force. But it is not in force; it has been repealed; therefore the promise made in that respect has been carried out. But I do not think that has anything to do with the question of the term of Paliament.

Mr. ROBB: Is not the Government that was elected under the War-time Elections Act still in power or claiming to be in power by virtue of a majority elected under that Act?

Mr. NESBITT: That is quite true; there is no denying it. But that does not make any difference so far as I can see. The War-time Elections Act was passed by the House, and the members of Parliament were elected under that Act and by very large majorities. Personally, I was elected notwithstanding the War-time Elections Act, so that I have not, and never did have, anything to say in favour of it.

My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) has referred to Quebec as being the most stable province in the Dominion. I agree with that view, because the province of Quebec has stability. Too many of our other provinces are taking up fads. There is too much "progressive" legislation in a good many of them—that is, so far as the finances of the provinces and the interests of the people are concerned. Therefore I pay all due respect and honour to the province of Quebec and compliment them upon the manner in which their political and financial affairs have been conducted in the last ten years, and upon the position they have now attained.

I am speaking this afternoon under some difficulty, because I was not here yesterday and did not hear what was said; nor did I have an opportunity to read Hansard. But in the Speech from the Throne there is a proposition—it is only a proposition; I do not know whether there is any intention to do anything in regard to it—in respect to unemployment insurance. I notice on actual reference to the Speech from the Throne that it is an investigation, not a proposition—that an investigation is being conducted by the Department of Labour into a system of unemployment insurance. I hope that the Government will not launch out into any system of unemployment insurance. I believe in giving every man an opportunity to work; I do think that the only way this country will succeed in the next few years, the only way in which it can overcome the enormous debt with which we are now burdened, is for every man to work; and I believe that if he is willing to work there is work in this country for every man to do. It may be necessary at times, as was recently the case in some of the larger cities, to assist persons who are out of work, but I cannot help thinking that a great many of these people could find work if they were really anxious to do so. I know that in our section of the country a great many of them could find work on the farms—not, perhaps, at five or six dolars a day, but at reasonable pay. Nothing is so harmful to a people as indiscriminate charity, because it helps to foster the idea that people can get along without working.

During the last two or three years the country has passed through very serious times so far as the labour question is concerned. Many industries were forced either to close down or to work on part time, and some of them made every effort to keep the work going in their factories for their employes, on the principal that

half a loaf is better than no bread. After all, business is but a cycle; the consumer buys from the retailer, the retailer from the wholesaler, the wholesaler from the manufacturer. The farmer grows various commodities that sustain life, and the rest of the people who do not farm buy his products. If those people are out of work and have no money, they cannot buy those products, nor can they buy the products of the manufacturer. Last summer it was stated in the newspapers—both in Canada and in the United States, so far as I could see—that everything was going to be cheaper; that prices were coming down enormously. As a matter of fact there were a great many reductions in the prices of goods retailed; certain goods that were really luxuries were allowed to drop very materially in price. Even then I suppose a pretty fair profit was made on them, because during the war time and the period of very high wages the people lost their balance, so to speak, people bought things that their financial circumstances did not justify their buying, and indulged in extravagant expenditure which was of no particular benefit to themselves. For instance, I knew of a man who had been employed for several years, drawing fifteen dollars a day, and who, before he was not without work for three months, had nothing. That man was living beyond his means and without any care for the future, and while I do not say that everyone did that, I know hundreds of people did the same thing. In the committee that we commissioned to investigate the cost of living, we were told that people who were offered boots, say at eight dollars a pair, would not look at them, but when the same boots were produced to them for eighteen dollars a pair, then they thought the boots were all right. I am giving that only as an illustration of the craze that came over the country for living above one's means by people who should have been saving at that that time.

Then we come to this summer when the idea crept into the minds of the people that everything was going to be very much cheaper, and they ceased buying. When the consumer ceased buying, the retailer's shelves were full of goods and he had to cease buying; the wholesaler also had to cease buying, and the manufacturer went on as long as he could, as long as the banks would allow him to manufacture goods and pile them up and store them. The manufacturer had faith in the future and kept on for the purpose of keeping his men employed. But there is a limit to that; the banks would not advance any further on that sort of prospect. The consequence was that everything stopped to a certain extent. Some people may blame the Government for that, but the Government had nothing more to do with it than they have with the rain and the snow, the frost and the heat. It is true that the luxury tax was put on last year very largely for the purpose of drawing people's attention to the fact that they were buying goods at extravagant prices, and that was why the tax had to be added to the bill and not concealed in the price of the goods.

That had in a great measure the effect of drawing people's attention to their extravagance, and the consequence was that many people began to realize that the goods they were buying were altogether too high in price for their means and they commenced to curtail their expenditures to a certain degree. That tax has been done away with.

As regards unemployment insurance, I feel that our Ontario Government passed a very wise Act in their endeavour to take care of the widow by giving her a grant based upon so much for a widow alone and so much for each child so as to help her in extreme cases where she had no means. The difficulty about unemployment insurance, like the difficulty at the present time of maintaining in cities and towns many people who are out of employment, is that there is a tendency to take advantage of that aid and not seek employment. In other words, the workers keep the drones. Even the bees set us an example in that situation. In a hive of bees the workers kill the drones; and while I do not want us to do that, let me repeat that there is only one salvation for this country and that is that everybody must work and give the best there is in him. At the present time there is a tendency on the part of some people to reduce the price of labour. I understand that last year in the West, in some instances, farmers had to pay as high as eight dollars a day for farm labourers. Farmers are not likely to get a sufficient price to produce grain on the farm at that rate of wages. But that condition of things did not predominate throughout the country, neither did the very high wages that were paid for munition workers during the war prevail amongst workers in ordinary industries, at east in Ontario. Ordinary industries certainly had to double their wages, but the difficulty was that while they doubled their wages, they did not get the same production. I know of an instance where wages

were trebled and the production per man was reduced by over one-half. As far as my knowledge goes, most employers of labour in ordinary business where wages were not extreme and exceptional, were not grumbling about the wages they were paying, but they were grumbling about the production. I am glad to say that during the last two months production has very materially increased in accordance with the trade, and if that be the case—that is, if the men do their duty and earn their pay—I know of no employers who are anxious to reduce wages. What the employer is after is results. I do not think there is any necessity for the large number of people that the newspapers report as being unemployed in our cities at the present time. I think that many of those men could find work at reasonable wages if they tried to. In small towns like ours, while there has been a certain amount of trouble because of slackening of work in manufacturing industries and, in one or two instances, the shutting down of factories for short periods, the bulk of the men were quite capable of carrying on until such times as their work started again. Those who were not, immediately sought other work and most of them were able to find it. That is the spirit I should like to see prevail throughout this country. Let every man,—whether he works with his head or his hands, and no matter what his occupation—not sit down and curse the Government, local or Dominion, or curse somebody else, but get busy and try and find some work to do that will provide him with a living whether he works with his head or his hands. Let every man try and assist the country to carry on, and if we all do that, there will be no necessity for unemployment insurance.

In other words, I object most strongly to any plan whereby the workers will keep the drones. There is too much of that now. It is the workers that pay the taxation of this country, no matter what form the taxation may take. That is why I am surprised to see sometimes in this House some honourable members attack very strongly what they call "the interests." Some man was talking to me very recently and blaming "the interests," as he called them. I asked him: "What interests? There is the farming interest," I said, "the manufacturing interest, the banking interest, the commercial interest; what interest are you talking about?" Well, he had only heard that "the interests" were to blame; he did not know much about it, and had nothing further to say. As a matter of fact we must all work together. We need all sorts of people in this country working together in sympathy, and doing the very best they can individually to make a success of the country, and that is why I hate to hear people who have made a success of their lives from a financial standpoint condemned because they have made a success. Personally, I have no jealousy at all of the man who makes a success of his life. Whether he comes from my section of the country or anywhere else in Canada I am proud of him. So far as the monied interests of the country are concerned, we have to have money to carry on. The successful man cannot take his money to bed with him. He has to invest it in some business in this country to make it produce. Therefore, while he may not be working with his hands, he may be working just as hard with his head to provide work for the people who work with their hands. You cannot separate the interests of the so-called labouring classes in this country,—that is, those who work with their hands,—from the interests of the capitalists, who provide the capital which furnishes the material on which the workers labour. So far as I personally am concerned, I think we members of Parliament have undertaken a serious responsibility when we come to this House, and it is our duty, at least, I think it is my duty, to investigate carefully any legislation that is proposed, no matter from what source, and if we think it is wise legislation, it is our duty to support it.

Thank Heaven, I am not so partisan that I cannot see good in the other fellow, and I see no reason at all, so far as benefit to the country is concerned, why this Government should dissolve and go to the country. On the other hand, I can see a great many reasons at the present time why they should not. In the first place, the country is still more or less in a chaotic state so far as business is concerned. Take unemployment, for instance. You could not make any of these men believe that it was not the fault of the Government that they are unemployed. So far as I am concerned I do not believe it is the fault of the Government in any shape or form.

Now as to the tariff. I believe, and always have believed before I came to this House, when I was a private citizen struggling for my existence, that a reasonable tariff that will protect the industries of

this country to a reasonable extent is the only proper thing for Canada. I am interested in farming to a certain extent myself, and I want to say right here that for me the local market is much better than any foreign market, for the instant my goods get out of my sight they are out of my control, and I do not know what may be the final result. There are some items in the tariff schedules at the present time that, in my judgment, are too high; they are unnecessary for the manufacturer. I know something about manufacturing, and when I say that there are some items that are too high and unnecessary for the protection of the manufacturer, I am saying what I know to be absolutely correct. In the first place, if the manufacturer has too high a protection it gets him into a slovenly way of doing business. He does not, to use the common expression, "get down to brass tacks." That is, he does not organize and systematize his business so as to be in a position to compete successfully. Therefore, I am opposed to too high a protection on any line of goods. In days gone by, along in the 80's, it may have been necessary to maintain a rather high tariff for our then infant industries, because it is a difficult thing to start a manufacturing industry. I know of nothing more difficult, because for the first four or five years it is all costs. You can get your company organized, you can get your manager, but it is a guess whether he will make a success or not. You can get your office staff and your help together, but you have got to introduce your goods from one end of Canada to the other. Now, we have a population of only about eight millions, spread over a territory extending three thousand miles, and it is absolutely impossible to introduce your goods from one end of the country to the other under two years. You must engage at least two very capable men to cover that territory in a year, and you have to pay their salaries and expenses, which are not very light I assure you. And after you have covered the country and got your agents appointed, you will find that half of them are not satisfactory and you have to cover the same ground over again.

It is the hardest thing in the world to start a progressive manufacturing industry. You cannot possibly make any money at the outset; if you make your expenses for the first four or five years you are doing remarkably well. It then depends entirely upon the ability of your management and the economic way in which you produce your goods. The tariff may assist you to a certain extent. In my experience I have found a great fallacy to exist in the country in the claim that all manufacturers add the tariff to the cost of their goods. I know intimately several manufacturing industries, and I know of none, so far as I am personally concerned, who consider the tariff in arriving at the cost of their goods or the prices they will put on them when they are offering them to the public. There are others with whom I am not so intimately acquainted—I know them only in a general way—who do take advantage of whatever protection the customs tax may afford them; but so far as my knowledge goes, they are very much in the minority.

I do not know that there are any other clauses in the Speech from the Throne to which I am opposed, except the one I have mentioned. Let me repeat that the more you force the workers of the country to keep those who are not willing to work, the more people you will find that are not willing to work. And after all it is the workers that pay the taxes, no matter in what form they are imposed. If it is an income tax you have to have over a certain income before you are obliged to pay taxes. If it is customs, unles you are earning you certainly are not buying very many imported goods, except on credit, and there is a limit to that, because a merchant is not going to carry on very long unless you pay him. I have only this to emphasize, that we members of Parliament, elected to represent the people, have a serious duty to perform. Personally, so far as party politics are concerned, I am not prejudiced in any way, and I do not think that the people expect us to vote on any question purely and simply from a partisan standpoint. I do think, however, that they expect us to vote from a business point of view. We may have differences of opinion in our ideas of business, and it would be hard to get any dozen men gathered together who would absolutely agree on all lines of business; but we can generally come to a reasonable conclusion as to what is in the interests of the country at large and what is merely selfish interest. We members of Parliament are not here to promote selfish interests; we are elected to safeguard and further the interests of the country at large and of the people as a whole. I have seen no reason advanced in the newspapers and

heard none uttered so far in this House why this Government has not a perfect right to continue functioning and why it cannot legislate for the interests of the people just as well as any other government which you could possibly elect at the present time.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome): I wish, first, to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address, both of whom well acquitted themselves of the task imposed upon them. I should be glad to congratulate, in his personal capacity, the Prime Minister, but I hesitate to do so for two reasons: first, he has left the Chamber, and secondly, my own leader's experience in congratulating met with a shabby reception. Perhaps it might be just as well to go to the heart of the question. I am aware that hon. members have listened through all the long hours of this afternoon to addresses, and it must therefore be difficult to inject interest into the debate. But before we go further let me make a few observations concerning the remarks made by the last speaker (Mr. Nesbitt). It is true that that gentleman has been taken at a disadvantage. This Government, on this second day of the debate, had almost stopped functioning when he stepped into the breach. Is this indicative of the fact that this Government is to be maintained in power by Unionists who previously called themselves Liberals? I trust not. There were eighteen men on the other side of the House when the Prime Minister was about to move the adjournment of the debate, in order perhaps to give members a greater and larger opportunity for preparing themselves for the festivities of the evening, when my hon. friend jumped into the breach. What was his contribution to the debate? He took a text against the investigation of unemployment insurance, and then he went everywhere in a truly apostolic manner preaching the gospel of reaction. He first of all stated that he was against the War-time Elections Act, and then, by a use of a logic which I cannot understand, said: Well, the Election Act has been repealed and I do not propose to cast out the Government or help to have them cast out: that Government was elected by an Act which I denounced when it was proposed and when it was passed, and which I denounce now. That was a dishonest Act, in my opinion; and if this Government came into power through it, why should they not be turned out? Is it not the business of hon. members to turn them out? I think it is.

His next contribution, Mr. Speaker, was to denounce progressive legislation. When he did so he looked across at the Progessive party or Farmers' party—that party which the Prime Minister calls "the opposition situated angularly opposite"—but that portion of His Majesty's loyal opposition did not applaud his remarks to any great extent. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) is against unemployed insurance. I wonder if he ever realizes the feeling of a workman—an honest workman, perhaps an unskilled workman—who is working day by day, and week by week, and does not know whether his job is going to last over the next week. If the hon. gentleman could realize the feeling of that honest workman he would not denounce in such unsparing terms unemployment insurance. The hon. gentleman properly says that workmen should not reduce output. Neither they should, Mr. Speaker. But isn't it a temptation for a man to make the job spin out as long as he can if he feels that perhaps the next Saturday he will be paid off, and will not have the wherewithal to buy food for his wife and children? For, although, in our civilization we have enormously increased the powers of production it is a matter of fact that vast majority of mankind, in the industrial centres at least, live week by week on their weekly wages. Therefore when the Government propose the innocuous measure of examining the question, surely my hon. friend might let them do so without raising his voice in advance against the proposition. Everybody must work hard. Ah, yes! and how well that came from a member who confessed he was one, if not two, days late in coming to his job here in Ottawa.

We have the infant industry proposal or policy. Ah, these infant industries! How certain types of men cherish them to their breast. They have to cherish the infant industries to their breast because those industries have never been able to be weaned and they are always asking for some special favour, some special privilege. I presume my hon. friend is quite in accord with that part of the Speech from the Throne which said the protective principle is to be maintained. My hon. friend is not prejudiced as far as party politics are concerned. He should know because he has sat on both sides of the House. Apparently

he has been just as comfortable on one side as on the other but he has no intention of moving from where he now sits. Let me, Mr. Speaker, without the slightest heat or the slightest unkindness, say that I believe he is well situated where he is, and that he would be no addition, no help, to the forces of progress and democracy in this country. A speech of a very different sort was delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). The Minister spoke at great length but he is always interesting; and the fact that the debate was almost breaking down before the hon. gentleman from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) arose, shows plainly why the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke at such great length. The Minister dealt with the League of Nations. It was a rather interesting thing to see that his remarks concerning that great attempt—and let us pray heaven that successful and hopeful attempt—was applauded as vigourously, if not more vigourously, on this side than it was on the other. Of course one reason was that—indicative of the feeling of the country—there were more members sitting on this side than there were on the other. I have nothing to say in criticism of the Minister's remarks about the League of Nations, I heartily approve of what he said in that connection. We all trust and pray that some way of settling international disputes may be brought forward, and may go into effect, different from a settlement by force of arms and by the slaying of men the majority of whom had nothing to do with the making of the quarrel—for it is men of over forty-five who make wars, and it is youths of under twenty-five who fight them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Government—for really I have said nothing very unkind about them so far—would, at this stage, consent to adjourn the debate until to-morrow. We have now reached the hour of almost a quarter to six.

An Hon. MEMBER: Is the hon. gentleman tired out?

Mr. McMASTER: As a matter of fact he is not a bit tired out. That reminds me of something I forgot to mention in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). If the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) will remember, his opposition to the way in which the votes were cast under the Soldiers' Voting Bill was almost as strong as his remarks in connection with the War Times Election Act. We all remember the vivifying moments in the Chamber when a controversy arose between the member for Brantford and the member for North Oxford as to the manner in which the soldiers' votes were counted in the last election.

On motion of Mr. McMaster, the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, February 17, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Statement of superannuation and retiring allowances in the Civil Service from January 1, 1920, to December 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Fifty-third Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Wednesday, February 16.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome) (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, I must first thank the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who, in the temporary absence from the Chamber yesterday of the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), was leading the House between half past five and six o'clock, for his kindness in calling it six o'clock when it was only 5.45, in order that I might have a better opportunity of connected discourse.

I think it must have struck the members of this House and the people of this country that no serious attempt has so far been made by speakers on your right, Sir, to advance any argument against the amendment to the Address proposed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. King). We had yesterday, as I have already said, a most interesting and inspiring address upon the League of Nations, but really no attempt was made to answer the resolution which preceded from this side of the House. So I am therefore driven back to discuss the remarks made by the Prime Minister, and this to the best of my poor ability I shall endeavour to do.

The Prime Minister takes this position. He says: This House was elected by a majority of the electors some few years ago; we have a majority in the House, and as long as we have a majority in the House, elected by a majority of the constituencies in this country, I propose to carry on. That, as I understand it, is the constitutional position which he takes. Now, first of all, this vote will show, and not until the votes are counted will it be demonstrated whether the Prime Minister has a majority of the votes in this House. That is something yet to be ascertained.

Secondly, has the Prime Minister a majority of the votes in this country? Why, just before the last election there was an Election Act passed for the purpose of disfranchising all those who might be suspected of political tendencies against the Prime Minister and his party, and of doubling up all those votes that would likely be in their favour. Soldiers' wives, soldiers' mothers and soldiers' sisters were all given the vote to the exclusion of other people just as deserving, and I remember in my riding noting with some amusement that soldiers' sweethearts were not given the vote, because although a soldier under our law can have only one wife he might have, and often had, many sweethearts. But that, after all, although important, is not as important an another point which I propose to prove before the House, and which I believe will be accepted by all unbiassed minds, whether in the Chamber or outside of it.

The proposition which I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, is this: That there was at the time of the last general election an undertaking made by and on behalf of the Government that it would, if returned to power, only hold office for the time of the war and during demobilization. There was the agreement made, and I propose to prove it out of the mouths of ministers of the Crown at that time. Hon. Mr. Carvell, who now occupies the position of chairman of the Railway Board, was a Unionist minister from the province of New Brunswick. During the course of one of the sessions of 1919 the question of the formation of the Union Government came up, and this is what Mr. Carvell said:

> I can only say that when I entered this Government—I am not going over the very, very long and somewhat unpleasant conditions which existed between the month of April and October 1917, possibly another occasion may arise when they can be discussed—I did so after the most mature deliberation, which many of my good old friends know all about, and nobody knows so well as does my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's—I did so for one specific purpose and for a specified time. The purpose I am happy to say, has been achieved. The time has not yet expired. During the election in the Province of New Brunswick I issued a letter to my constituents and to the people of our Province setting forth the fact that the Government was to be of an equal number of former Conservatives and former Liberals, for the purpose of carrying on the war and finding recruits for our army, and that it would continue for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter for demobilization. Demobilization has not yet been completed, and so far as I am concerned my contract has not expired.

Just as soon as demobilization was completed Mr. Carvell resigned from the Government because he regarded his contract as having expired.

Mr. P. F. MARTIN (Halifax): What followed when his contract was terminated?

Mr. McMASTER: He was given the high quasi-judicial office of chairman of the Railway Commission, and his appointment to that office emphasizes the value of the citation which I have just made. Now, we have such a thing in this country as ministerial responsibility, and that responsibility is a joint one. When a minister of the Crown makes a declaration on a question of high importance such as was the question mentioned in this letter, he binds not only himself but his colleagues as well. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) was one of the colleagues of Mr. Carvell when he made that statement, and he was bound thereby. That is the statement of the present Prime Minister as well as of Mr. Carvell, and it was a direct undertaking of the present Prime Minister that this Government—he says that the present Government is a continuation of the last; that is his contention—would, as soon as demobilization was over, cease to exist, and an appeal would, of course as a matter of consequence, be made to the people. There were others who spoke in the same language. I quote from a speech of the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) delivered at Winnipeg on October 27, 1917. Said he:

> I have not sacrificed my liberalism. My liberal principles are part of myself and will stay with me until I die. But this is not the time to quarrel over political view-points on domestic issues. The whole issue, the sole reason for the union of parties is to win the war.

Before I go further I wish to protest, as I have protested before in this House and elsewhere, against the assumption that there was any difference in the desire to win the war between people who were

Liberals and those who were Conservatives at the time of the last election. We differed as to methods but not as to aim and object. And the oft-repeated assertion, repeated at that time and, I am sorry to say, even since, that it was a question between the Union Government, to win the war, and the Liberals, to abandon the boys in the trenches, was one of the most ungenerous and wicked perversions of the truth ever perpetrated by a political party for their own political ends. Its ungenerousness was shown by the fact that among the Liberal leaders of the day was the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), who was languishing in a German prison. Besides that, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), Mr. Graham, Mr. Oliver, all had boys at the front who then or shortly after were to fill the graves of heroes who had died for their country. The sons of our friend the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) and of Mr. E. M. McDonald, as well as those of many other Liberals, were fighting in the trenches then. The member for Maisonneuve suffered the loss of his only boy. But still we were taunted at that time that we were not in favour of winning the war. How wicked was that statement is shown also in the fact that it divided race from race, province from province, religion from religion. I remember some sessions ago that the hon. gentleman who now occupies the high position of Prime Minister, stated on the floor of the House, when the Liberals were laughing at some unconsciously amusing thing he had said, that our interest in the war was measured by our laughter. I protested then, and I protest to-day when he says that the great issue was one of winning the war. We differed in regard to methods, it is true, but I would not have this House forget that the method proposed was one of selective conscription, and that after this method had been put into force, only a few months had elapsed before the same Mr. Carvell, one of the leading members of the Government at that time, said that by a round-about, clumsy method they had been able to secure only 30,000 men.

Now, after this digression, made necessary by the repetition of what I regard as an unvenerable falsehood, I return to my argument as to the understanding between the parties. I quote again from that former champion of Western Liberalism, the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization. He spoke at Vancouver on the 31st of October, and in the Vancouver Sun he is reported as having said:

> I'm for plain speaking, and I intend so to speak. I am a Liberal, and when all is over I intend to remain a Liberal, because I believe in Liberal principles. I have been fighting Toryism all my life, and I propose after the war to take up that fight just where I left off.

We have heard of the warrior taking his rest with his martial cloak around him. It is about time that this warrior of Western Liberalism took off his cloak, and began to fight. But so far we have not seen any symptoms of his entering upon the engagement. But not only were these statements made by those men high in the councils of the Unionist party, but the people so understood. Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, the undertaking which was signed by those members of the primaries in Vancouver, who were voting for delegates to the Unionist Convention and who nominated one of my friends at whom I am now looking, the member for one of the seats of Vancouver City:

> I, the undersigned, do hereby pledge my support and influence to the present Unionist Government and the policy enunciated by them, i. e., the immediate and continuous enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, the mobilization of all our resources, the taxation of wealth, and the prevention of profiteering, and I agree to support the candidate selected at the Convention.

That was the view expressed by people connected with the formation of the Union Government; they were the views held by supporters of the Union Government in British Columbia. Now, let us proceed to another province, and again let us quote from the words of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. He is reported in the Regina Leader of Dec. 17 as saying:

> Referring to his own position, Mr. Calder said that it had been suggested that he had been duped by the Tories and that he would stand as a cipher when he got down to Ottawa. I want to tell you, he said, that Calder has not been duped by the Tories. I have never stood in the position of a cipher, and I do not propose to do so now. I have a very clear conception of what I am going into the Union Government for, and what I am going to do. With reference to the suggestion that it was still the same old Borden Governement and the Government of the big interests, Mr. Calder asked his audience whether they thought it could be the same Government with F. B. Carvell in it and with Mr. Maclean as a member, and whether it could be the same Government which included Alexander Crerar and General Mewburn; and I want to tell you that you don't know Mewburn yet. He is a fine fellow.

Some Hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, to know that the member for East Hamilton, so happily characterized in that paragraph, has left the Union Government; that the member for Marquette has left the Union Government; that Mr. Carvell has left the Union Government; I am not sure whether Mr. A. K. Maclean has yet resumed his seat on our side, I know his seat is here and waiting for him. An hon. gentleman beside me states he is going to be here.

Now I know it is somewhat tiresome when a lawyer cites evidence—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not, Mr. Speaker, expect the gentlemen sitting to your right to enjoy the reading of that evidence. As a matter of fact I am not speaking for their pleasure, but I trust for the country's profit.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Sir Thomas White, speaking at Brockville, said—

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: He is the member for Leeds.

Mr. McMASTER: No, I understand he is not the member for Leeds. I understand he has accepted an office of emolument, and I am perfectly in order when I refer to him, with all the dignity that should be attached to a knight, as Sir Thomas White.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman must refer to him as the member for Leeds, and I hope he will adhere to the well-established rule in that regard with respect to every hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMASTER: I understand that I am not allowed to discuss the Speaker's ruling. His Honour will admit that I am one of the most obedient of the flock over which he presides, but he will allow me to state that the constitutional authorities differ somewhat from the view which he takes. However, the gentleman who occupied some time ago the position of member for Leeds, and whose occupancy of that position is now a matter of dispute and discussion, said on the 17th November, 1917:

> Union Government is an accomplished fact today. It was born of the will of the Canadian people, the majority of whom have long and earnestly desired that party strife should cease, that National Government should be formed for the period of the war.

The Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), speaking at Guelph on the 2nd October, 1917, said:

> I believe in an union at the present time of all political forces for the prosecution of the war, irrespective of all political parties. In the past I have been looked upon as a strong party man but since May last I have publicly and privately advocated a cessation of party strife, and I intend to continue in this course until the end of the war. It must not, however, be supposed that by pursuing this course that I have changed my Liberal principles, I have not done so.

Mr. DUFF: The war is still on.

Mr. McMASTER: Again, there was a meeting of Conscriptionist Liberals held in Hamilton, Ontario, on November 2, 1917, where the following motion was passed:

> That whereas, since the notice calling this convention was sent out a Union Government has been formed in which Liberals throughout the Dominion have joined this convention recording its belief that the formation of a Union Government for the duration of the war was highly desirable and in the best interests of Canada, and believing that thereby the share of Canada in the conduct of the present world war will be best served and the Government of the country most effectively and satisfactorily carried on during the period of the war, expresses its approval of the action of the Liberal members of the present Union Government in entering the same.

I do not think I should have to labour the point any more. It is absolutely true that the Liberals—and there were a certain number, a large number—who supported Union Government in 1917, did so under the direct promise, under the direct statement, that they were supporting a government for the duration of the war. I would not give any narrow or technical interpretation to these words "during the duration of the war." I would be prepared to extend that to cover demobilization. To be perfectly fair I would give the expression the largest interpretation. The Prime Minister's argument was that the Government elected in 1917 differed in no way from the government of 1904, let us say, which was elected on the question of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The cases are not at all similar. Had there been a sharp line of division, let us say within the Liberal party, on the question of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if Sir Wilfred Laurier gone to gentlemen opposite and asked their concurrence for the special purpose of putting through legislation for the building of that railway, then the conditions might have been somewhat similar. The Prime Minister is not comparing things that are the same in nature. The only political situation we have had approach-

ing that which confronted the Canadian people at the time of the election in 1917 was the election in Canada prior to Confederation when Brown and certain Liberals of Ontario—quite a number of Liberals of Ontario—joined Macdonald and certain Tories of both Ontario and Quebec for the purpose of putting through Confederation, although Dorion and other Liberals in Quebec opposed him. That is a political situation which approximates somewhat the political situation of 1917. And what happened then? It is very, very interesting, Mr. Speaker. As soon as Confederation was an assured fact Brown resigned, but Howland and McDougall did not—they hung onto office. The name of Brown will be admired and revered in this country after generations have passed who have forgotten that there ever was a Howland or a McDougall. We have with us today some Howlands and some McDougalls, although they bear different names. The Prime Minister said yesterday that the aim and objects of his Government are the same as those of the preceding administration. Well, if I wanted to be unkind I might admit it. I might say that the aim and objects of Union government were to retain power, and the aim and objects of this Government are to retain power. But let us be kinder. What were the declared and ostensible objects of Union government? The declared and ostensible objects of the government were to carry on, in a manner which they judged efficacious, the fighting of the war which was to maintain democracy and to crush privilege and autocracy. The declared aim of this Government is to hold on to office—to maintain autocracy and to maintain the protective principle in the tariff, which is to maintain privilege and autocracy as well.

In passing let me call attention to an error of fact into which the memory of the Prime Minister led him. In his remarks he stated that the Government had had large majorities on every vote last session. I see a ray of hope there, Mr. Speaker, because if the Prime Minister thinks a majority of five large, what sort of majority is he counting upon in this vote? If my recollection is right, the Government majority last session was rarely more than twenty-five, and on one important occasion it dropped to five. But, after all, for a party which went into power with a majority of about seventy, majorities in the twenties or under were certainly small majorities.

Now, let us come to another phase of the subject. The Prime Minister has formed a Government which he describes as a National Liberal and Conservative Government—to put it in more popular phrase, a National Grit and Tory Government, which is about as wise and reasonable as "National Wet and Dry Government." I speak without the slightest personal experience, but as a matter of fact I understand it is quite possible for those who have been very dry to sometimes get very wet, and the day after the change they are very, very dry.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I hear sounds of "hear, hear" from the other side. I am glad my confirmation comes from that direction rather than from my own side of the House.

The Prime Minister has arranged this Government with its long name of National Liberal and Conservative Government, and he has induced to join that Government the hon. member for Yarmouth and Clare (Mr. Spinney).

Now, what is a political party, Mr. Speaker? A political party is an association of men who have joined themselves together for the purpose of advancing the public interest of certain principles of policy which they hold in common. That is the sense of Burke's definition, and I think it is as good a definition as we have of what a political party is. What is the Cabinet? The Cabinet is the executive committee of such a party, chosen from men who have seats in this or the other House. It stands to reason that if men form a party they have to have similar views—not, of course, on all questions, that would be impossible, but on the main leading questions before the people a fortiori a Cabinet must have like similarity of views, and a Cabinet which has men in it of diverse views cannot give sound, constitutional, strong government to a country.

Now, if there is one thing that the Prime Minister has enunciated it has been the protective principle. It is true there has not been that same bold front presented in all parts of the country. When he visited the beautiful Eastern Townships—part of which I have the honour to represent—he made a speech in the thriving industrial town of Sherbrooke and emphasised the maintenance of duties,—in other words, the maintenance of protective principles. When he got out to Winnipeg, after speaking about tariff revision and the report to be made thereon by the Minister of Fin-

ance (Sir Henry Drayton), he uttered a pious hope that the duties would be lowered. As far as my recollection serves me, there was no such pious hope expressed by him in the city of Sherbrooke. But, after all, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has been a pretty consistent protectionist.

Now, let us hear what his Minister without portfolio from the province of Nova Scotia (Mr. Spinney) said as late as last year, within a few months of his joining the Government of the Prime Minister. He stated:

> I can only say that I regret that at this stage my hon. friend found it necessary to introduce his amendment, which comes at a very inopportune time. It has for its purpose, I assume, the downfall of the Union Government, or their return to the country to get a fresh mandate from the people. I do not wish to criticise, but as I am an honest follower of the Union party, I must point out this fact, that since they have been in power I have followed them as a free trade or rather as a revenue tariff Liberal. I am that to-day, but I do not believe that any tariff for other than revenue purposes could be satisfactorily dealt with in this country at the present time.
>
> Our progressive friends may declare for free trade. They have come out for free trade, but I do not see where they propose to raise the enormous revenue to carry out the heavy responsibilities resting upon this country to-day. It means raising between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000 at least. You cannot get that by direct taxation in this country. The people of Canada are not educated up to that. Neither are the financial resources of the country capable of responding to direct taxation. To my mind the idea is absolutely absurd. We have to raise a certain percentage of our necessary revenue through customs taxation, entirely aside from any question of protection. The Minister of Finance has maintained his reputation for honesty, and I believe he fully intends to give this country what he has promised in the way of tariff revision. When that revision comes in, if it should have any earmarks of protection, if this Parliament is in existence at that time, they can bank on my opposing any such tariff.

The hon. member for Yarmouth and Clare, the minister without portfolio from the province of Nova Scotia, need not wait until the Budget comes down; he has his answer in the Address from the Throne, for that address consecrates the principle of protection which he pledged himself to oppose. There is just one of two things for my hon. friend to do; he should tell us that he has honestly changed his opinion and no longer stands for the principle of tariff for revenue, but for the principle of tariff for protection, and after telling us that he should go down by the sea and ask the men in his constituency whether they approve of his change of mind.

Mr. DUFF: They would not.

Mr. McMASTER: If he does not do that, then it is for the Prime Minister to explain how, when he is nailing the colours of protection to the mast, he invites a free trader, such as the hon. member for Yarmouth and Clare, to form one of his Cabinet. I grant that the member for Yarmouth and Clare brings respectability, high business integrity and a good name to the Cabinet of which my right hon. and learned friend is Prime Minister. But I say that it is constitutionally improper, and that it is a piece of camouflage when he attempts to deceive the public by window dressing his Cabinet with the name of the minister without portfolio from the province of Nova Scotia for the purpose of justifying the sign over the door—"Liberal," as well as "National" and "Conservative."

Mr. SPINNEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the hon. member a question? Does he stand for the policy of the Liberal party between 1896 and 1911?

Mr. McMASTER: I stand, Mr. Speaker, for the policy of the Liberal party as laid down in the tariff plank of the Great National Liberal Convention held in August, 1919. I would say with all kindness and courtesy that what the people are most interested in at the present time in regard to this matter is not where the member for Brome stands, but where the member for Yarmouth stands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just tell us.

Mr. SPINNEY: In time; do not be impatient.

Mr. McMASTER: No doubt explanations will be in order and may be forthcoming. It would be interesting to know whether the member for Yarmouth has converted the Prime Minister to his fiscal views or whether the Prime Minister has converted the member for Yarmouth to his.

The next item of Cabinet reconstruction about which I would like to talk for a few moments is the entry of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Wigmore). The Prime Minister was a little facetious the other day, or attempted to be a little facetious, at the expense of the leader of the Opposition in connection with the election at St. John. I was there and I know something about it. My hon. and learned friend the Prime Minister endeavoured to draw comfort from the fact that he had been able to elect a man in the city of St. John. But there is not much comfort in that for the Prime Minister, because when the Min-

ister of Customs went before the good people of St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert, he said, Mr. Speaker, —and oh, it burned itself into my consciousness, — "I stand not as a Liberal and not as a Conservative. I stand first in the interests of the port of St. John; next I stand in the interests of the people of St. John; then I stand in the interests of the province of New Brunswick, and after that of the Dominion of Canada." Now, this is not a free paraphrase of what the hon. gentleman said; I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost verbatim from the speech which he made shortly before I arrived in that city—where the river flows both ways in the short space of twenty-four hours. However, lest what I have said be regarded as unfair, let me read from one of the papers supporting the Minister, the St. John Standard of Friday, September 10. It says:

What can Dr. Emery—

Dr. Emery was the Liberal candidate.

—do for the city that Mr. Wigmore cannot? Can he do anything at all? And if he were by any chance to find himself in Parliament representing St. John, what amount of weight would his representations carry? If the electors of St. John were to turn Mr. Wigmore down, then there would be an end, once and for all, of any hopes there may be of getting any more work done on the harbour or anything else that the city is interested in, from the present Government; and as this Government is likely to be in power for several years yet,—

They are not too hopeful, those people down in St. John.

—St. John cannot afford to shut herself out in the cold indefinitely. St. John won't do it; her citizens will rally to the support of Mr. Wigmore with even more enthusiasm than they did three years ago—

As a matter of fact, they rallied to his support only to the extent of about half the enthusiasm they had demonstrated two or three years before.

—and he will see that they get what they want for their city, and that its shipping facilities shall be such as will enable it to handle the ever-increasing traffic that is coming and going through it year after year. Citizens, stand by Mr. Wigmore, and he will stand by the city.

It reminds me of the celebrated phrase in Pickwick Papers—"Pickwick and principle";—Wigmore and the harbour!

Other attempts Mr. Speaker, have been made at Cabinet reconstruction. We have had court laid to the province of Quebec.

Mr. DUFF: Fishing expeditions.

Mr. McMASTER: The Prime Minister has developed a great love for the province of Quebec, and the province of Quebec has said: "Oh, Arthur, this is so sudden." And he has answered: "I never told my love, but let concealment, like a worm in the bud, feed on my damask cheek." I am glad the Prime Minister has spoken kind words of the people of the province from which I come and of the race to which I do not belong, which I love. My only regret is that he waited until he was forty-five years of age and Prime Minister of this country before expressing, at least audibly, any such sentiments. But better late than never; So, fishing operations have begun under the control—under the initiative almost—of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. (Mr. Ballantyne). Since the House rose in July last, there has been fishing, but it has been hook-and-line fishing, because you see, Mr. Speaker, the fish can be landed only in a boat with somewhat slender rod of a by-election. The tackle is somewhat light—in fact, the rod much too frail. We hear that after great efforts, one fish has been hooked but not landed in the boat. The tackle was too weak; the rod was not strong enough, and the poor fish is in this position—we often see it; a man is fishing; he has left his landing net at home; his tackle is not strong enough to lift the fish into the boat; he is drowning the fish; the mouth of the fish is above water, but the fish is not in the boat. It is desperately hard on the fish and of little profit to the fisherman. Let me say this to my right hon. friends: situated immediately opposite it is not a very elevated thing to be trying to bribe, by portfolios, your political opponents to enter your Cabinet. It is not what should be done. It has not been successful; I hope the attempt will be given up, But—and I say it with pride for the province from which I come—although these temptations have been held out to man after man on this side of the House, as yet there is no one from our side in the Cabinet which is presided over so ably by—

An hon. MEMBER: What Cabinet?

Mr. McMASTER: Was there a remark made? If so I did not catch it. I was referring to the Cabinet presided over by the present Prime Minister. I thought there was a remark made, Mr. Speaker; I am sorry if I have made a mistake. Perhaps it was a whisper—sotto voce.

The Prime Minister has endeavoured to taunt the Liberal party on its tariff attitude. He says that it is hard for him to find where the Liberal party stands on the tariff. If he has not already a copy, he

has only to apply to the National Liberal organization and he will be given, with that liberality of hand which distinguishes us, as many copies as he likes of the proceedings of the Liberal Convention of 1919. The Liberals, in convention assembled, laid down a tariff platform. That tariff platform is the policy of the Liberal party. By that platform we stand, and by that platform we shall win.

I do not purpose at this time imposing upon the House any long tariff discussion. I see the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) looking at me. Ah, how well I remember that day in the summer of 1915 at Calgary when I made a speech in which I said that the tariff could not be wiped out over night and that we must proceed with caution, how he rose and berated me as a friend of the protectionist manufacturers of the East. I did not go quickly enough for him then. What has come over the spirit of his dream that he sits where he sits now? There are five main things that have to be considered in the tariff. There is the relief of the consumer. There is the directing of the capital and labour of the country into channels where they will bring forth the greatest economic return. There is the freeing of the people from the control of trusts and combines. Those are the three great objectives of a tariff revision. Then we have to consider the fact that for many years we have had this system of protection, and care and prudence must be used in reducing the tariff; and we must also consider the question of revenue. Those are the five great things we have in mind. Those are the five great things which have been looked after, taken care of, provided for, in the tariff policy of the Liberal party.

This is an important debate because upon it may rest the fate of the Ministry. It is a matter for the Prime Minister to consider whether for his own personal political fate he should refuse to go to the country. I suppose all thoughtful men in this Chamber will admit that Parliamentary institutions are on trial; that there are in the world to-day many people who say that Parliamentary institutions have not worked out as they should have done and that recourse should be had to direct action.

The other day—when I say the other day I am referring to what really happened several months ago—there was a rumour in Great Britain that war was to be engaged in with Russia, and the labour leaders in the Old Land said: We will have no war with Russia; if you bring on war with Russia, we will down tools; we will stop the machine. With their opposition to war with Russia I am in most complete accord, but with the idea that one section of the community should, by economic force, be able to impose its will upon the rest of us, I have no sympathy whatever. But there are only two ways in which men can be governed—

4 p.m.

either by force or by their consent—and in order to have men governed by their consent, there must be an organization for giving that consent, that opinion, proper expression, there must be a maintenance of some sort of Parliament; and any one who attempts to make Parliament unresponsive to the will of the people does so at the risk of encouraging direct action. I have no dislike in my heart for the Prime Minister; I admire his good qualities; but with his political practices and policies I am at eternal war. I believe he sits there a usurper, and I would remind him that no usurper has ever for long successfully controlled the destinies of a British country. There was one great usurper—his name was Cromwell—and he did a great deal for his country. He made the name of England known and respected on land and sea; but after he disappeared, his power immediately became as naught, and we had the Restoration with all its attendant ills. I would ask the Prime Minister to read the history of leaders in all democratic countries who held on to office once their right to office had terminated. Did not every one of them suffer and suffer badly for having done so? I believe history will show that I am right.

Just in conclusion, I have a word to submit in connection with the Liberal Unionists who yet sit on the side of the Government. With us they are or have been the inheritors of a great tradition and a great name. Every man of them got vote after vote, tens of votes, hundreds of votes, thousands of votes, on the distinct understanding that his mandate was for the war and for the war alone. If they sit there, if they support this Government, then they break their pledged word to the electors of the country who supported them on that understanding. They can do that, but it will be wrong. The other day I heard a story of that great explorer, missionary, scientist, David Livingstone. He fell sick in the centre of Africa; he was carried to the coast by his African bearers, and when he reached the coast there was an

English ship that would have taken him home to glory, honour, safety and health. But he had given his word to those Africans that he would take them back home again to their native village, and he left health, life and the opportunity for glory; he kept his word to those Africans, and they bore him back into mid-Africa to die because he was a man of his word, because his plighted word to him was above everything else. The fate of this Government is in the hands of those men who formerly called themselves Liberals, who sit behind the Government. It will be for them to say whether there should be an immediate appeal to the people or whether this Government should maintain itself in power after having secured power under an understanding that its mandate would cease with the war.

Mr. LOUIS JOSEPH GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, every member who rises in his seat in this House to address his fellow-members generally asks for the indulgence of those who are about to listen to his remarks. This is specially true to-day on account of the special circumstances I am in, and I shall not even wait for the indulgence of my fellow-members, I ask for it at the very outset of my remarks.

I should not like to be discourteous towards the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. McMaster). He has spoken in a very light manner indeed of the procedure adopted by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government to secure representation in the Cabinet. I should not like to follow him in the same vein, but I shall address a few remarks to that hon. gentleman. He concluded his address with an appeal to the Liberal members who are supporting the Government, so that dissolution of Parliament could be secured. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Brome claims to be a Liberal, claims to love justice, claims to fight for fair play, and represents one of the constituencies of the province of Quebec. And yet he has the audacity to rise in this House and in the name of his constituents ask the Government to dissolve Parliament when, according to the constitution the province of Quebec is the pivot of Confederation, and when its last unit of representation was 30,080, while its unit of representation based on the next census will in view of the increase as shown by the records of our province be 40,000 dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. GAUTHIER: Yes, some of my fellow members laugh when I speak of dollars. I would like those who laugh and those who smile to be able to stand where I stand to-day and fight the battle that I am fighting. Laughter and smiles won't stop me. The men who have tried to tame me know they cannot tame or break me. I was saying that our unit of representation based on the next census will be 40,000. Take simply the Island of Montreal, represented in this Parliament by twelve members, and having a population of more than 800,000. The city of Montreal will be entitled to twenty seats. And yet a member from this province asks the Liberals supporting the Government to consent to the House being dissolved.

My hon. friend has been talking of fish and bribery. I do not know what he means, and I will wait for his future explanation. But when he says that he is going to stand on the platform of the Liberal party as enacted in the National Liberal Convention held in Ottawa in the month of August 1919, I would remind the House that the only plank which was able to bear the weight of the hon. member for Brome was the plank of free trade.

But since that convention was held, the plank has been so much chopped up that now it does not carry the hon. member but he carries it, cut in pieces, in his vest pocket. May I remind the hon. gentleman who is still labouring under the misapprehensions with which he prefaced his remarks on the question of free trade and protection, that it is only last year the hon. gentleman discovered that the Liberal party in its fifteen years of power had always adhered to protection. It was a scene to be recorded in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. Many Liberal members were sitting around the table, and the hon. member for Brome was trying to commit his party to free trade. The meeting was presided over by that great old politician warrior who for fifteen years sat on the treasury benches as Minister of Finance in the Laurier Administration. My hon. friend the member for Brome was trying to induce the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) to commit himself to free trade and said "Well, does not the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's understand that the Liberal party is a party of free traders?" "Yes, yes," said the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's with his genial smile and in his highly cultured manner, "yes, yes, free trade is a nice theory." "But," said the member for Brome "we must have it." "Yes, yes,"

answered the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's," "In theory; but in practice, no." The hon. member for Brome was dumbfounded. He had still ringing in his ears all the speeches of the Liberal chieftain stating that the Liberals were for free trade. But he had not looked at the statute book. He did not realize until last year that when in power his party and my party adhered to the protectionist idea, as can be proven. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I should not take up more time in discussing the hon. member for Brome. Perhaps in the course of my remarks I may have the pleasure of referring to him once more.

I come now to the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). He issues a warning to the Government. He says: Do not talk tariff on the Address. Who is talking tariff on the Address? The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) stated that he was ready to discuss the tariff question. As a matter of fact, he said: Whenever our party comes back to power we will give this country a tariff identical with that of the fifteen years of Liberal Administration. Now what was the platform of that party if it was not protection? Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal party came into power in 1896 the platform of the National Liberal Convention of 1893 was still fresh in the minds of everybody. The Liberal leader at that time, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, called in to his assistance all the Liberal premiers of the different provinces of Canada, and we had in this country what will go down in our political history as the great Cabinet of Confederation. What happened, Sir? In spite of all the pledges for "free trade as they had it in England," and all the promises that the tariff should be a tariff for revenue only, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's had a tariff commission going around the country just as the present Government has had a commission going around the country.

And I do not understand why the member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) should ask the question, "Why a tariff question?" When the party which he supports had two commissions, one in 1897 and another in 1907. The fact is that this Government is following the same policy as the Liberals followed when they were in power. I admit that there were many articles on the free list; I do not remember the exact number, but speaking from memory I believe that there were at least 141 articles on the free list; and the duties were lower—on at least 118 articles coming from foreign countries into Canada. But there was a preferential duty accorded British industry. The first preferential duty was 25 per cent, and it was understood that it would be increased to 33 1-3 per cent. If my figures are correct the tariff of 1897 when brought down was an average tariff of 21 per cent. Now, in the devastation that follows war the countries that have suffered must import farm products from those countries that have continued to produce. The demand arising from South Africa after the war in that country arose about the same time as the preference was given by us to British industry, and these two combined caused a condition of expansion and development in Canada.

Here I desire to draw attention to a fact that tells many sad tales. In 1893 the Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte fought his Conservative friends. He threw down the gauntlet to his former associates to run in the County of L'Islet on the question of the Connolly Dry Dock Scandal. He was returned, to battle down the fortress of the Conservative party in this House, and finally brought Parliament to dissolution in 1896. Every man of my age who had the opportunity to fight in those days must remember the Hon. Mr. Tarte who, during the Campaign of 1896 had not enough money to pay his cab fare from one meeting to another. They must remember the hard work he did and I think they will recall the fact that he was rewarded in a sense, by being appointed Minister of Public Works. But the Liberals of that day, like the so-called Liberals of to-day, wanted to secure the scalp of Mr. Tarte and represented him as a Tory in a Liberal Government. In 1904—and here is the injustice of the thing—Mr. Tarte started a campaign preaching the increase of tariff duties, because in the meantime the British Preference had gone up to 33 1-3 per cent, and our industries were unable to compete. As I stand here, Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the woollen industry of this country has been killed by the British Preference; but for the sake of the rest of the community we swallowed the Preference and the woollen industry went bankrupt. Seeing the danger with which this country was confronted, Mr. Tarte started a campaign to have the tariff raised; he preached the increase of protection. He was thrown out of the Cabinet, and in 1907, three years after his expulsion, this very party increased the tariff from 21 per cent to 29

per cent, the very thing which Mr. Tarte had been advocating. Listen to their speeches! They have saved the country! Yes, Sir, they saved the country—when they could not do otherwise. Imagine my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) speaking as he does, when he knows that for fifteen years the Liberal party had been committed to protection. Imagine his being the financial critic of the Opposition during a whole Parliament. God save that party! The Conservatives of this country have been committed to the principle of protection since 1878; and the proof that the Liberal party had a protective tariff is the fact that during the elections of 1911 the Tories said "let well enough alone." They were satisfied with the tariff at that time. What has happened since? Since 1911 the British Preference has been abolished. I do not believe that the present Government should be lauded for this. The tariff has been reduced to please the agrarian movement, and I do not believe either that the Government should be lauded on this account. Sir, let me make a declaration here and now: I have more respect for the representatives of the farmer and the labour elements because they are true to the doctrines they preach. There is a difference between this group on the cross benches and that other group, the Liberal group. The Liberals vary their declaration as they move from one parish to another, from one county to another, and from one province to another. The hon. gentleman who represents the county of Maisonneuve and at the same time the county of Gaspé has declared in the province of Quebec time and time again that he was a protectionist, that he always had been a protectionist, and that his party was one that adhered to the principle of protection. Yet he was present at the convention, where he spoke, and two rows behind him the hon. member for Brome could stand up and say: "I am a free trader; I am against protection"—this notwithstanding that his provincial leader called himself a protectionist to the core.

Well, Sir, if—as I believe and as I think will be admitted—the Liberal party when in power adhered to protection; and if the Liberal party, as has been stated by the member for North Cape Breton when brought back to power, is willing to give the country a tariff similar to that of the Liberal administration from 1896 to 1911, why should the Opposition now refuse to accept the paragraph in the speech from the Throne with respect to protection? Ah, they are trying to evade the point, they are trying to cloud the issue that is involved, they do not care about the other provinces. The Liberal party in this House numbers eighty-two members, and sixty-one of them come from the province of Quebec. In that province they control or are interested in certain newspapers, and they believe that through the influence of those journals they will be able to so mould public opinion as to ensure that the solid block of Liberal members from Quebec shall never be disintegrated. On this issue I am prepared to meet them, if not through the press on the public platform.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We will be there.

Other hon. MEMBERS: We will meet you.

Mr. GAUTHIER: To hear these hon. gentlemen one would imagine that I held the fate of the Government in my hands and that they were asking for dissolution from me. The answer I give them is that I promise to transfer their message to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government.

An hon. MEMBER: A good messenger

Mr. GAUTHIER: A messenger that the Liberal party was glad to have in its ranks for many years; a messenger who in their interest ran from one to another of the forty-five ridings in the district of Montreal and who has preached the gospel of Liberalism not only in Quebec but in New Brunswick, in Ontario and in the West; a messenger that my hon. friends can use no more; a messenger that they are willing still to be master of but who recognizes no master since his leader is dead.

Coming to the question of dissolution the leader of the Opposition wishes to know what mandate the Government has for remaining in office. Sir, I have always thought that according to sound constitutional doctrine a government was elected for the period prescribed by the law—that it was at liberty to shorten that period, but had no power to enlarge it. That is the letter of the law. What is the spirit of the law? It is that as long as a government has a majority in this Chamber it can remain in office, and many are the occasions when it should undoubtedly do so. Supposing the appeal made by the hon. member for Brome should be favourably received by Liberals who are now supporting the Government? Supposing for one moment that were to occur

and that those thirty-eight Liberal members were to cross to the Opposition side? Would the leader of the Opposition when called into office be obliged to go to the country?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sure.

Mr. GAUTHIER: No, he would have supporting him a majority of the members elected for this Parliament. Possibly he might take that course, but it is my firm belief that if such a thing happened he would not go to the country. He would not go to the country because if he did so in advance of the redistribution of seats following the taking of the census he would not remain in office for one single day. The West, as well as the province of Quebec, would clamour to have its rights; and no Prime Minister would be strong enough to withstand the clamour that would be raised by the province of Quebec supported by the other provinces.

But there is another consideration to be borne in mind. At the last session of Parliament the Opposition proposed an amendment to the Speech from the Throne declaring that the Government had no mandate and that it should dissolve Parliament and go to the people.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Did you support that amendment?

Mr. GAUTHIER: I did.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why have you changed your attitude then?

Mr. GAUTHIER: Do not be to precipitate. I will give my explanation and it will show the difference between the hon. members of the Opposition and myself. I will prove that I am consistent and that they are not. But inconsistency does not worry my hon. friends; they never were consistent. When the amendment declaring that the Government had no mandate had been debated and the division had disclosed beyond no doubt that it had sufficient majority to continue transacting the affairs of the country, what happened? Towards the close of the session a resolution increasing the indemnity of members was brought down and adopted. Did my hon. friends of the Opposition accept that increase? Yes, Sir, they did. Why did they accept it if the Government had no mandate? If their contention were true, they, as well as the Government and its supporters, improperly accepted money from the public treasury. But they accepted the increase of indemnity, and having done so they now say to the Government which granted it, "You have no mandate, get out." Last Session I voted in favour of the motion declaring the Government had no mandate, but I accepted the increase of indemnity because the majority decided otherwise and to that position I adhere.

Mr. LANCTOT: I did not benefit by the increase of indemnity.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I was going to make an exception with respect to my hon. friend; I should be very sorry not to do so. The only gentleman who stood up in this House and fought the increase of indemnity was the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot). Of course, like the others, he pocketed the money, but he declared—and this is the declaration that I want to underline—that he would never profit by this increase, but would divide it equally between his two counties. I suppose that is what he intends to do. The auditors will audit the books, and they will report in due time.

Mr. LANCTOT: Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to offer an explanation?

Mr. GAUTHIER: Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in making an explanation at this stage. If he desires to submit a question to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) he may do so with the latter's consent.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The gentleman who wanted to correct stands corrected. The hon. member (Mr. McMaster) seemed to be very fond of precedents to show that this Government might remain in office. Of course, hon. members of the Opposition have stated that there is no precedent whatever for such retention of power. May I be permitted, Sir, to tell hon. members who come from my province that the only two precedents that can be quoted occurred in our own native province. In November, 1904, we had a provincial election there. The Premier at that time was the late Hon. S. N. Parent, and he had as one of his cabinet ministers Mr. Lomer Gouin. The election was fought in November, the cabinet of Mr. Parent was maintained, and the House was called upon to meet in January; but for fifteen days there were no sittings, because the members were fighting in groups, and finally Mr. Gouin got the best of it and Mr. Parent was murdered, politically. Is that a precedent? The Liberals still claim that Sir Lomer Gouin is the greatest premier we have ever had in our province, but that

is the way he came into power. He had no mandate from the people; he had a mandate from the members of the House, and that was sufficient for him, and was also sufficient for the federal members, the so-called Liberals from Quebec.

But there is another precedent, Sir; it happened in 1920. In June, 1919, we had a general election for the provincial House. Sir Lomer Gouin was the premier, and was returned with seventy-six of his partisans, but later on he was appointed to the Legislative Council and Mr. Taschereau took his place. Mr. Taschereau did not go to the country. Is not that a precedent? "Oh, well," the Liberal press of Quebec will say, "he is following the same policy." He is not, and they know it. Sir Lomer Gouin had placed on the statute books a prohibition law. Mr. Taschereau is about to enact another law by which the local government at Quebec will be the absolute and sole dealer in alcohol. Is that the same policy as Sir Lomer Gouin's? No. Did Mr. Taschereau go to the country? No.

Having disposed of the arguments that have been advanced so far by those who fight this Government on the question of dissolution, to please my former friends I should like to go a ltlle deeper into politics. I asked the indulgence of the House. As there was no expression of dissent, I suppose I secure that indulgence. The Liberals of to-day, as I stated a moment ago, do not follow the path of true Liberalism. What constitutes the first principle of Liberalism? It is universal suffrage. Who gave it to this country, the Liberals or the Conservatives? I was amazed to listen to my hon. friend from Brome, a worthy scion of the sturdy Scotch race. I suppose he came originally from the Highlands, but he has always lived in the lowlands of politics. He proclaims himself a Liberal of the old school, and yet in his speech, Sir, he was complaining because during the war the Government of the day saw fit to give the right to vote to the wives and daughters of the soldiers at the front. From a Liberal standpoint it was a good move to give universal suffrage; but it came from the Government of the day, consequently my hon. friend from Brome sets aside his Liberalism and hurls his attacks against the Government.

Liberals of to-day, we will—with your permission, Mr. Speaker—look over the road. The Liberal party in days gone by fought for many years to abolish the double mandate, and it was finally abolished in 1873. Before that year the same man could be a senator, a legislative councillor, and an appointee of the Crown. This double mandate had emanated from the Family Compact, which at one time controlled this country for the advantage of the few. What do you see, Sir, even in this Chamber? You see the hon. member for St. Denis, Montreal (Mr. Verville), the untamed defender of the working man. Do you remember, Sir, his fiery speeches when he was cutting into small bits a piece of sausage to distribute to the children? He was preaching rebellion, and I remember having heard him say on the floor of the House, when we were discussing the $35,000,000 grant to the English navy, that if ever there was a war the working men would stop it by going on strike. Well, he was a very bad prophet, as he is a very bad Liberal. Actually he draws his sessional indemnity of $4,000 as a member of this House, and he draws $10,000 as a commissioner of the city of Montreal. When he is in Montreal he does not fulfil his duties in Ottawa; when he is in Ottawa he does not fulfil his duties in Montreal. But he draws the two salaries. He is for the double mandate as long as he can hold on to it.

He is not alone, Sir; he has a colleague who stands in the same position. I might say, en passant, that the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) is at the same time a member of the House and a substitute for the Attorney General at Montreal at a salary of $4,000. But when the late Government appointed Mr. Chapais to the Senate, while at the same time he held the office of Legislative Councillor, you could hear the Liberals claiming that it was an outrage. An outrage when the double mandate is for the benefit of the Tories, but a mighty good thing when it is for the benefit of one of the Liberals.

But in this House, Sir, we have better than that. We have an hon. member, who, since the beginning of this Parliament has represented two different ridings separated by a distance of three hundred and fifty miles. One is the constituency of Maisonneuve, which is an urban riding; the other is the constituency of Gaspé, mostly settled by fishermen. When the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) is asked by the fishermen of Gaspé to support a policy of free trade because they want to obtain American goods free of duty as well as enjoy the benefits of the Boston market for their fish, the hon. member has to advocate free trade. But when the electors of Maison-

neuve want protection because with free trade their earning power might be diminished, the hon. gentleman votes for protection. Whether it is free trade or protection, the hon. member is sure always to have one seat at the right time. The member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé has been in public life for quite a while. He has a few friends—a few people are scared by him; and a large number of people do not care much about him. By right of seniority he is the first lieutenant of the provincial Liberal wing. The member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) is at the head of the other faction. If I were to compare the leaders of the two factions, I would say that the members in the Quebec district are proud of their leader in the person of the member for Quebec East; but who among those of the Montreal district will say that he is proud of his leader? I do not think, Sir, that you could find one who would say so. Why? The hon. member was described on one occasion in a newspaper article published in French, entitled "Tout pour le mieux". If I had to translate this in English I would say: "All to the good," but in order to get at its real meaning in this case I would have to translate it: "Everything for Lemieux." That is why the hon. member has no friends, Mr. Speaker. And pretending to represent the Liberal party, though he was not the leader of the party to which I belonged, has seen fit to read me out of the ranks of the Liberal Party. I have been in the Liberal Party since 1896. I have fought the battles of my party since 1897. I never complained when I was given the worst positions to defend; I never complained when there were any bouquets or flowers to receive that were received by others. No, Sir, I never complained. I was a soldier in the Liberal army and I did my duty to the best of my ability and according to the dictates of my conscience. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that I am a traitor; that I am a renegade; that I am a Judas. He has no right, either, to ask his fellow-members who are the owners or editors of certain newspapers in my Province to hurl insults at me, after all I have done for every one of them.

I am going to try to show who is really the traitor and renegade. I stand here for the protective tariff as enacted by the Liberal administration. For what does the Liberal Opposition stand? Fifteen per cent tariff; fifty per cent Imperial preference—giving a preference of seven and a half per cent against English industries, and in favour of our own industries. Who are the traitors? Who are the renegades? Is the man a traitor who still fights for the tariff instituted by the late Sir Wilfred Laurier and the Liberal Party, which has brought wealth and happiness to the people? Or are those the traitors who went to destroy that platform; who want free trade; who want a tariff for revenue, or any kind of policy which will enable them to take the spoils of office?

I was elected as a Laurierite in 1917. On what policy, Sir? On the Laurier naval policy. For that policy I stand and will stand to the end of my political life. Am I a traitor? Am I a renegade? Am I a Judas? Whom have I betrayed? The Liberal Opposition themselves have left the platform and the policy of Laurier. I was elected by electors who knew where I stood and who know where I stand to-day. To whom am I a traitor? In what respect am I a renegade? Against whom am I a Judas? Where is the man, where is the party, where is the platform, that I have betrayed? It cannot be shown. But in order to keep the Quebec block solid, the two factions of the Liberals of the province of Quebec do not want any conferences between Quebec and the Government. They admit, though, that Quebec, being in the minority, must have an ally. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) would be willing to join hands with the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). The hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé is willing, if I can rely upon his word, to make an alliance with the Hon. Mr. Drury. Everyone admits that the isolation of Quebec must be terminated; but because I do not see eye to eye with my hon. friends, because I do not want to be a party to an alliance with the farmers, to an alliance with the labourers, because I am afraid of the communism of the agrarian movement—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Oh no, we are all right.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I have a right to my opinion even when it is contradicted by the hon. member for Red Deer. I do not want him to be ruled by my opinion, and he could not ask me to be ruled by his. It is my belief, Sir, that the agrarian movement is tending to a class movement, and I am afraid of that, and my people are afraid of it. Have we not a right to

choose our ally? Are we going to choose our ally to please Mr. So-and-So or the hon. member for such-an-such riding? We are going to seek an alliance, this alliance to be made for the benefit of all parties concerned and specially for harmony amongst all classes, all groups, all provinces, all races, all creeds.

When the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) took exception to my words, I was stating that I could not advocate an alliance with the labour element. I will say why. The labour element in this country is affiliated with the American Federation of Labour, the headquarters of which are at Washington, pretty near the Capitol. I do not want our policy, our fiscal policy, our national policy, to be dominated by somebody who does not live in our land. That is quite right, and I have an absolute right to hold that opinion. I have said this, and I am willing to repeat it because I speak the truth as I understand it. I have more respect for the farmers who stand by their guns, who advocate free trade, who want to have a group of agrarian members in this House. We know where they are; we know where they will land. I can discuss matters with them, because I know what they want; I am not afraid of them; they are under their own flag, they show their colours. We know of what stamp they are made; we know what their policy is. But after all, if their principles do not agree with my belief, surely I am at liberty to say that I do not want an alliance with that group.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Sure.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Thank you. Before leaving this interesting subject of the Liberalism of the Liberals of to-day, I should like to make a few more references to my bosom friend, the hon. member who represents in this House the two constituencies of Gaspé and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). In this life majority counts; we must have every unit when we are fighting. Here is a gentlemen who is supposed to be a Liberal, who holds in this House a double mandate with only one seat. The Liberal party has found its last refuge in the province of Quebec, because outside of Quebec, I do not believe there are more than twenty-one Liberal members. The Liberal party, when the votes are recorded, is interested in having all the votes it can poll; but through sheer eogtism the hon. gentleman has seen fit to keep the two seats, and whenever a vote is recorded, the Opposition loses one vote. But my hon. friend wants to go down to posterity as having been on the same footing as his late chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who for one Parliament held two seats also. But one of those seats was protested before the courts; actually there is no protest. How is it that a gentleman can stand in that position for the satisfaction of his own feeling against the triumph or the progressive fight of the party with which he is affiliated? It is a mystery which cannot be very easily explained. If I had any malicious feeling towards the hon. gentleman, I would say that I could give two explanations of his career, one a literary one and the other an applied science one. In reading over the fables of LaFontaine one finds the Fable of the Bat. The Bat, when flying with birds, can say: "Look at my wings, I am a bird," but when down on mother earth, she can also say: "I am a mouse; long live the rodents." When the hon. gentleman fights for free trade, he appeals to the masses of democracy to look at his wings. But when he fights for the big interests of his own constituency, when he goes with the bankers, the financiers, the industrial men; when he goes into the trust companies, into the insurance companies, dealing with all the wealthy in the land—"long live the rodents." If, passing from this literary reminiscence you go to applied science, you will remember that for many years there was a great discussion about airships. Some scientists claimed that in order to float in the atmosphere you should have something lighter than air. Then scientists came to the conclusion that it was necessary to have something heavier than air. At the time of the first theory balloons were made of silk and were filled with gas. Then the aeroplane was invented, and through the rapidity of the movements of its motor it was able to plane into the atmosphere. The hon. gentleman started his career as a balloon. He was robed with silk and filled with gas. Then he changed into an aeroplane. He had to give action to his airship through the most powerful motor there has ever been in this land, one that can never be duplicated. This motor was named Sir Wilfrid Laurier. When the motor stopped, the aeroplane came down to Mother Earth, and it is still splashing around in all the muddy spots, whence it can fly no more. He can say to those who still surround him: "Once I was

5 p.m.

a bird, look at my broken wings," but for the common people he will ever remain the most perfect political bat this country has ever known or heard of.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unsound Liberalism to preach the gospel of hatred against the majority of a country. It is unsound Liberalism to isolate a minority in a country.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Oh, never mind. This is a very serious game, and I have had to discard the hon. gentleman. There is no joker in the deck. I repeat, it is unsound Liberalism to isolate a minority, and I stand by what I have just said. It may be all right to have a solid block if you can appeal to the majority and win them to your cause, but if you cannot win them on account of your platform or on account of your theory, and if you are condemned to remain an isolated minority, I say it is bad Liberalism, and that has been proved to the hilt by the constitutional history of this country. The doctrine is so false that even the so-called Liberals are looking for allies. They are trying to induce the farmers to come in with them. They feel their utter incapacity unless they make an alliance. With whom should this alliance be made? By whom should it be made? These are the two points I should like to discuss now.

I have advocated the doctrine that isolation for Quebec should come to an end. Have I sacrificed any one of my political principles? Not one. Have I betrayed anybody? No one. If there are those in my province who are in any better position to discuss the situation with the powers that sit on the Treasury Benches, why do they not discuss it? If they believe that an alliance should be made, and if the Government of to-day is willing to make an alliance on a fair basis, with equal rights and mutual respect for everybody, who should complain? The policy of an alliance has been the policy of Quebec since the days of 1840 under the Union Act. It has been the sound policy, and it cannot be otherwise, for the good of this country, and the interests of all parties are looked after.

Sir, we have had two policies of alliances in this country. I am speaking now of my own province. The province of Quebec has had two alliances, one was when Cartier united Quebec with Ontario. The other was after 1896 when my late leader made an alliance between Quebec and the West. If you look at the records of the general elections of 1900, 1904, 1908, 1911, and 1917, you will see that, although through the alliance of the late Clarke Wallace with the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we were able to get forty-eight out of the ninety-six seats in Ontario, at every ensuing general election this majority has dwindled. It was thirty-eight in 1904, it was less than twenty in 1908, it came down to seventeen in 1911, and it finally rested at thirteen. What is the meaning of this? It is that the province of Ontario, seeing that the alliance with Quebec had been broken for the benefit of the western provinces, sought new alliances to direct the policies of this country. The alliance between Cartier and Macdonald was consummated in 1849 or 1850, about the time when the Governor General was insulted in the streets of Montreal, when the Parliament building was set on fire, when the annexation manifesto was circulated and signed by many people in this country who wanted secession from the mother country and annexation with the United States.

Cartier made an alliance with Macdonald. What has been the result so far as the country and my province are concerned? We had the opening of the Lachine canal, the construction of the Grand Trunk railway, the abolition of "tenure seigneuriale" in 1854, the organization of our municipal law in 1858. We had the codification of our French laws in 1864, and then there was Confederation, which gave to the province of Quebec the absolute control of all matters relating to education and of parochial and municipal law, making Quebec mistress in her own territory, under the guidance of the Federal Parliament.

This is what we had under the first alliance. What have we from the other one, and what can we expect? That is the point. The population of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, is atached to the soil. This is our own country; we have no other. If we left it we should be exiles. We must therefore remain here; we are rooted to the soil. It was discovered by our forefathers; it was trodden by our pioneers, and it has been reddened with the blood of our martyrs. We want to remain here; therefore, we have no desire to go onywhere else. Now, we are in the minority. With whom should we make an alliance? I have claimed all along that the natural ally of Quebec is Ontario. Since 1912, after the defeat of reciprocity in 1911, in the ranks of my own party I have advocated that theory and preached it as a gospel. I was not listened to. The Liberal party

wants to retain an alliance with the West. Sir, I have no objection to the people of the West: none at all. I respect them. They came here to draw from the soil the wealth which Providence has stored there for those who are sturdy enough to work and obtain it. I have no objection to their helping us to develop the country. But, Mr. Speaker, figures are figures, and I have before me figures that show that west of the Great Lakes 63 per cent of the population are not British born. This is not my fault, but it is a fact. Am I going to preach an alliance with those who have not the same ideals as we have and who do not love our institutions? No, Sir, I cannot do that; for one, I will not consent to it. Everyone, of course, is at liberty to choose his own ally. I am choosing mine, and I shall try to make my people see as I do in this matter. If I fail I shall not bewail my failure; but I hope to win because I want to see peace and harmony restored in this country. This doctrine, in my mind, is a sound one. It is not based on prejudice; it is not based on hatred; it is not based on any sad passion of the human heart. The doctrine was so sound that my former friends, the so-called Liberals, could not attack it, and they therefore decided to murder the preacher.

Now, they have begun to take cognizance of two accusations that have been levelled at me, one since 1906, and the other since 1915. At the outset of my remarks I asked for the indulgence of the House, as it was my intention to deal once for all with those accusations; and if my former friends, so-called Liberals, have seen fit to make use of those accusations, being a public man, I have considered that the proper place in which to dispose of them is the House of Commons, the highest tribunal in the land. I shall deal with the first accusation.

It is that in 1906, when I ran as a Liberal candidate for the county of L'Assomption, I promised my support to the Conservative party in consideration of the sum of $1,500 which was to be paid to me. This accusation has been hurled against me now for fifteen years. So long as the Conservatives of my province thought fit to make use of that charge I deemed it a good strategic move to let them keep on for the time being, for they were not injuring the governments which I was supporting. As a matter of fact, Sir, this charge has never hurt me, because every time it has been made I have been in a position to give the official denial to it. Here are the facts. In 1906 there was a vacancy in the Provincial House, ocasioned by the appointment of Mr. Joseph P. Duhamel to the office of Chief Registrar of the province. The Liberal convention held at L'Assomption was presided over by the late Hon. Jean Provost, who was at the time Minister of Colonization and of Marine and Fisheries in the local Cabinet. My name was put forward as a candidate to the convention. I refused to have my name put up for nomination because I was certain—I had the proof—that some delegates had been approached with the view of inducing them to vote against me; and not wishing to be slaughtered by process of a convention organized and influenced in that way, I withdrew my name before nomination.

One Joseph Papin was chosen as the candidate. He was the President of the Agricultural Society of the County, but his choice did not meet with the approval of the farming community. Immediately after he was chosen, some farmers came to me and tendered me the nomination should I desire to run as an independent Liberal. One of those farmers offered me his personal cheque for $1,200 to defray my expenses. On the morning of nomination day the man chosen as the government candidate was so strong that he ran away and I was returned by acclamation. Now, Sir, the Conservatives since that time have spread broadcast against me, the slander that they had been prepared to bribe me.

I will explain how this legend has been created. The Provincial Government of the day was preparing a taxation law against fraternal societies. La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, which is doing business in eight provinces of Canada and in eight states of the American Union would have been called upon, had the proposed legislation been enacted, to pay in taxation an amount equal to six or seven thousand dollars, whereas they were at the time paying but a nominal tax. In the law of every province of Canada, or state of the United States, there is a proviso that if a foreign company doing business in that province or in that state is paying in its own country a higher taxation than it is paying in the foreign country, the government of the latter country will have the privilege of increasing its taxation to an amount equal to that imposed in the native land of the association. The proposed legislation would have meant for this society a taxation of from five to six thousand dollars a year, when we were paying but $5 and $10 a year in every province and state.

The lawyer of the Society was one Alfred Labelle, who is now deceased. During the time of the L'Assomption election we discussed more than once the question of the taxation of the fraternal societies. I was interested in La Société des Artisans, and Mr. Labelle and I decided that if it were necessary we would organize a joint movement between all the fraternal societies doing business and having their headquarters in the province of Quebec so that we would be able to ask the government to refrain from putting the proposed law into effect. Well, Sir, I was returned by acclamation. Afterward I went and had dinner at the Club Lafontaine, which was a social as well as a business club. My leader, Sir Lomer Gouin, had dinner there more than once. Lately in the city of Montreal a banquet was given to a certain Conservative senator who was attended by Liberal senators, and even ministers, men who were personal friends of the host. Would it be possible to suppose for one moment that because you have a luncheon or a dinner with a man of opposite politics you are going to betray your party? That is nonsense. I did not need the money. I was returned by acclamation. If I had been opposed I had actually a certain amount of money which was more than sufficient to pay my legal expenditure. I did not need the money, I did not get the money, I never promised anything. After the election I was asked by the then Premier to propose the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. Since that day up till last fall I always fought for my party, and have defended members of the Liberal party when Conservatives were attacking them. Now so-called Liberals, my former friends, are indulging in slanderous attacks. The only thing I can say that I have nothing but contempt for them and for their actions.

Now, Mr, Speaker, let me proceed to the second acccusation. It is the one which has reference to the same Society of Artisans. The Society was founded in 1817, in the dark hour of that dark period when the civic authorities in the city of Montreal were compelled to open public kitchens at the corners of all thoroughfares to feed the starving population. A carpenter by the name of Archambault founded the Society to look after the interests of sick members and, upon their demise, the interests of their widows and orphans. As in the case of all societies of the kind funded during that century, it was based on charity and sympathy.

Orginally the Society was local in its character, but, starting in 1890, it expanded throughout all the provinces, and in 1900 it began operations in the United States. I regret to say that although in 1915 the membership was forty-three thousand and that membership international in character, its administration was provincial in the sense that all the directors to be elected must be chosen in the district of Montreal. I entered the Society in 1900. I acted as a delegate at the convention of that year and have acted in a similar capacity at every convention since. I have been in charge of the legislative committee which has entirely transformed the Society and its finances and which has put the Association—to quote the words of its actuary Mr. George Dyre Aldridge —in a position unique on the whole continent. When I left the office of president, to which I was elected in 1914, for every $100 of liability I left in the coffers of the association $125.50. The Society stands in a class by itself. After having transformed this society, I was the first professional man to be elected as first vice-president, which office consists mostly in looking after the financial affairs of the association. At the convention of 1914 I was the first professional man to be elected to the high office of president, and I am sure that office was given to me unanimously on account of the services that I had rendered to the society.

Now, Sir, on the first Saturday of September, 1915, just as I was leaving the hospital where I had been undergoing an operation, the newspaper Le Pays came out with an article stating that L. J. Gauthier had been speculating with the funds of the society, that he had taken the money in its treasury to buy bonds, which he afterwards re-sold to the society of which he was the president. This was the accusation, and it was afterwards published in the Montreal newspaper, La Patrie, by the Quebec newspaper, L'Evenement, and also by Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe, which at the time was a Conservative organ.

A convention was called, and the membership of 43,000 sent in their delegates. The books were opened and the transactions carefully examined, and out of sixty-five votes, eleven were cast against me and fifty-four were given in my favour, the latter stating that the accusation was malicious, slanderous and unfounded. But I was not surprised. The society being international in its membership and provin-

cial in its management, there was a certain regime and a certain routine, and the coming into office of a new man was liable to break that regime and that routine.

Those hon. members who pay me the compliment of still listening to my remarks will be astonished when I give them the contents of this official report, and they will understand. All the investments were made by the same man before I became president of the finance committee. During my term of office in that capacity and as president-general of the society, I was approached more than once and told that if I did not consent to go back to the old routine somebody would have to suffer for it. I refused to yield. The accusation came, and I am glad to see my hon. friend the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) in his place, for he was the president of the convention when this matter was threshed out.

What were the facts, Sir? The society started investing in bonds in 1901, and under the presidency of M. Joseph Thibeault, bought $25,000 worth at an average interest of 3·62 per cent; under the presidency of M. Alfred Lambert, $465,000 worth at an average interest of 4·20 per cent; under the presidency of M. J. V. Desaulniers $429,500 worth at an average interest of 4·49 per cent; under the presidency of M. Ludger Gravel—when I was president of the finance committee and responsible for the financial business of the society—$599,400 worth at an average interest of 5·30 per cent; under my presidency during fifteen months we invested $445,000 at an average interest of 5·82 per cent.

I will now give the names, Mr. Speaker, of those who sold bonds to the society. Under the presidency of M. Joseph Thibeault the Bank of Hochelaga sold bonds netting a revenue of 2·88 per cent, and Victor Morin, notary, sold bonds netting a revenue of 4·38 per cent.

Under the presidency of M. Alfred Lambert the following persons sold bonds to the society, netting the revenue set opposite their names:

	Per cent.
T. Bastien	4.12
T. Paquet	4.10
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.25
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.56
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.50
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.12
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.10
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.10
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.10
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.15
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.15
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.12

[Mr. Gauthier.]

I have still another list—the names of those who sold bonds to the society under the presidency of M. J. V. Desaulniers, the percentage of interest appearing after each vendor's name:

	Per cent.
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.30
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.10
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.35
Fuller C. Smith	3.50
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.50
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.50
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	5.25
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	5.06
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.60
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.70
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.70
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.40
D. W. & A. E. Brunet	4.40

Now we come to the list of bond sales to the society made during the presidency of M. Ludger Gravel, when I was president of the finance committee:

	Per cent.
Z. Fontaine	5
Canada Investment Co.	5
Canada Investment Co.	5
J. V. Desaulniers	5
David Rochon	5.15
Hon. E. A. Deavitt	4.12
R. T. Beaudoin	5.50
G. A. Terreault	5.50
Commissionnaires Scolaire de Villeray	5.50
Alf. Lambert	6
Banque Provinciale	5.50
Société d'Administration Générale	5.75
Société d'Administration Générale	5.75
Commissionnaires Scolaire de Villeray	5.50

And, finally, Sir, I come to the presidency of L. J. Gauthier, with the following list of bond sales yielding the percentages enumerated:

	Per cent.
Eug. Poirier, N.P.	5.87
Société d'Administration Générale	5.62
Gervais Décary	6.50
J. M. A. Robitaille	5.75
Paquet & Perreault	6
Wm Murphy	5.50
Gervais Décary	5.50

Upon a simple reading of that list everybody will understand that I broke the regime; that I broke the routine and that during my term of office I asked those having the best offers to come forward, so that the society got bonds which yielded the highest possible net return.

During the special convention, which was presided over by my friend the member for Berthier (Mr. Gervais), we took cognizance of all these facts. The delegates asked our actuary, Mr. George Dyre Eld-

ridge, to make a report from an actuarial standpoint on the financial position of the society as regards its investments. Here is the report:

I, Geo. Dyre Eldridge, Actuary, hereby certify that it has been a part of my duty as actuarial adviser of "La Société des Artisans Canadiens-Français", at all times to be fully informed as to the investments of the Society, with special regard to the question of their income-producing quality, as compared with the statutory requirement of interest to be earned for the purpose of accumulating the reserve required by law to maintain the present rates of contribution and meet all the obligations of the Society.

During the year 1914, the interest-income derived from the investments of the Society, after making proper allowance for the cancellation of any values in excess of final par value, and deducting full proportionate interest on sick benefit funds, was $40,393, greater than the interest required upon the statutory standard for the maintenance of the full life insurance reserve.

This is equivalent, when capitalized, to a further surplus over that shown by standard valuation of $445,000.00.

The investments of the past two years are above the average in income-producing value; and this is especially true of the investments made during the current year.

From personal knowledge of the care in, and results of methods of investment followed by many of the life insurance companies and large fraternal societies, I have no hesitation in certifying that "La Société des Artisans Canadiens-Français" stands among the very foremost in both particulars.

I regard the investments of the Society, in view of the care always shown in making them, and the conservative methods followed, as a strong guaranty of its ability to maintain its present rates and to continue the practice, inaugurated the present year, of waiving the payment by the members of one of the monthly contributions, a course that could not be permanently continued if the Society were not earning interest in excess of the statutory requirements.

GEORGE DYRE ELDRIDGE.

Is it possible, Sir, that in the hope of destroying a single man, members representing the province of Quebec—in which this society is one of the foremost organizations of its kind, because it has made the French-Canadian name known in all insurance circles throughout the continent of North America—is it possible that in the hope of crushing down a single man, a member should take the risk of injuring the future of an institution of that kind? This will show, Sir, what is the spirit which animates members who, to flatter their own egotism, to give a chance for the employment of their verbosity and pomposity, would like to be alone in the field; would like to let posterity know that in the year of Our Lord 1921 there was a very big man who represented at the same time the two separate constituencies of Maissonneuve and Gaspé.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was just concluding my remarks by reading a report from the actuary of the Society of Artisans on the management, from a financial standpoint, of the affairs of that society. I do not want to weary the House with that question, but I would like to put on Hansard the following remarks which will conclude the point that I had been making before six o'clock. This question of the Artisans and this question of Le Club Lafontaine were dealt with in the Courier de St. Hyacinthe, which at the time was a Conservative newspaper in my riding, and following the advice of my friends in the constituency, I instituted legal proceedings against that newspaper. The owners of the newspaper came to me asking for a settlement out of court. This I refused. The matter went to judgment, and the two questions were declared to be slanders and malicious affirmations against a public man with no good ground for them. The judgment was rendered by His Lordship the late Mr. Justice Charbonneau.

There was another judgment in the same matter of the Artisans before the Superior Court of Montreal presided over by His Lordship Mr. Justice Mercier. The whole question of the investments of the society was looked into, and the judgment declared that there was nothing in those accusations. The plaintiff was not satisfied; he inscribed his case in the Court of Review, and in the last days of 1920 judgment was rendered unanimously confirming the judgment of His Lordship Mr. Justice Mercier. When my former friends decided to take up this question, I wrote on the 29th January last to the headquarters of the society asking the Board of Directors, as much for the sake of the society as for my personal sake to re-establish the facts as they were according to the books. On the 1st February, 1921, the Board of Directors held a meeting at which were present: Mgr. G. M. LePailleur, general chaplain, Messrs. Napoléon Deschamps, 1st vice-president, General L.

G. Bertrand, Dr. J. E. Racicot, J. E. C. Daoust, Dr. E. Hurtubise, E. Desjarlais, S. Dupéré, general directors; Henri Roy, general secretary-treasurer; Louis Fontaine, assistant general secretary-treasurer; Dr. J. A. Rouleau, chief physician and Zénon Fontaine, legal counsel, under the presidency of Mr. Rudolphe Bédard, general president. This is the motion which was adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of the society, which motion, in my mind, should do away with all the attacks to which I have been subjected:

The Executive Council, after deliberation, declare: that the administration of Mr. L. J. Gauthier has been progressive, wise, prudent and profitable; that the Society recognizes with pleasure the important services that have been rendered to it by Mr. Gauthier in his capacity of legislative adviser as well as with his ability in administrative matter. In a word, the society must congratulate itself upon having Mr. Gauthier as one of its directors and as president, as has been acknowledged by the highest tribunal of the society, the conference held in 1915.

I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House; but I believed, as long as I was a simple member of a political party and these accusations were brought against me by my opponents, I had nothing to complain of; it was their right to try to persuade the electors that I was not worthy of the confidence of my constituents. But my status has changed since last fall, and when my former friends, the Liberals, took upon themselves those accusations which have been declared futile, malicious, and slanderous, I thought it was my duty, equally for my constituents as for my family and myself, and also for the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Mr. Meighen) to get clear away from the shadow of these accusations because I have been called to public conferences with the constituted authorities of this Parliament.

What has been my stand all along? Can my former friends, the so-called Liberals of Quebec, complain because I am to-day in favour of protection, as I was in former days in favour of protection? At the last convention of the Liberal party held in the month of August, 1919, in the city of Ottawa, when the time had arrived to choose delegates for that convention, I took pains to go to the manufacturers of my city of St. Hyacinthe and I told them that I was afraid that the Liberal party, with the two factions of Montreal and Quebec, would alter, change and amend the acknowledged policy of the Liberal party. I was afraid that they would ask for a reduction of tariff duties, and I wanted the manufacturers to help me, if that were possible, to have the Liberal party adhere to this platform of protection. During the convention, the authorities of the convention on three different occasions offered to give me an opportunity of addressing it, and I refused because I was not in sympathy with the platform which was prepared at the time, and I thought it was my duty first to remain true to my electors, to my principles and to the principles for which my province has fought since 1878.

On a former occasion, I stated on the floor of this House that the hour of Quebec would strike. The Government supporters thought that there was a threat, a menace in those words. I took pains to state that it was only a declaration. It was not necessary to have the ability of a prophet. Everybody knows that it is impossible to keep in a solid block the minority of a country in public affairs. This marvellous thing has been done once by a man who stood is this country, in the Empire, and especially in his own province, as the idol of his race and the representative of all our aspirations. This has been done once. It cannot be repeated. Where is the man in the ranks of the Liberal party who could go to-day to the province of Quebec and bring back here a solid Quebec block? I should like to be shown that man; but he does not exist. And mind you, Mr. Speaker, when the Quebec population was remaining solid in its principles, awaiting its opportunity it was not necessary to be a prophet to understand that the Government, composed as it is of groups and factions united on a certain principle but divided on other questions, would split one of these days, and that one of the groups or perhaps two would separate themselves from the Government; and that would be the time for the province of Quebec, if it knew how to wait for its hour. Now, Sir, is there anything wrong in that declaration? Nothing at all. It is a simple matter of good political sense, and nothing else.

Nobody can believe that the isolation of Quebec must not be terminated. It is impossible in a country like ours to leave aside a population of pretty nearly three millions out of a total of nine millions. These people must have representation in public affairs. They cannot be ignored for all time to come. Sir, because I hold the principles I have enunciated to the House

from my seat here, I have been attacked as a traitor and a renegade. What crime have I committed? To whom am I responsible? The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) this afternoon was trying to belittle the issue by talking of fish and bribery. The hon. member for Brome ought to know that the man who would be weak enough to allow himself to be bribed could not show his face any more in the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Brome should understand, even if he does not respect my belief, that there are situations in this life which require resolution. The hon. member for Brome may think it is all right for himself to represent a constituency of 13,000 souls when according to the last census, the unit of representation was 30,080. The hon. member for Brome should understand that when he speaks from his seat in the House, he speaks not for his own personal benefit, but for those he represents on the floor of the House. He speaks for his province, and for the benefit of his country, and, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Brome has that high esteem of himself, can he not respect the beliefs of others who, though they may not be as bright as he, yet are as honest as he is, and who are entitled to their opinion as long as they are willing to fight for it? No, Sir. The hour of Quebec has struck, I repeat the words.

Why has it struck? Sir, it is the privilege of my province, and to the honour of my race, to have given to this country every time the darkest clouds rose over the horizon a man who was strong enough to command the respect of a majority of this country, and at the same time to command the obedience of the men of my race. In 1840, after the rebellion of 1837 and 1839 Lower and Upper Canada were united under circumstances that were more than dangerous. When, with the population in Lower Canada double that of Upper Canada, with a deposit in the chartered banks of Lower Canada and a deficit in the finances of Upper Canada, both provinces were united on an equal footing as to representation and finances, Upper Canada to have half of the money deposited by Lower Canada and Lower Canada to take half the debt of Upper Canada, the Union was looked upon by my people as an insult and they refused to submit to it. Then Louis Hypolyte Lafontaine came into the public arena. He appealed to the majority in the country and appealed to his own people, and the Union Act was passed.

That Act may not have been a success from all points of view, but at all events it created an atmosphere once more of peace, harmony and traquility in this country. Then in 1849, when the annexation memorandum was signed, and when the Parliament buildings in Montreal were burned, when this country was on the verge of disruption, Cartier arose and appealed to the majority and to my people and they united together and peace was restored once more. In 1867, when the time had come for all the provinces in British North America to weld and work together for the expansion of the country, for the prosperity of its population, and for the agrandizement of our resources, Cartier was there again fighting night and day to secure the consummation of the British North America Act.

In 1896 when one of the smallest provinces in this country saw the Federal Government threatening to encroach upon her school system, a man arose from the province of Quebec, a man of my race. This question had been taken from one tribunal to another during six years, and in the campaign of 1896 Laurier, appealing to all races, all creeds, and all provinces, made the statement "This question of the Manitoba schools has been dragging along for six years. Give me power, and in six months peace will be restored." He obtained power, and peace was restored inside of three months.

I do not pretend to be a Lafontaine, a Cartier, or a Laurier. No; my role is more humble and more modest than that, and as my so-called former friends are very fond of precedents I will turn to the world's history and cite a precedent for the stand I am now taking. In the early days of the Christian era, in the deserts of Judea, there was a man who preached the advent of a Saviour. This man was known as the Baptist, and when he was asked whether he himself was the Saviour, he answered that he was not worthy to untie the latchet of that Saviour's shoes; he was only the precursor of the Saviour, who would come to redeem humanity. The Baptist, having fulfilled his mission to the last, was beheaded, but the Saviour came and humanity was redeemed. To-day, Sir, standing in the wilderness of "no man's land," I am, like a Baptist, announcing to this House and to the country that at this time, when every race is hurling insult at the other, when every province is trying to fight every other, when every passion in men's minds is infuriated, a man will come from my province and from my race who will preach

the gospel of toleration and self-respect. He will appeal to the majority of the people of this country and he will show them that though his people constitute the minority, nevertheless there is no reason why the minority and the majority should not unite so that this country will have another era of happiness, of prosperity, of contentment, of good-will to men who love peace and harmony and are proud to live under the protection of the British Crown and our national institutions. I say, this man will come. The hour of Quebec has come, and this man will save the situation.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent): I desire at the outset, in common with other members who have spoken, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address on the excellent way in which they have acquitted themselves. I can hardly, however, concur in all that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just concluded (Mr. Gauthier). It did appear to me that from the first to last he was saying everything he could think of in an uncomplimentary way about the Labour party and the Farmers' party and the Liberal party, which are represented in this House, in view of the portfolio which he seems so anxious to secure in the future. It comes with bad taste from the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) to ridicule all his former friends in the old Province of Quebec, and in one respect particularly I take exception to his remarks. I object to the uncomplimentary way in which he referred to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) who was formerly Postmaster General in the Laurier Administration, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that representing as I have the privilege to do, a constituency where a great number of French-Canadian citizens hold the high positions and occupy some of our best farms I was charged personally with the duty of conveying to the hon. member for Gaspé, in his hour of bereavement as a result of his great sacrifice to the cause of the country, in the loss of his son, the sincere sympathy of many of my constituents. When we hear an hon. gentleman ridiculing a citizen who has stood so high in the esteem of the people of this country in the past, I think we may safely assume that many of his words will fall on deaf ears not anly in Quebec but in every other part of the Dominion. In this respect I hope I shall be permitted to read an item or two which appeared in a newspaper in the province of Quebec and which I think will be of interest to the members of this House. I quote the following:

> Since the opening of Parliament the Hon. Mr. Lemieux occupies the seat immediately next to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's, and that preferment is merited. A member of Parliament for the last 22 years, Mr. Lemieux by his assiduity, his industry, his correct behaviour, and his thoughtfulness in the fulfilment of his duties has well earned the reward of being officially acknowledged as Laurier's first lieutenant in the Province of Quebec.
>
> However, it is on the floor of the House of commmons that the Hon. Mr. Lemieux shows to best advantage. Trained in the best traditions of parliamentary life, holding the tenets of the sound English Liberal faith, in constant sympathy with the views of all the great men who have contributed by their speeches and their writings to the perfecting of parliamentary practice, he is wholly at ease when taking an active part in the various debates.

Could a greater compliment be paid to any Parliamentarian in this country than that contained in the two extracts I have just read? And they were published in one of the Quebec newspapers which was controlled by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, and were his words over his own signature. These were the words of the hon. gentleman in regard to one of our Canadian statesmen, a man who well deserved the compliment. Yet to-night he sees fit to cast aspersion upon him. I will not make any accusations against the hon. gentleman, but we have seen by the press that he had been in communication with the Government with a view to securing a position that would bring him greater benefit than he might obtain as a private member; and because greater statesmen than he might be given a preference over him he gets up in his place and takes up two hours of the time of the House in saying unkind things of his former friends from the province of Quebec in this Parliament and in the local legislature. What confidence can the people of Canada have in the utterances of the hon. gentleman? At his words the ministers of the Government might well hold their heads down, from the Minister of Justice to the least among them. There were plaudits from the back-benchers in abundance when such language was used by the hon. gentleman, but which one of those gentlemen opposite was brave enough to walk over the floor and shake hands with him and congratulate him? His only congratulations were his own handshakes, and he got a very cold reception from all friends whose cause he was pleading. I say that it comes with very bad taste from the hon. member, who recognised the ability of the member for Gaspé,

—a gentleman who sat at the right hand of the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Sir, the people of Canada, irrespective of nationality, many of whom were not his political supporters, were admirers of that great British Canadian Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and to-night, on the second anniversary of his death, they mourn his loss. Under such circumstances it is pathetic to think that one who was supposed to be a supporter of Sir Wilfrid and an admirer of the great work that he accomplished in his life time, would lend himself to the task of trying to drive a wedge between the followers of that lamented statesman for the benefit of men who always did their utmost to oppose him. I say, Sir, that such conduct on the part of the hon. gentleman exhibits the worst possible taste, and I believe it will have a contemptuous reception in the old province from which that hon. gentleman comes, as well as in the English speaking provinces. To-night I am in the unique position of occupying the same seat as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe occupied not more than a year ago when that hon. gentleman undertook to reply to a speech delivered by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). On that occasion the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe assured the Government that the people of the province of Quebec had received bad treatment. Let me quote his actual words:

> Speaking in my own name, and for my province, I will quote the words of one of our public men who says that the province of Quebec is not in a state of mind to enter into any conference; it has been misjudged; it has been badly treated; it has been slandered; it is waiting for its hour and after that it will confer, but not before.

Waiting for the hour! In the interest of the province of Quebec? No, Sir, in the interest of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe himself. He was waiting for the hour to come that would, if possible, give him a better position. It was not the interest of his constituents or the citizens of the old province of Quebec that he was thinking of. He was waiting for an opportunity to get into the Government; but I can assure him, after studying the faces of members of the Cabinet and other hon. gentlemen opposite, that if ever a man crucified himself and sacrificed his chance of getting a high position in public life, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has done this on the present occasion.

From the hon. gentleman's first remarks it would appear that he had been in consultation with the Prime Minister; he uttered words and used arguments almost identical with those which the Prime Minister employed. He said that there should not be a general election until after the census had been taken; and he let the cat out of the bag when he said that the city of Montreal, which now has twelve representatives in this House, would, after a redistribution of seats, have twenty. He said that the unit of population would then be forty thousand instead of thirty thousand.

An hon. MEMBER: Dollars.

Mr. McCOIG: Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the province of Quebec is the pivot of Confederation. It does not make any difference what the unit of population may be, the province of Quebec can only have sixty-five representatives in this Parliament. It is interesting to make a contrast between the remarks of the Prime Minister and those of the hon. gentleman. The Prime Minister, in his flowery and beautiful fashion, declares that we cannot have an election until we give the West its proper representation, and by way of a decoy the figures ten to twenty-five were suggested. But the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, as I have already said, let the cat out of the bag when he stated that it is to Montreal, Toronto, and the other big cities of the Dominion that the Government is anxious to give greater representation.

Let me make a suggestion in this connection. If the Government intends to hang on and not appeal to the country it should, regardless of the stipulations of the Act of Confederation, start taking the census immediately and not wait until June. In the large cities and towns of Canada there are many men out of employment. In the City of Chatham there are twenty or thirty returned men who are anxious to get work, and these are men that are well qualified to be employed in the census taking and would give every satisfaction. I repeat, let the taking of the census be started at the earliest possible date so that the men who are out of employment will be able to get work now when they need it, and not wait until June when there will be no lack of employment. I hope the Government will give some consideration to this thought.

It was also interesting to hear the Prime Minister during his speech make reference to the "ill fated National Transcontinental Railway." Of that enterprise the Prime Minister spoke in the most mournful tones. Let me ask the Government why high

officials of the Canadian National Railways, at a time when fuel throughout the country was most expensive, allowed the ties to be removed from different railway tracks in Canada, piled up in cords and cords and the torch applied to them, instead of placing that fuel at the disposal of people in humble circumstances so as to enable them to keep their homes and their families warm. The Prime Minister may speak of this railway as "ill fated", but I do not think that it would be possible for any enterprise to succeed where such extravagance is practised. If a person were starting out in business he would employ the right class of men to make that business a success, and the same course should be pursued by the Government in regard to the National Railway System. It should employ men of the highest calibre and ability with the necessary knowledge to look after the important interests entrusted to them from time to time. But, Sir, what class of men has the Government been appointing in connection with the National Railway System? We find according to press announcements of July 7th, 1920, that the man who has been appointed to one of the most important positions on the National Railway System, with an elaborately furnished suite of offices in the City of Chicago, is no other person than Mr. DeWitt Foster, who was read out of the Conservative Party by the late Prime Minister, and sent back to his constituency, on account of the way he handled matters in connection with the purchase of horses for the Government during the late great war. That gentleman's management of affairs was so scandalous, it was so ridiculous and farcical, that it involved an expense of thousands and thousands of dollars to the people of Canada.

Yet, Sir, this man is sent to the city of Chicago to occupy one of the most important positions in connection with the Canadian National Railways. Is it any wonder that we hear my right hon. friend the Prime Minister speaking of the "ill-fated" National Transcontinental road when men of the type I have referred to are associated with our national railway system? How can you expect that system to be a success, how can you expect not to have deficits, when such men are on the staff? Last year the deficit amounted to $47,000,000, this year it is estimated that it will reach $65,000,000.

What does it mean? It means that we must expect a continuance of deficits if such things as I am about to bring to the attention of the House are typical. I am informed that the most important train leaving the city of Toronto, instead of being filled with passengers who had paid their fares, was composed of special cars for the benefit of a few friends of the Government. The would-be passengers who were prepared to pay had to cross over to the ticket office of the competing road and buy tickets for Ottawa. Then I am advised on very reliable authority—and the Government can ascertain whether my information is correct or not—that the trains running from Vancouver to Toronto on the days before Christmas were loaded to capacity, but fifty per cent of the passengers were travelling on passes. If this be untrue, no person will be more pleased than myself, because if half of those passengers were travelling on passes, it goes to show why to some extent the people who are trying to ship their products are being held up by the higher freight rates now being charged; and the necessity of higher freight rates is no doubt because the passenger trains are not paying. In view of this condition of affairs, it seems to me incumbent upon the Government to appoint a committee of this House to deal with the statements which I have brought to their attention. If the Government have the interests of the country at heart, I am confident an investigation will be held.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) may smile, but this is too important a question for him or any other leading member of the Cabinet to smile at. An investigation of the conductors' books will show whether the statement I have made is well founded or not. If it is not correct, all well and good; but if fifty per cent of the passengers at that season of the year were travelling on passes, it is important that the country should know it and that the practice should be promptly discontinued, as our National railways need all the revenue that they san possibly secure to reduce their operating deficits.

Now, Sir, let me go a step further. We have to-day advised the Government to appeal to the people, or place their resignations in the hands of the Governor General so that he may call upon other persons to form a Government which will meet with the endorsation of the country. The right hon. the Prime Minister will probably think that our advice does not count for very much, but let me assure him that the advice we are tendering him now is just as sound as the advice which we proffered

when his Government were about to establish the Board of Commerce. We told them then that the appointment of such a board would be a detriment to the country and would be barren of results. What followed on the appointment of that board has confirmed the soundness of our advice. It will be remembered that the members of that board sat for months, drawing thousands of dollars in salaries and expenses, but not one profiteer was ever put in jail, nor one dollar added to the Treasury as a result of their efforts to put a stop to profiteering.

What we contended then and what we contend now is that we should have a public prosecutor appointed to take action against profiteers. We have complaints, particularly from our returned men, that profiteering still continues. For instance, notwithstanding that hides are to-day cheaper than they have been for years, those men complain that their children's shoes cost the same price as when the war was raging. We hear from the farmers that they are getting only $13.50 a hundred for their hogs, and yet to-day bacon is twenty cents a pound dearer in Canada than in England. These two cases alone are sufficient to justify an investigation.

If we are going to allow these combines to exist, we cannot expect to attract as many people to assist us in agriculture as we need to-day. I have been informed that in the case of Peterson versus the Dominion Tobacco Company, tried at Sandwich in December, 1919, before Mr. Justice Middleton, there was filed as an exhibit a telegram from the representative of the companies in the Tobacco Buyers' Association to the Macdonald company of Montreal, who were not members of the association, asking them, in effect, to come in and agree to keep the price down; and that Stewart, of the Macdonald company, swore in evidence that his company was asked to agree with the other companies not to pay more in 1919 than thirty cents per pound. This, Sir, went to show that there was an attempt to combine against the producers of tobacco in the counties of Kent and Essex, which meant that the men who returned from overseas and took up tobacco growing had their tobacco hanging in their barns with no chance of selling. it. This year there has been a tremendous tobacco crop and from the absence of buyers the farmers suspect a combine has been formed to force down prices, to the detriment of the growers. Is it not worth while for the Government to take this matter up, for it will be remembered that the men who went overseas were promised that combines would not be allowed, and those men naturally expect to have that promise redeemed.

To-day, Sir, we are trying to get men to locate upon the land. And what do we find? We find that the agricultural implement manufacturing companies, not only the Massey Harris Company, but the International Harvester Company, the Cockshutt Company and all the other big implement concerns, have raised the price of binders $30 over last year's price, which was the highest on record. How Sir, can we expect to induce men to locate upon the farms if we allow these implement concerns to extract such exorbitant prices from those who have to use these implements? Last year it took 250 bushels of oats to buy a binder; to-day it takes 700 bushels. I find that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is, going to follow me. If that is the case I ask him to challenge the statement that I have made. The same thing applies on other agricultural machinery all down the line. This is a matter that should receive some consideration at the hands of the Government.

In conclusion, I have only this to say, that if at the next general election the Government expect to be returned with anything like a respectable following, the matters which I have brought to the attention of the House will have to be given greater consideration than they have received in the past.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne always covers a very wide field. A number of interesting subjects are mentioned in the Speech itself, but it is not necessary that one should confine himself to those particular subjects; a general latitude is permissible on the part of one who addresses the House on this occasion.

But before taking up the matters to which I wish to refer in connection with the Address, I want to say a word with regard to our new Prime Minister. It is the first opportunity that I have had of speaking in the House since the right hon. gentleman was elevate to the high position he now occupies. I have followed his career for a number of years: He came from that part of the country in which I have the honour to live,—and that does not make him any the worse. He combines

the steadfastness, carefulness and shrewdness of the East with the push and progress of the West, and that combination should go to make a man of breadth and of enterprise, a man eminently fitted to fill the high position to which my right hon. friend has been called. So far as I am concerned, though I am an independent man in some ways, I profess to give my allegiance to the Prime Minister so far as I can see my way to do it—whenever he brings forward measures that I believe to be in the general interests of the country. I do not think, from what I know of him that he will bring forward many measures, either now or at any time, that are not in the general interests of the people. I wish, therefore, that the tenure of office of the right hon. gentleman as the Prime Minister of Canada may be a long and successful one.

We have had a rather interesting exhibition this afternoon. There has been more or less of a family fight; and of course that is always "pie" to us if it occurs on the other side.

Mr. BELAND: One-sided.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I can quite imagine that some of the remarks of the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) were not very much relished by gentlemen opposite. It was really a study to sit here and watch the varrying shades of contempt and disgust that occasionally played upon the features of hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), the gentleman with the loud voice and the small constituency, came in for a fair share of the speaker's attention. I have always thought that the member for Brome, if he kept on long enough, would make a convert of some kind, and apparently he succeeded this afternoon, because his eloquent remarks on free trade and various other things so incensed the member for St. Hyacinthe that he could hold his seat no longer, and the result was the exhibition that we had of a family squabble. I am sorry that the hon. member for Brome could not see what was coming. He has been trying for this for a long time, and finally his chickens have come home to roost, and he has made a convert. However, it was a kind of backfire business that he did not expect; it has hit the preacher so that he is really in a worse position than the man who was supposed to be the sinner.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

The member for Kent, (Ont.) (Mr. McCoig) has attempted to belittle what the member for St. Hyacinthe said. But when the papers come out to-morrow and the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen are read, it will be found that the speech of the member for St. Hyacinthe has created an impression of a very different nature, from that created by any remarks of the member for Kent. Whatever may be said with regard to the right or the wrong of the situation, as the member for St. Hyacinthe sees it, there is no doubt that he spoke from a full heart and with a conscientious desire to do what he conceived to be a very difficult, and perhaps, a somewhat dangerous duty to his fellow-men, especially with regard to the Province of Quebec. I give him all cred for having made one of the most impressive speeches from the province of Quebec that I have heard in a good many days. If a few more of our friends across the way will study questions of the day in the same light as the member for St. Hyacinthe has done we shall have a rapprochement between the old Provinces of Ontario and Quebec the like of which has not been seen for many years. That would be a very desirable consummation indeed, and for my part I hold out both hands to my hon. friend.

The member for Brome took great exception to the Prime Minister possibly opening a little seat on this side for one or two repentant gentlemen from the other side, but almost in the same breath he said he welcomed from this side the member from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who was expected shortly to take his seat on the Opposition benches. The inconsistency of the member for Brome was certainly remarkable when he could make a bid for the member for Halifax to cross the floor and occupy a front bench—which is nearly a Cabinet position, because no doubt all the members of the new Cabinet made up from members on the other side when they came in will be named by the member for Brome. The member for Halifax, therefore, might consider himself as good as a cabinet minister. But having said this, why should the member for Brome be offended if the Prime Minister should say that he would welcome gentlemen from the other side? It has long been the desire of Ontario men to have representatives from the province of Quebec sitting on this side as they used to. We can sit here more comfortably with them alongside of us than we can simply as a number of Ontario men

9 p.m.

sitting together. In the old days the good old Conservative party had the backing of the French-Canadians to a great extent—in fact, the backbone of Sir John Macdonald's party on many occasions were the representatives from the province of Quebec, and it seems to me they had quite as much light in those days as we have in these.

There are many respects in which the provinces of Quebec and Ontario are alike. Quebec is a manufacturing centre; so is Ontario, and at such a time as this I take off my hat to Quebec as being probably the most stable labour province in Canada to-day. Quebec has shown itself during the last two or three years to be a province with a great deal of self-respect and a great deal of backbone, and one that is doing more, perhaps, in the reconstruction period following the Great War than any other province of our Dominion. While we, in Ontario, and our brethren too, in the West, are giving way to all kinds of fad legislation and calling for every conceivable kind of government, Quebec sticks to the old rule, maintains the old stand, attends to her own knitting, keeps her factories running—supplied by the labour, the brawn and the brain of the good inhabitants of that province. I give them credit, then, for playing at this time a very important part in the re-establishment of Canada after the war.

Now, having said this much I do not wish to enter into a further discussion of the family affairs of my hon. friends opposite. Before touching, however, upon some of the items specifically dealt with in the Speech from the Throne, I feel that I must pay some little attention to one or two remarks made by my friend from Kent (Mr. McCoig). I understand that he comes from a tobacco district. I do not know whether he himself smokes much of the tobacco grown there, but if he does perhaps that would be a higher recommendation of it than we would otherwise have. I understand that the tobacco growers in his constituency have recently asked that the modest duty of one dollar a pound be placed upon tobacco. What percentage that would be I must leave the hon. member for Kent to calculate. So far as I know the price of tobacco in the western section, it runs from twenty-five up to forty-five cents per pound. Therefore, a modest duty of one dollar per pound on this would sound fairly big as a percentage, being somewhere between two and three hundred per cent. My hon. friend has taken occasion, as he often does, to allude to the firm which bears my name, but with the management of which I have no connection. He informs the House and the country that we have raised the price of our binders twenty or thirty per cent. If he knows the firm as well as he ought to know it, because it is no secret that the hon. gentleman was at one time an agent for the company which he is so glad to abuse on various occasions, he knows they manufacture no mowers and no binders and never have done so.

Mr. McCOIG: You handle the Frost & Wood mowers and binders in western Ontario.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The handling of them is one thing and the manufacture is quite another. It is true we take orders for and sell those implements, but not a single one is manufactured by the firm, and the hon. gentleman knows that perfectly well; so that when he speaks of the Cockshutt firm raising the prices of those implements, he knows he is making a misrepresentation because they have nothing at all to do with the manufacture of those machines. Further, as a practical farmer, as I presume he is, he knows that during the war, during the last five years, any farmer either in eastern or western Canada going to any market in this country with a load of produce, whether it were pork, beans, wheat, oats, barley or rye or any of the products of the farm, could take back, as a result of the sale of that load, as many implements as he ever did before the war. I do not think that can be said of everything, but it can be said of the implement business, and of all industries in Canada none, perhaps, suffered more than did that same implement business. I do not, however, want to speak of that. The time will come later in the session when we can take care of that, but I do not like my hon. friend who was carried away by his feelings—and possibly he had some good excuse because he was smarting under the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)—to make such sweeping statements as he did. But we know that as regards the products of his constituency, which are sugar beets, corn and all those items, he is very careful not to advocate any policy that would bring any less to the growers of any of those products than they have received in the past. How he can pose as a free trader—and I am not quite sure whether he does

so entirely—when he has two or three sugar factories and several other large industries in his riding, I can hardly understand; nor can I understand how he can advocate that all barriers should be removed and at the same time retain those in his county. I must apologize for having spent so much time upon the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) because I am not sure that his remarks deserve it.

I want, before going further, to refer to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), who I am sorry is not in the chamber. I am not going to spend many moments upon his amendment, but I desire to point out to him one or two things in connection with it. In the first place I hold in my hand the Brantford Expositor, which is well known as one of the staunch Liberal papers of Ontario and of Canada, and this is what it has to say with regard to the point at issue:

> If the Hon. Arthur Meighen holds the reigns of power long enough to pass the new Redistribution Bill based on the census taken this year and frankly implements the obligation to secure an equitable representation by population and then appeals to the country, he will pursue a wise course of statesmanship and one hard to successfully challenge.

I recommend those remarks to my hon. friend who moved this amendment. He says that this Government has no mandate. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) pointed out several mandates which this Government had, and that the Opposition were ready to acknowledge that the Government had the mandate when they raised the indemnity last session and my hon. friends pocketed it. My hon. friends say nothing about that. This Government only about three years ago was elected by the largest majority of both members and popular vote of any Government that I have ever known of in Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: Where are they now?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: There are many of them here as my hon. friend will find out, and they are here to stay for quite a little while in spite of the efforts of the hon. member of Pontiac to dislodge them. I suppose he would carry them out on railway trains if he had the opportunity, as he is a great railway expert, but I do not want to be diverted from this matter by the hon. gentleman. This Government was elected by the largest majority of the popular vote that any Government ever received in Canada. That cannot be successfully contradicted. Therefore, they had the mandate from the people to occupy the treasury benches not only for the duration of the war, but for five years, in spite of anything that may be said to the contrary. I knew something about this fight up in our section: I had a little to do with it, and I never once heard the question raised as to the right of the Government to retain power so long as the Parliamentary term was not exceeded and, as well known, that term was to be five years.

My hon. friend complains that this mandate does not exist now, although it has run only about three years. Let me point out to him the inconsistency of himself and many of his friends in this regard. We have to-day in two of the provinces at least, in Manitoba and in Ontario, Governments sitting that have not now and never had any mandate from the people. The Ontario Government polled only about one-third of the vote. The Premier of Ontario was unheard of on the platform throughout the election; he was not even a candidate, and the Farmers' Party and the Labour Party between them polled only about one-third of the votes that were polled in the recent election in Ontario. Still, my hon. friend does not question their mandate. Oh no, they are good for it. Why? Because he considers they are his friends; he says that there is little difference between them. Well, I am sorry for the farmers if there is little difference between the leader of the Opposition and his followers and the following of the Agrarian party. But there is the fact that the Government in Ontario to-day, sitting there and legislating for this great province, are there by reason of about one-third of the provincial vote cast in the recent election. It is true they are largely farmers and they possibly do not recognize that a citizen living in a city has a right to value his vote as highly as a man on the farm, because in Ontario, in the city of Toronto for instance, it takes the vote of three men to offset the vote of one man on the farm.

Mr. MAHARG: Is the present Government responsible for that?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The present Govenrment is not responsible for that, but it proposes to continue it after the situation has been pointed out. This was given to the Ontario Government by the generosity of the cities in times past, and while on various occasions it has been pointed out that a vote in the city should be worth as much as a vote in the country, that sentiment did not prevail, and to-day my hon. friend knows that it takes the votes of 60,000 people in

the city of Toronto to offset the votes of 18,000 to 20,000 who are scattered throughout Ontario on the farms. Anybody knows that to be the fact.

Why should such a situation exist and why should a mandate that was given by not more than one-third of the population be considered good by my hon. friends opposite, when a mandate for a Government such as this is should be considered to be no good?

Do not let us forget the province of Manitoba. What has happened there? My hon. friend does not find any reason for asking the Government to relinquish the sweets of office. Why? Because it is a so-called Liberal Government—liberal to itself, but certainly not liberal to the people who oppose it, because in spite of an adverse majority at the polls, it proposes remaining in office. Why does my hon. friend not challenge some of his friends in that respect instead of challenging a Government that has had a mandate for the past three years and that has two years to run? I contend that the proper course for the Prime Minister to pursue is just the course that he has laid down, that is, to have a fair census taken this year of the Dominion of Canada, have a redistribution according to the population thus found, and after that appeal to the people.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) shouts for an election. Well, that is a piece of heroics. I have often seen a dog that was chained up appear very anxious for a fight with a big fellow across the way. Let me at him, let me at him, he seems to say, and drags at his chain and tries to break loose, but finally when his chain is unloosed and he gets half way across the road and finds the other dog does not seem afraid but shows a tendency to meet him, he decides that he does not want to fight so very much after all. That is the position my hon. friend will be in. He has had the chance of testing the feeling in the province of Ontario on two occasions not very long ago, in Waterloo and North York, and in neither of those cases was my hon. friend so successful that he might wish to repeat the test. But he says: Give us an election; an election is what we are pining for, and what the country needs and must have. Well, gentlemen, you will get an election in due time, I imagine, and it is to be hoped that those who are shouting so loudly for it will be ready for the fray when it comes, because it comes like a thief in the night, and it may be nearer than we expect.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." The chances are, if the statement of my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) is true, that my hon. friend from Brome may find that his little constituency has disappeared from the map after re-distribution, and holding the views he does, I question very much if he could get a seat in Montreal where the people have some intelligence on economic questions. My hon. friend from Brome represents, I believe the smallest body of citizens in the Dominion of Canada that are in one hive, some 13,000 people. That means that Montreal, the city of intelligence in the province of Quebec, the city of big men and big things, requires from 60,000 to 70,000 votes to offset the vote of 13,000 people in the little county of Brome. Oh, my, that is a beautiful little county. I am somewhat surprised that a gentleman coming from so small a place should develop such a pugnacious tendency as my hon. friend has. He certainly had broadened out beyond the confines of his constituency. To hear him lay down the law, not only on free trade and protection, but all the rest of it, you would think he was the oracle of the province of Quebec, but after hearing the opinion the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville holds of him I have been forced to a different conclusion. My hon. friend certainly thought he would put the Premier in a very bad hole to-day when he pointed his finger at him and dared him to offer a bait to any of the gentlemen sitting around my hon. friend. Has my hon. friend any misgivings in his heart that the Premier even of the Dominion of Canada could tempt any of those just men to cross the floor under any condition whatsoever? I cannot imagine how my hon. friend could think the Premier had sufficient to offer of the loaves and fishes. After hearing the hon. member for Brome speak you would think you could take him up to the top of the mountains here, the Laurentians that the hon. gentleman knows so well, and offer him all the Kingdom he could survey from there, all that glory, if only he would cross the floor, but never conceive of him coming across.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER: I hope not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, he could not be tempted. But the hon. gentleman, apparently, having seen the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville go away from him

down into No Man's land, is afraid that the offers of the Prime Minister may win over some of the gentlemen around him. I must admit that this microbe of protection is very catching. It has got into the heart of my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville in spite of my hon. friend from Brome, and it is liable to break out yet in unexpected places. I imagined I saw a wave of unrest this afternoon move over the features of some of my friends the Agrarians opposite, when they found the plague of protection had got into the very next row to them. However, that will no doubt disappear. We know these gentlemen are studying economics, because they have told us so. I wonder if they could also tell us that they study economy as well. I have not found much evidence of that.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): The luxury tax has made us study economy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is the kind of economy the farmer is practising in Ontario. He is not practising economy with the public monies. I was going to point out to my hon. friends that in the province of Ontario the so-called Agrarian Government has the biggest expenditure ever, and when you find fault they say: Wait till you see us next year. The expenditure in the province of Ontario under this new combination runs close up to $75,000,000 for the past year, a sum vastly in excess of the requirements of this House when I first came into it a few years ago.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): How much of that expenditure was on capital account?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am quite ready to tell my hon. friend if he gives me time. I am pointing out that the total expenditure of the new Government in Ontario, which had economy as one of the planks in their platform, exceeds that of any previous government by about $25,000,000. I think it is that much greater than the expenditure in the previous year under the late government, and that is only little compared with what they intend to do. They say, like Mr. Tarte said at one time: Wait till you see us next year. The expenditure that we are confronted with in the province of Ontario at the present time under the new order of things will stagger the people of this old province, especially the tax-payers. They will have to pay pretty dearly for the experiment of a group government and a new order of things in the province of Ontario. In reply to my hon. friend from Maple Creek, whose question was a very fair one, I understand that the expenditure on current account runs between $22,000,000 and $23,000,000, and that the expenditure on capital account is pretty nearly $50,000,000. My hon. friend will probably know whether that is correct or not, but I understand that is about how the figures stand. Then new taxes are proposed, five or six in number, only one of which will slightly touch the farmer. All the rest will go to the city people. That is how the farmers are showing their favour to the cities, by giving them five times as much to pay in taxation as they pay themselves.

Now, they went in with a flourish of trumpets with regard to economy, and when our hon. friends opposite come into power, as they expect to do in the near future in this Dominion, in addition to the said economics which we have been assured they are studying, they will also have to study economy, or we shall find the expense of the Dominion jumping up in the same proportion that we in the province of Ontario are confronted with at the present time.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Is the hon. gentleman aware that he is in Ottawa and not in Toronto?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is very kind of my hon. friend to remind me of that fact. We are told by the hon. Mr. Drury that he is only occupying his position in Ontario temporarily, that he expects to give the economic situation at Ottawa his early attention, and therefore we are justified in connecting Toronto with Ottawa in that respect, because our friends, though new on the job, are very ambitious and I can tell you they are excellent spenders. They not only spend money lavishly, but they spend, according to the doctrines laid down by some of our friends from the West, a large part of the money on the other side of the line; and then we wonder why the Canadian dollar is shrinking and ever shrinking, and why it takes $1.15 or $1.20 to pay for a dollar's worth of goods. It is because of the policy that my hon. friends would thrust upon this country, by which they would increase still further what is already far too large, that is to say, purchases from the United States. One would think that the legislation now proposed at Washington, and which we are told the Senate yesterday passed, would give a little new light to my hon. friends opposite. What about the

Fordney Bill? Have they heard about it? Has my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) realized that the Fordney tariff proposes a duty of 30 cents a bushel on wheat—

An Hon. MEMBER: Forty cents.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, forty cents on wheat, 20 per cent on flour, 15 cents a bushel on barley and all along the line; on cattle 3 cents per pound, and all the rest of it. Still we find that some of our hon. friends are ready to advocate that in spite of all this treatment which we have received or are about to receive from our neighbors to the south of us, they would continue not only the present liberal policy that has been pursued towards the United States but would increase the advantage still further by a large reduction of duties. So tha to-day the minister in Toronto, Mr. Smith, I think, who brought down the budget, complains that during the past year he has lost $800,000 on the exchange situation alone. Why did he deal so much in the United States? Why did he buy to such an extent in the United States as to incur an additional debt of $800,000 in the province of Ontario on exchange alone? Let the Hon. Mr. Biggs tell him why and how. When he wants road rollers or machinery for his roads does he buy them in Canada? I live close to the neighbourhood where a good deal of money was spent, not to much advantage, I am sorry to say, and along that road you can see evidences of where he buys rollers. It is plainly marked on the implements themselves showing that they come from the United States, and our dollar is going steadily down. I am glad to know that this Government proposes, in the light of the investigation that has taken place, to try to remedy some of these difficulties by giving a tariff that will be more safe and sound for the industries of Canada, and that will restore to its rightful place the value of the Canadian dollar. I believe there is no better dollar in the world than the Canadian dollar. We have resources in Canada that make our money just as good as any in the world, and therefore it is penalizing us in a way that should not be permitted in this country that we should buy $2 worth of goods in the United States for every $1 we sell them, and that has been the fact within the last two or three years. We have bought $2 for every $1 sold them. My policy is to buy less and sell more in the United States and thus restore the balance which has so far gone against us. That is a safe and sound policy and I recommend it to my hon. friends. I do not want to be hard on my Agrarian friends over the way. I am glad to see a good body of them here, and I think it is a pity sometimes, when I see them kept here all day long and late at night, that the rosy complexions and rotund figures of some of our swarthy brethren from the soil should be depleted, so to speak, by having to attend to public business in the House of Commons. Of course, I am somewhat interested in not wishing to see the group grow too rapidly. The hon. member for Maple Creek, in spite of his heterodox notions on some matters of business and public policy, looks like a man who has a good conscience, in the ruddy complexion and youthful appearance he shows in the House of Commons. I congratulate my hon. friend that in spite of all the strenuous efforts he has put forth in the interests of the Agrarian party he is looking so very hearty as I see him to-night.

I did not intend to dwell for more than a few moments on the tariff, and I have said already more than I intended to say on that question. Before I resume my seat I wish to direct attention to two or three matters on which possibly I may not be quite in line with some of my colleagues on this side of the House. I said, in the first place, when paying my tribute of respect to the new Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen), that I intended to follow him on all possible occasions. But I must say, as I have said on previous occasions, that in so far as the much-vaunted League of Nations is concerned, I am still a doubter. I am sorry to have to make that declaration, but I am glad to know that there must be either in the mind of His Excellency or in those of some of his advisers, somewhat the same opinion as I have myself with regard to the League of Nations, because I find, in the fifth line of the clause dealing with that subject, that it is termed a "great experiment." Truly, a great experiment, Mr. Speaker. I was very much interested and very much enlightened by the address of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) yesterday in dealing with that matter. He gave us some very enlightening information with regard to the aims of this great League of Nations that has been formed. I could have hoped that he would have dwelt not only upon what appeared to be the sunny side of the League, but on a few other mat-

ters that have perplexed and bewildered us and caused us some regret. For instance, what about disarmament? I understand that that question was shelved. Again, for example, what about reparations? What about indemnities? It is true that the hon. gentleman in speaking on this subject told us that they were going to cut across the history of six thousand years and reverse the old order of things. It has always been the order of things in the past that to the victors in war belong the spoils. It may be a false doctrine, but it has always existed, and it seems to me that in making peace, if we have won the war we have lost the peace, or some of the pieces at least. It may be a false doctrine but it was always there; and it seems to me that in making the peace if we won the war we have lost the peace, or we have lost some of the pieces. What about making Germany pay?

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: We in Canada are to be bled hard for a generation to pay for the cost of this great war. Do we forgive the Germans their debt? Do we say that after bringing that terrible ruin upon this world, after bringing ruin to a large part of France and turning nine millions of people out of their homes, and after devastating Belgium, Roumania, Serbia, and all those countries of Europe, that our delegates shall come back without any proposal with regard to what we are going to make Germany pay? Because that is one of the very few arguments that a German understands. He does understand though when you tap him in the pocket; it is one of the most sensitive parts of his constitution. I would like the Minister of Justice and the late President of the Privy Council to deal still further with this matter, and I believe they will do so. I should like them to take up one or two of these knotty points, and tell us what they are going to make Germany do with regard to reparation to France, to Belgium, and to those devastated countries, and tell us whether there is any possibility of Canada receiving some slight share of the immense indemnity that should be paid by reason of her financial sacrifice. Talk about taxation! I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is being taxed in a way that we have never known before. That is the case, and yet some of our agrarian friends say, "Put on an income tax." I have had the privilege of paying two income taxes, one to the Dominion Government and one to the local municipality, within the last six months. I expect to have to pay another before the year is out, making three within a year. I tell you that many of our people are feeling this taxation and feeling it keenly, and in all fairness I say to the Ministry, and especially to the Minister of Finance, that you cannot keep the wheels of commerce going in this country if you are going to take all the profits and a good deal of the capital. Because you have got to pay whether you make money or not. They will allow you to pay on those things on which you make a profit, but if you make a loss you must not take that into consideration —that is not in the bargain. I am glad to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Government proposes to revise the Income Tax Act. I am glad to know that, because I think it is a wise announcement which will be received with satisfaction by the country. I do not believe that this Government, or any government, desires to take wrongfully from a man anything that he possesses. As I understand it, a government sets the standard of business morality for the country in which it rules—I thing that is a fair proposition—and that no act should be done, either by a strong government or any kind of a government, that would be opposed to justice and would not bear the light of investigation as an honest transaction. I feel that in the hurry of last session there was put through in the Income Tax Bill some of the most iniquitous features that I have ever seen in any legislation. I make these remarks in order that our friends on this side may take notice and during this session rectify what I believe is a grievous wrong. The Income Tax Act makes you your own assessor. You have got to assess yourself, they are not going to give you your bill any more. Formerly the bill was sent in by the man who was going to collect it, but not now. It is going to be made up by yourself, and you are warned that if you make a mistake of ten per cent you will be fined at that rate on the mistake you made. If you make a twenty per cent mistake you will be fined half the amount of the capital concerned; and if you make a mistake of over twenty per cent woe betide you, because you will be liable to a fine of $10,000 and to six months' imprisonment. Now in all justice I say, Mr. Speaker, that such a state of things as that should be rectified in this Dominion. I am glad to know that such a proposal is on the agenda, and before the session is over we will possibly have that rectified.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two with regard to another matter. There are quite a few in Canada who are ready to pull down everything that has been built up with the greatest pains for a thousand years past. I mean in Britain, and in Canada, our laws and a large part of our constitutions are copied from Britain. These persons are prepared to sacrifice all that has been built up at such pains for some current fad that has never been tried out and which is not likely to succeed. That should not obtain with such a people as we have in this Dominion. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is the part of good citizenship at the present time to play safe, to advocate no change but what will be for the better; and if you are not absolutely sure that it will be for the better, stick to what you have until you know. If this country, and if civilization itself, is to be saved, there must be more care taken by public men and by those who guide public thought than has been witnessed in Canada in the past. During the past two or three years we have had every kind of heterodox preaching from every soap box that could be found in the province of Ontario. We have it in Ontario and it extends to many of the other provinces both East and West. This is a state of things that should not exist, and I rejoice that our good old friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) has a resolution on the Order Paper, that is to come up a little later in the session, in which he deals with Empire matters. This is no time, Mr. Speaker, to cut the old flag down, to tear apart the few remaining threads that hold Canada to the Mother land. We have but four of them remaining and yet right here in the city of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario and in the heart of the Dominion, we have had it recommended recently by one high in authority that the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should be done away with, and that the Governor General should no longer come from overseas but should be appointed in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend from Brome, who is ready to be carried about by every wind of doctrine and every fad that comes down the line, says "Hear, hear" to the former statement. I wonder if my hon. friend would not call for the Queen of Sheba to come back and rule if it were possible to get her here.

An Hon. MEMBER: No petticoat Government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend is ready to call for anything rather than what he is getting. He is getting a very fair government, why not keep it? Why should we, I say, wish for a moment to cut loose these few remaining threads that bind Canada to the Motherland? Let me tell you what these threads are, as I can see them to be. There is the King—long live the King! There is the flag—long wave the flag! There is the appeal to the Privy Council—long may it continue! Because that appeal has stood between us and a great many very difficult disputes in the past. If time would permit me I could point out where, in respect to the province of Ontario in the past, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Oliver Mowat—a name that was known throughout the length and breadth of the province at that time—had a life and death struggle about an increase of territory. Sir John said "Not one acre of land, not one stick of timber will you get." Sir Oliver Mowat on the other hand said "We will have both." The dispute was carried to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and although I was against Sir Oliver and in favor of Sir John I must say that I did not shed any tears when the Privy Council said "Sir Oliver is right on this occasion and Ontario gets both the acres and the timber."

There is just one case of the value of an appeal when a difficulty arises between a province and the Dominion. What could be better than this appeal? And yet we have a man, high in authority in the province of Ontario, who has advocated in Ottawa within recent days that this right of appeal should be done away with. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is no time to tear down any of the safeguards that surround our constitution. The world is full of unrest; the Mother Country is beset with troubles and cares, both from without and within; the nation is in peril to-day —Lloyd George tells us so. Will we in Canada, who have practically no grievance, give it out to the world that we, too, are full of unrest and want to cut the painter? Are we going to have an election, as they have had in South Africa recently, to decide whether or not we will stay with the Motherland? I hope not. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the enemies of the Empire are abroad, they are sowing the seeds of discord wherever they can be sown, and the attempt is being made even in some parts of Canada to raise the red flag and to call not only for the dissolution of the British

Empire, but for the overthrow of constituted Government in this and other parts of the Empire.

In a time such as this none of us who wish well to our country and to our Empire can afford to experiment in any degree with any of those ties that have held us so long to that good old land over the sea. I, for one, trust that I shall not live to see the day when the few remaining threads that hold us to the Motherland from which many of us come will be cut asunder, because bad as may be the example of some Britishers, and bad as the rule may be said to be in some parts of the Empire, the world has yet to show any better constitution, any greater safeguards to our liberties, to our rights and to our religious freedom than has been brought to us by reason of the benign rule that has been handed out to the Dominions from over the seas in a very mild way; and we have had not only all, but much more liberty than is enjoyed in most of the countries of the world.

This then in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is no time to advocate any of those changes that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) would so lightly adopt overnight and repent of on the morrow, because I am sure he would repent when he saw the evil he had done; but once he cuts the painter and casts off, he will find no place of repentance, though he should seek it in tears. I beseech him to be a little more guarded when he applauds every fad that comes down the line and is prepared to adopt almost anything in the way of legislation that will bring a change—especially a change of Government. The hon. gentleman does not recognize a good Government when he sees one.

Mr. COPP: We have not seen one for a long time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is the kind of glasses he wears with the result that he cannot see the qualities possessed by the Government that occupies the treasury benches at the present time.

But I hope, Mr. Speaker, whether the appeal to the people come early or whether it be delayed, that the electorate will recognize that we have about as good a form of government—I am not speaking of this particular Government—as exists in any country in the world, and that no attempt will be made in such times as these to upset the apple-cart, to change any of the vital parts of our constitution by the introduction of fads. I see my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) smiling; he has the referendum and the recall in his mind; I call those fads which we do not want to adopt in this country. I hope that when the appeal comes, whether the party opposite to me or the party on this side or the Agrarian party should succeed to power—and there is quite a possibility that my agrarian friends will be found in the majority, for elections are very uncertain—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: They are very uncertain.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am glad that my hon. friend from Red Deer agrees with me that elections are very uncertain. I believe that if he agrees with me to that extent he is going to vote about the same way as I am on this amendment, because it is safer to hang on to a seat that you are sure of for one year than it is to take the chance of a seat for five years which may not eventuate. I think my hon. friend, who in the absence of the real leader is leading the Agrarian party, is a man on whose judgment I can rely in this respect, and I feel that my words have not been in vain when I get corroboration from the hon. member that he thinks that axiom which I have just pronounced is a true one. I hope he will act on it; and as some of his followers are comparatively new in the House, if he instructs them that he thinks the best interests of the Agrarian party would be served on the present occasion by voting against the amendment and in favour of the continuance of this Government until the census has been taken and redistribution made, I think he will carry conviction to his own constituents and to the people generally in the great provinces in the West.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for thus far trespassing upon the patience of the House. I feel that I have not done anything like justice to the various questions mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, but at the same time I feel that I was justified in making these few remarks, and I hope that the hon. member who has moved the amendment (Mr. Mackenzie King), although he has not heard them, will read them before he casts his vote, and will realize that he will be inconsistent in pushing that amendment now after what I have pointed out is going on in the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba.

Mr. C. G. POWER (South Quebec): Mr. Speaker, allow me in the time-honoured fashion to congratulate the mover and

seconder of the Address. Though one belongs to the older generation of parliamentarians and the other to the new, they have both worthily fulfilled the task entrusted to them. It is to their credit that they discharged so well the somewhat thankless and politically unprofitable task of bolstering up a dying party. The compliments which they addressed to the ministry and to the Government I can make no objection to, for I agree fully with the old saying—de mortuis nil nisi bonum.

In reference to the other speakers, we have had two who have given us highly instructive and entertaining addresses on the League of Nations. One, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) seems to be strongly in favour of this grand institution; and the other, the hon. member who has just at down (Mr. Cockshutt), would appear to be rather violently oposed to it. I am sorry, for I hardly think that the opinions either of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or of the hon. member for Brantford will influence in the slightest degree the statesmen of the world who have founded the League.

We had another address this afternoon—or, rather, a performance—and I wish to make but a slight reference to it. I can only hope that when the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) crosses the floor of the House he will be as true and faithful to his new friendships and to his new friend as he was to the old. I can only hope and pray that he will be as worthy of the trust and confidence of hon. members opposite as he has shown himself to-day to be worthy of our trust and confidence.

I congratulate the new leader of the new party which is now facing us, but not upon the party which he has acquired, the very weakness of which must cause him many a wakeful night. I hope for his sake that he will give the people the chance to deprive him of his friends and so enable him to return to his normal state of mind. I congratulate him, but not on being the choice from such a field; I give him credit for being worthy of better rivals. Nor do I congratulate him on the colleagues whom he has inherited; were I to say too much about that I might be accused of sarcasm in vaunting his legacy. But I do congratulate him from the bottom of my heart on having attained the highest position in the gift of the Canadian people. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) corrects me—the highest position in the gift of his Tory friends. Fortune may have favoured him in eliminating from the field other more popular and, perhaps, worthier rivals. It may have favoured him too, in that those members of his Cabinet and those of his colleagues who were not quite certain that he would make the best Prime Minister were unable to put before their followers and before the Tory party one who was better fitted for the position than himself. However, we must say this for him; that his elevation is due, to a large extent, to his own untiring energy, to his own perseverance, to his own courage, and to his undoubtedly high talent. We are quite willing to acknowledge those talents. We are quite willing, from having felt them, to admit the weight and temper of his blows. We are willing to admit also that time and again he has been called upon to save the threatened citadel of Toryism and that time and again he has given unsparingly his learning, his wit and his eloquence to his party. We have only one criticism to make of him: that we consider it would have been far better for the country as a whole had this wit and energy and these high talents been devoted more to the general welfare of the country than to the welfare of a section thereof.

We consider also—and I wonder whether the hon. gentleman was not himself thinking of it yesterday—that the country expects a somewhat greater degree of dignity and of poise in its Prime Minister than is shown by the employment of the tactics of a partisan and the adoption of the policy of a guerilla leader. The day before yesterday I noticed that in his remarks there was missing the old fire, the old biting sarcasm, and the result probably was that his speech lacked that enthusiasm which he had been in the habit of communicating to the gentlemen behind him. I noticed, too, that during the course of one of his electoral campaigns this summer, at Sherbrooke, he may have thought it would be well before an audience so distinguished as that which faced him there, to put aside his fighting posture.

10 p.m. Anyway, we read in the newspapers, and it was placarded throughout the land, that this new and courageous leader had come down to the province of Quebec and freely admitted the paternity and his advocacy of the conscription measure and other measures of a similar nature. The trouble was that

the right hon. gentleman, having in mind the thoughts to which I have just alluded, forgot to make the remarks ascribed to him in the press throughout the country—the very remarks for which he received encomiums throughout the West and Ontario. It was freely stated, and it has never been contradicted, that in Sherbrooke the right hon. gentleman made no reference whatever to those matters.

However, I did not intend to go at length into the question of the career of the Prime Minister and of his fitness for the post which he now occupies. I intend to-night to discuss as briefly as I can the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the consequence of that amendment—the dissolution of Parliament and an appeal to the people.

We have in the House three different schools of thought. We have a number of hon. gentlemen to my left, who believe that in all things and in all matters the members of this House should be the mouthpieces of their constituents, and that in all things and in all matters they should represent with the fidelity of a gramophone the views which at that moment find support in the local riding, altogether irrespective, I am sorry to say, of the general good and the general welfare of the people. The adoption of this theory would make of this House nothing but an assembly of delegates whose mandate would be revocable at will, and those who hold their positions would hold them only by a very precarious tenure, depending entirely upon whatever wind, for good or for evil, was blowing in the constituency.

To the hon. member from Red Deeer (Mr. Michael Clarke) I will say this: he has been for many years, and still is, I think, the guardian in this House of the Gladstonian traditions. He has too much respect for and too much knowledge of the British constitution to share with his colleagues the views which some of them have espoused.

There is another point of view, that held by a number of hon. gentlemen oposite. They adopt a point of view which I might call, although it may offend them, an American one. They take their principles from the American Constitution which states that a government, or a ministry, or a member, or a congressman is elected for a certain term of years and may remain in office for that full term. It is true, having regard for our Constitution and for proper parliamentary practice, they hold that they depend for the length of time during which they might hold office, on their majority in the House of Commons. In our present political position and if we take into consideration almost every government which has been in power since Confederation, this would really mean nothing more nor less than that the Government could remain in power for their full term unless such purely accidental circumstances as death or appointments to lucrative offices under the Crown had so diminished the numbers of their supporters that they no longer had a majority in the House. In other words, hon. gentlemen opposite hold that their tie to office is to be assimilated to the marriage tie—only to be dissolved by death or the Senate.

There is another point of view, that held by those on this side of the House, who believe in and are followers of Liberal principles. We believe that whilst no temporary outburst of sectional feeling or passing breeze of popular fancy should affect, to the extent of requiring a dissolution, any government strong in the confidence of the saner elements of the population and recently come from the electorate, there is no doubt that a government, to remain in power, must have a steady, constant support from the majority of the people, and that such support must be inspired by the trust which the majority had in that government's programme as outlined before them in an election previously held. We contend that the dictum of Edmund Burke "that the value, spirit and essence of the House of Commons consists in its being the express image of the feeling of the nation" is the proper constitutional standpoint to take. We believe—and I do not think I shall be contradicted by any supporter of the Government—that this House of Commons is not the image of the people of this country; that it does not represent the feelings of the nation; that it represents only a distorted view of the feelings of the nation, and further, that should this House of Commons be dissolved and we be returned before the people, there will be a great and material change in its personnel and composition.

May I glance for the moment at the history of this Government? It was formed, amidst the plaudits of the whole country, by what was said to be the best and most patriotic citizens of Canada, united for one purpose alone, to win the war. I do not wish to quote at any great length from the assertions of my hon. friends opposite, but it was repeated on the platform and in

the press that this was merely a temporary alliance, and that as soon as the war was over, the Unionist party would be dissolved into its constituent parts.

I do not care to say much with regard to the means taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to win the election, except that, owing to their appeal, thousands and tens of thousands of people throughout the country voted for the Unionist party and for the candidates thereof, people who, under other circumstances, have never had the slightest confidence in either. Having obtained power with a substantial majority, the Government proceeded to exercise this power with an autocracy which has seldom been surpassed in Canadian history. The most priceless, the most cherished rights of the people were trampled upon. Orders in Council were passed and put into force without consultation of Parliament and, in many cases, in direct violation of pledges made and given to the electorate. To every argument that right and justice were being violated and that public decency was being outraged, there was only one answer: "We must win the war.,'

No matter what took place, it was justified with that end in view.

As soon as the war was over, the reaction took place, and the people, who had, up to that time, been most submissive to authority were the first to demand with no uncertain voice that the privileges possessed by them and their ancestors should be returned to them. Though the administration has been growing steadily weaker and its majority in this House has been diminished at almost every division, it was considered wholly right, fair and just that the Government should carry on until such time as demobilization was complete. After demobilization was complete, when every newspaper of any standing in the community, when every man, outside of the House, of any standing admitted that the ministry of Sir Robert Borden and the Unionist party was doomed to an early end to its career, it was suddenly discovered that it might be well to form a new party and, with a new leader, to endeavour to re-establish the dwindling popularity of hon. gentlemen opposite. The new leader thus forced to take over the reins of power was faced with an onerous task. He had to reconstruct the cabinet and renovate the party. Had he been successful in accomplishing this we might have been justified in granting him our suffrages in order that he might retain power.

But what has he done? He has taken three new ministers into his Cabinet. One, I am sorry to say, was not obliged to face the electors. Had it been otherwise, I am sure that the explanations which he would have given in answer to questions such as were suggested by my hon. friend from Brome would have been highly interesting to his electorate and to the country. The other two went before the people and were elected. These gentlemen are great personal friends of mine and I have no wish to offend them. I wish to congratulate them upon their appointment to office. But may I also say that I congratulate them on their peculiarly good fortune in representing such constituencies, and upon their still greater good fortune in being supporters of a party which could not without extreme difficulty elect any one else.

Elections have been held in three other constituencies, seats traditionally Tory. In the one, the Government majority was reduced substantially, and in the other two the candidates of the Government met with ignominious defeat, with the result that there has been and is to-day throughout the country a very strong and almost unanimous demand for an election, which demand is joined in not only by the Liberals but by the most bigoted and fanatical supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. On this question of the by-elections, may I quote a gentleman whose authority I am sure will not be questioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, the Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone at one period of his career, whilst he was Prime Minister, suffered a number of losses in by-elections and we find that he—I am quoting from Gladstone's life—"laid before the Cabinet a pretty full outline of the case as to the weakness of the Government since the crisis of last March and the increase of that weakness, especially of late, from the unfavourable character of the local indications." I submit that at the present moment in this country there is no doubt whatever about the unfavourable character of the local indications, the local indications being the by-elections held.

But there is something more. There is the unfavourable character of the local indications when we refer to the by-elections not held, when we refer to the badly needed reconstruction of the Cabinet, and the fact that it is impossible or almost impossible for the Government to have new ministers elected. We have heard a great deal of late about reconstruction, and I am reminded of the old homely proverb that in order to skin your rabbit, you must first catch him. Similarly, to reconstruct your

Cabinet, you must first elect your ministers. In studying the history of the British Constitution—and this history, when it is written, is to be found chiefly in the debates of the House of Commons—I find that a situation similar to that which exists here to-day existed in the Old Country not many years ago. In the year 1900 the Empire was engaged in a struggle in South Africa with the Boers. The struggle, though not one which would affect the integrity of the Empire, was sufficient to give cause for considerable uneasiness to the people of England. The English troops had met with some rather severe and unexpected defeats, and generally, the position was not of the happiest. In 1900 the Parliament was dissolved and the electors of England were called upon to elect a new Parliament. The Tory party, true to its principles and its best traditions, went to the country on one issue, and on one issue alone. They waved the flag. They alone were the patriots; others were the enemies of their country, and, as has happened before, the people of England, as were later on another and a better people, were deceived and the Tory party was elected. They dragged on for some considerable time, until 1905, when we find that the people of England had become rather tired of this war ministry, and that the representatives of the people in the House were making exactly the same demand on the Government as we are to-day making on this Government. In that connection may I quote, because the circumstances are so similar, from Mr. Asquith? He said:

> For let us remember that when this House was elected in 1900, Lord Salisbury was the Prime Minister.

May I say that in 1900 when the Tory party came into power in England Lord Salisbury was the Prime Minister, but he was succeeded shortly afterwards by the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour. So the circumstances were very similar to the situation here. The hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) was in power and he was succeeded by the present Prime Minister. To continue the quotation:

> Where is the Ministry and where is the Party that Lord Salisbury left to his successor? The one, the Ministry, has disappeared. Nothing would have surprised the country more in the year 1900 than if they had been told that they were voting for installing on the Treasury Bench the gentlemen who at present occupy it.

May I say that nothing would have surprised the people of this country more than to have been told in 1917 that they were voting to install on the Treasury Bench the hon. gentlemen who now occupy it. He goes on:

> The Ministry has disappeared and you have to look and search about for most, at any rate, of its more distinguished and experienced members in all sorts of unexpected quarters.

May I call the attention of the House to the fact that exactly the same condition obtains here. The most distinguished and most important members of the ministry are scattered in all sorts of unexpected quarters. Two of them now sit on this side of the House. One of them has even had his title to sit in this House challenged. Another of them has accepted a high position in the gift of the Crown, and still another, and I am sorry for him, has announced publicly that he will support his colleagues, and save them and keep them righteous and godly only when questions of international importance are being discussed. When these questions are not being discussed he leaves his friends to pursue their own course of salvation.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: I thought it was the other way.

Mr. POWER: My respect for the rules of the House prevented my making the suggestion made by the hon. minister. To continue the quotation:

> Where is the party? What has become of the party? The party, as every man I am addressing knows, has split and sundered beyond the salving power of any person.

With respect to the party which faced us after the election of 1917, we find a goodly number of the most respectable members sitting on this side of the House. Their independence and their courage have shown the way for them to come across the floor of the House and sit on the side where it is posible to be independent and to be honest in one's opinions on questions of public policy. I could go on quoting at considerable length, but since the hour is growing late I think it would be well to cut my remarks short.

Mr. McMASTER: Go on.

Mr. POWER: I could refer any hon. gentlemen who are interested in this matter and who wish to obtain constitutional precedents in regard to the question, to the Parliamentary Debates of the British House of Commons for February 1905, wherein they will find ample matter for discussion and for the enlightenment of their minds with reference to the true constitutional

view to be supported in this debate. But in order to show my impartiality and to prove that I am moved only by highest motives in supporting my hon. friend—I will quote a gentleman whose authority may perhaps be more respected by hon. members oposite, and I will quote him in such a manner that I hardly think the advice which he gives will be ill received. The Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour in February, 1895, referring to the Rosebery Ministry, which had at that time gotten itself into a situation somewhat similar to that of hon. gentlemen opposite, said:

> I have never observed in the history of this country that any party of any Government have gained credit from hanging on to office, in the vulgar sense without power and with only the insignia of office, from hanging on to their places when they were deprived of all real influence on the course of events and when the general trend of public opinion was against them. Under such circumstances the Government may possibly do good administrative work.

Possibly.

> It may possibly continue to hold its tenure of office for one month, two months, six months, or even a year or more, but you will never find in the history of this country that this has had the result of increasing the credit of a Government with those on whose favour their fortunes ultimately rest.

You will see that this advice is given in the best interests of hon. gentlemen oposite. But if this were the only result, that their credit in the country would be diminished, I confess that we should not have very much ground for complaint. But by carrying on the course which they are pursuing, the very foundation of parliamentary government is being shaken, and the principles on which this constitution has been founded are being endangered. We then have the right to protest, as we do, in the most emphatic manner possible. I submit that it is useless for hon. gentlemen to carry on any longer. They have lost the confidence of the country. They have lost the confidence of every important body and every important interest in the community. The business community looks with horror on gentlemen who are able to lose $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 every year on the management of railways. Business men stand aghast at the probable cost of that new and useless ornament which we have added to the country's burden, namely, the Mercantile Marine. They are convinced that it will not be many years before it will equal in deficits the other branch of the service, and that we shall pay as much for it as for that other ill-fated adventure in public ownership.

With reference to the farming community, I find it difficult to say anything more than what my hon. friends to my left can say. We know that the farmers have a good deal to say to the Government and the people of the country. With regard to the labouring classes, I have only this to say, that they too are convinced that hon. gentlemen opposite have not the confidence of the people. They are convinced that they are not properly represented by hand-picked gentlemen in another Chamber. They are convinced that if the Lords of the Council only go before the people labour will have that oportunity for which it has been waiting a long time.

Another class of the community about which we heard a great deal in 1917, something in 1918, something in 1919, but a gradually diminishing amount as the years go on, have been the ex-soldiers, our boys at the front, our boys in the trenches, boys for whom the election was fought and, may I say, boys with whom some of the seats were won. These same boys have a word to say. May I quote from a manifesto issued by Mr. R. B. Maxwell in his official capacity as President of the Great War Veterans' Association, the largest body of organized soldiers in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. Maxwell says:

> Parliament has confessed inability to redeem former pledges and restore to returned soldiers and dependents in a substantial measure the economic advantages they would now enjoy but for war service. Parliament has shown reluctance to offset much failure by general measures for the improvement of living conditions throughout the country whereby returned soldiers might more easily regain a secure foothold in the national life. Parliament now requires that those who served in the war shall share in the payment of the major portion of the war debt despite the fact that war accumulated wealth remains practically unmolested.
>
> Parliament as at present constituted apparently cannot cope with distressing living conditions which affect not only the returned soldiers but the public generally. Parliament has denied to the electors of Canada any opportunity since 1911 to assert their views upon domestic questions by means of the ballot. Parliament continues to ignore the fact that the demand for a general election does not arise solely from among returned soldiers but is supported by the vast majority of those who have the interests of the country at heart and who view with alarm the increasing unrest. Parliament has outlived its mandate. The time has arrived for the people to declare themselves on the vital questions of the day. I therefore call upon you in defense of the basic principles upon which this association was founded to assemble in mass meeting with

your fellow citizens and secure without delay an unmistakeable expression of the wishes of the people in regard to the necessity of a general election.

Sir, we have heard the views of the authorized representative of the returned soldiers of Canada, those returned soldiers for whom we were prepared to do so much. I ask the hon. gentleman who said to the soldiers in France, "When you return Canada is yours," to only allow the returned soldiers a chance to vote in Canada —one little chance to exercise that franchise for which they fought. If you will only give them that little chance, if they are only permitted that opportunity, hon. gentlemen opposite will have earned their gratitude. They will have shown for the first time since they came into power that they are really prepared to agree to the wishes of the returned soldiers.

There is another class, and this class I mention last, because in my mind it is the most important. By means of a series of indignities and insults, without parallel even in the days of our earlier history, some hon. gentlemen opposite have alienated the sympathy of a whole province and of a whole race. In order to win victory at the polls a campaign of hate and a propaganda of detraction was launched, which I admit was to a large extent successful, and our province was pointed to as a pariah among the other provinces of Confederation. Experience has taught us that this enforced isolation has not affected us in the slightest degree, and we have not been annihilated or destroyed by the enmity of the central government. On the contrary, since we have been so splendidly isolated we have experienced our best and our most prosperous days. We find that the enmity of our opponents has united us and their offers of friendship will not divide us. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that one of our party has been detached from us, but the day and the hour of the electors of the county of St. Hyacinthe-Rouville is at hand.

I have this much more to say with regard to that same province. We can forgive and we will do so. We will do so cheerfully as it is one of the precepts of the religion which most of us profess. But we will not forget, and we will never put it in the power of any Government to strike a blow at our prestige and our standing in the community such as has been attempted to be struck by hon. gentlemen opposite. Never again will it be possible for any Government, in order to win an election, to point to us as those who have wished to break the Confederation pact. Never again will the people of this country allow hon. gentlemen opposite or their successors to get into office by a campaign of calumny and of detraction such as has been waged. The people of the rest of the Dominion now know that in the province of Quebec there resides a population which is the sanest and most honourable in the whole Dominion, and that in spite of accusations of backwardness and of being priest-ridden, in no part of Canada are the citizens more free or more happy. We live in a province that is free and contented, but if I am to believe the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), the case is far different in our sister province. We are free, contented and happy and we have never been more so than since we have been forced into our splendid isolation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have shown that the business community are with us with the exception perhaps of some who have been frightened by the voice of the Prime Minister and his satellites when they accused the leader of the Liberal party and his followers of Bolshevist tendencies. The Prime Minister by that accusation may have frightened some of the business community. But there are others, who realize that with the advent to power of members from this side of the House the day of the profiteer and of "special interests" is at an end. Those gentlemen and those interests will, I am sure, support to their utmost capacity when any election is held, hon. gentlemen opposite.

I have shown that the labour classes are not supporting this Government. I have shown that the agricultural classes are not supporting this Government. I have shown that the returned soldiers far from supporting it are praying only for its dissolution; I have shown that through its own fault this Government has earned the disdain and contempt of a whole race. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is nothing further to be said on the question, that there is nobody left to support hon. gentlemen opposite, that they no longer represent and they no longer are the image of the people of this country. I would like in conclusion, if I may be permitted, to quote just two lines of poetry. It is not my habit to quote poetry, but this is so applicable to the situation that I feel I shall be doing a service by giving the quotation on the present occasion:

There is on earth a more auguster thing,
Veiled though it be, than Parliament or King.

And that, Sir, is the public conscience. On this occasion the public conscience has been outraged. The public conscience cries aloud for the hon. members opposite to resign; it cries aloud to this House to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King), an amendment which would involve a dissolution and would bring those hon. members before the bar of the public opinion of this country.

On the motion of Mr. A. Thompson (Yukon) the debate was ajourned.

On the motion of the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Friday, February 18, 1921.

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Report of the Clerk of Petitions dated February 18, 1921.

Returns of the 13th General election to the House of 17th December, 1917, and by-elections held during the years 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919 in French and English.—Mr. Speaker.

Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year 1920.—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

Report of the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue for the year ending March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Wigmore.

Shipping report of the Department of Customs.—Hon. Mr. Wigmore.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) presented the reports of the Select Committee to prepare and report lists of members composing the Select Standing Committees of the House as follows:

No. 1

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs:

Armstrong (York),
Blake,
Boys,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cannon,
Copp,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Fripp,
Guthrie,
Jacobs,
Keefer,
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
McCoig,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Meighen,
Mowat,
Porter,
Tweedie, and
Vien.—28.

No. 2

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Allan,
Anderson,
Archambault,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Béland,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Boyer,
Boys,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Calder,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Chisholm,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Copp,
Crerar,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davidson,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (Cape Breton),
Douglas (Strathcona),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Fraser,
Fripp,
Gauvreau,
Guthrie,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Kay,
Keefer,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Long,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (York),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGregor,
McLean (Royal),
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Murphy,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nicholson (Queens),
Pardee,
Parent,
Peck,
Pelletier,
Porter,
Power,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Richardson,
Savard,
Séguin,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Trahan,
Tudhope,
Vien,
Wallace,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—127.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Andrews,
Archambault,
Armstrong (York),
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brien,
Bureau,
Butts,
Casselman,
Charters,
Cronyn,
Douglas (Cape Breton),
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Fortier,
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Harrison,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Kennedy (Essex),
Knox,
Lafortune,
Mackie (Renfrew),
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McLean (Royal),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paul,
Pedlow,
Power,
Prévost,
Proulx,
Reid (Grenville),
Richardson,
Robb,
Ross,
Rowell,
Scott,
Steele,
Stein,
Stewart (Lanark),
Thompson (Hastings),
Tobin, and
Tolmie.—61.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),
Brien,
Butts,
Chabot,
Clarke (Wellington),
Cruise,
Deslauriers,
Doherty,
Duff,
Euler,
Gervais,
Griesbach,
Halbert,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
MacKelvie,
Maclean (York),
MacNutt,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McIsaac,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Mowat,
Paul,
Séguin,
Stacey,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Wallace, and
White (Sir Thomas).—33.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist or Seven Members.

No. 5

ON PRINTING

Messieurs:

Bowman,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Cardin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Crowe,
Currie,
Fontaine,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Maclean (Halifax),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Prévost,
Richardson,
Shaw,
Verville,
White (Victoria),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—23.

No. 6

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Archambault,
Ball,
Best,
Bonnell,
Boys,
Calder,
Cannon,
Chaplin,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Davidson,
Demers,
Devlin,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Edwards,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauvreau,
Green,
Griesbach,
Jacobs,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Lapointe,
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,
McCrea,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Maharg,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Papineau,
Parent,
Proulx,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Ross,
Scott,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Antigonish),
Spinney,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Tweedie,
Verville,
Vien,
White (Sir Thomas), and
Wigmore.—61.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messieurs:

Allan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Argue,
Baldwin,
Best,
Bristol,
Calder,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
DuTremblay,
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Gauthier,
Lang,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Loggie,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York),
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McQuarrie,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Pedlow,
Porter,
Redman,
Robb,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (Antigonish),
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Tremain,

Glass,
Henders,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Johnston,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Kennedy (Essex),
Tweedie,
Whidden,
White (Sir Thomas), and
Wilson (Saskatoon).—81.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs:

Allan,
Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (York),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Brouillard,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Casgrain,
Casselman,
Charters,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cruise,
Davis,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Edwards,
Finley,
Fournier,
Fulton,
Gervais,
Glass,
Gould,
Halbert,
Halladay,
Harold,
Hay,
Henders,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Hunt,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kennedy (Glengarry),
Knox,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lang,
Léger,
Long,
MacKelvie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McDonald,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McMaster,
Maharg,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Myers,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nicholson (Queens),
Paul,
Proulx,
Reid (Mackenzie),
Robb,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Antigonish),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Sutherland,
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Yukon),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Truax,
Wallace,
Whidden,
White (Victoria),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—105.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messieurs:

Ballantyne,
Butts,
Caldwell,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Clark (Bruce),
Clements,
Deslauriers,
Duff,
Fielding,
Gauvreau,
Hartt,
Hay,
Lang,
Léger,
Loggie,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Martin,
Munson,
Nicholson (Queens),
Peck,
Pelletier,
Rowell,
Savard,
Sinclair (Antigonish),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spinney,
Stevens,
Trahan,
Truax,
Tudhope,
Turgeon, and
Wigmore.—36.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10

ON MINES AND MINERALS

Messieurs:

Arthurs,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cockshutt,
Déchêne,
Denis,
Fortier,
Gould,
Green,
Griesbach,
Halbert,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Johnston,
Kennedy (Glengarry),
Lalor,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Long,
MacKelvie,
McDonald,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Pacaud,
Peck,
Pelletier,
Prévost,
Reid (Mackenzie),
Rinfret,
Sexsmith,
Smith,
Thompson (Yukon), and
White (Victoria).—37.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 11

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS

Messieurs:

Baldwin,
Béland,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Casselman,
Charlton,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Finley,
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Gould,
Halladay,
Kennedy (Glengarry),
Mackie (Edmonton),
McDonald,
Manion,
Michaud,
Pacaud,
Power,
Redman,
Stein,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Weyburn),
Tolmie,
White (Victoria), and
Wilson (Saskatoon).—34.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 12

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs:

Balantyne,
Chabot,
Devlin,
Lemieux,
McKenzie,
Marcil (Bonaventure),

Elkin,
Foster (Sir George),
Hocken,
Kay,
Munson,
Richardson, and
Rinfret.—13.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members.

No. 13

ON THE LIBRARY

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Béland,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boyer,
Chaplin,
Clark (Red Deer),
Cooper,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Foster (Sir George),
Harold,
King,
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
Meighen,
Myers,
Pardee,
Rowell,
Sheard, and
Whidden.—21.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the report was concurred in.

PRINTING—JOINT COMMITTEE

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing namely, Messrs. Bowman, Brouillard, Buchanan, Cardin, Charters, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Crowe, Currie, Fontaine, Hocken, Hughes (Sir Sam), Keefer, Maclean (Halifax), Michaud, Murphy, Prevost, Richardson, Shaw, Verville, White (Victoria), Wilson (Wentworth), and Wright, will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY—JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. MEIGHEN MOVED:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing Their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Andrews, Beland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Chaplin, Clark (Red Deer), Cooper, Cronyn, Crothers, Drayton (Sir Henry), Foster (Sir George) Harold, King, Lapointe, Lemieux, Meighen, Myers, Pardee, Rowell, Sheard, and Whidden, a Committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTES

On motion of Hon. Mr. Meighen the Select Standing Committees of the House were severally empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records; with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WM. DUFF (Lunenburg): Is the report correct that the steamships "Canadian Mariner" and "Canadian Explorer," lately built by the Halifax shipyards on the orders of the Government, have been registered in the Port of Montreal? If so, may I ask why they were not registered in Halifax instead?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question which the hon. member asks is one that should properly be placed on the Order Paper. It is not a question of such urgency as to warrant its being asked on the Orders of the Day.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Thursday, February 17.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (Durham): Mr. Speaker, while I have not had the privilege of being in the House and listening during the past two days. to the discusion that has taken place on the motion for the adoption of the Address I judge, from a perusal of Hansard, that the procedure adopted on this occasion is to devote one day to a general political party controversy and the next to the consideration of questions of public importance upon which there is a substantial degree of unanimity in the House. I judge, from reading yesterday's debate in Hansard, that this is the day for a discussion of a matter on which there may be a substantial measure of agreement. I therefore shall be quite within the limits of the procedure so far pursued in discussing the Address. if I confine my observations to that one important paragraph in the Address dealing with the League of Nations and the work of the assembly of the League at Geneva. The House has had the benefit, if the right hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, of a very clear, comprehensive, and wholly admirable review of the work of the Assembly at Geneva and of the purposes for which the League of Nations was formed. My duty this

afternoon, therefore, will be to fill in some of the details of the picture sketched in such broad and clear outline by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). Before, however, referring to some of the matters discussed at Geneva, may I say in passing that I shall not attempt to go into great detail this afternoon, for I judge that the time for a detailed discussion, if the House desires to have such a discussion, will be when the estimates for the League are before the House. At that time there will be a full opportunity to ask and to answer questions in reference to these important matters. Let me preface my remarks as to the work of the Assembly by one or two general observations in reference to the League of Nations and the great purpose which it is designed to serve in the world. Prior to the present time, so far as history preserves for us a record, each nation has looked upon every other nation as a real or potential enemy; and because each nation has regarded every other in that light it has felt compelled to protect itself against aggression by erecting works for defence, by establishing armies, by building navies, and by taking all the precautions necessary to protect it against aggressive attack, or if aggressively inclined it has taken these measures to ensure success in its attacks upon its neighbours. The same idea has compelled nations to form alliance, to associate other nations with themselves in alliances more or less close, with the object of offsetting other alliances among other nations and so preserving what has been know for a long time in diplomacy as the balance of power. The culmination of that policy, and its severest condemnation, has been the great war from which we have just emerged, and the crimes and atrocities, as well as the loss and suffering, which that war entailed, compelled humanity to try and discover some other principle which should find expression in the diplomacy and policy of the world. That other expression is, that each nation should look upon every other nation if not as a real, at least as a potential friend, and that the best safeguard of the peace of the world is not in arming for conflict but in co-operating together to prevent armed conflict; and that is the principle embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

We all recognize in organized society the difference between a private wrong and a public wrong. We recognize there are certain injuries which if a private citizen sustains at the hands of another citizen his redress is through the civil courts. There are other injuries where the law steps in and says, although an injury has been done a private citizen, a public wrong has been committed, and no matter what the desire of the parties immediately concerned, justice must be vindicated and the guilty party must be punished. Therefore we have the public prosecution of public wrongs.

Too often in international affairs serious controversies between states, have been regarded as only of immediate concern to the two parties to the dispute, and each nation has claimed the right to settle its dispute with its neighbour nation in whatever way it thought best, regardless of the views or interests of the other nations of the world. The world is coming to realize the fact that there are public rights and public wrongs in international affairs, just as there are public rights and wrongs in domestic affairs in each civilized country, and it is no longer possible to permit a nation to make war upon another to redress its own grievances and so disturb the peace of the whole world, and that war, or a threat of war, in any part of the world is a matter of concern to all the nations. That is another principle which finds expression through the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make one or two observations in explanation of what the League is, and I ask pardon of the House for coming back to a matter which has been so frequently discussed. I do it, however, because wherever one goes one finds great misapprehension as to the purposes and functions of the League of Nations. Let me say, notwithstanding what has been so often suggested, the League is not a super-state. The League has no jurisdiction to undertake the government of the world or to settle all difficulties that may arise in various quarters of the world. I have heard the complaint made that the League is ineffective because wars are now going on in various parts of the world. The League was not organized for the purpose of making peace, following the recent war. That is the task of the Supreme Council, and if peace has not been established up to date in many quarters of the world it is not because of any failure on the part of the League. It is because the Supreme Council, in view of the policy of the past and the conditions of the present, has not been able to bring about peace. The question came directly before the Council of the League some months ago on the application of the King of the Hedjaz in complaint against France in con-

nection with certain acts committed in Lebanon. The Council of the League took the position, which is justified under the Treaty and under the Covenant, that it was not their duty to make the peace. They were organized to preserve the peace once it was made, and as peace had not been established as between Turkey and the Allied Powers, the League had no jurisdiction to intervene in that dispute.

I mention these matters because another question has been asked. What is the League doing to secure reparation from Germany for the crimes she has committed and the losses occasioned by the war? The League, Mr. Speaker, has no jurisdiction over that matter; it is entirely beyond its jurisdiction. That is a matter entirely for the Supreme Council which must deal with that problem and settle it.

What then are the functions of the League? They are of three-fold character. I would call them the primary and secondary functions under the Covenant, and third, certain functions under the Treaties of Peace.

What is the primary function of the League under the Covenant? It is to preserve the peace of the world by the prevention of war, and to prevent war by providing a substitute for war as a means of settling international disputes. The secondary function of the League, as was so well pointed out in the address delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is to provide a means for international co-operation in a large number of matters of common concern to all the nations of the world. What are the duties of the League under the Treaties of Peace? I shall give two or three illustrations. Under the Treaty of Versailles the League is responsible for naming the commission and organizing the Government of the Saar Basin. On that commission is one of our Canadian citizens, Mr. Waugh of Winnipeg, and I am sure it will be a matter of gratification to you, as it was to us, to hear from the officials of the League in Geneva the strongest testimony to the splendid service that Mr. Waugh was rendering as a member of that commission. The League had also to arrange for the government of the free city of Dantzig, to negotiate a Treaty between Dantzig and Poland, and to name a commissioner as governor of that city. They are responsible for guaranteeing the carrying out of certain of the clauses of the minorities treaties entered into pursuant to the Treaties of Peace. The League is now devoting its energies to these important functions. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has dealt with the organization of the Council and the Assembly, and I shall therefore pass on to touch upon some phases of the work of the Assembly at Geneva which were not explained by my hon. friend the other day. The Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out that in the organization of the Assembly we had to appoint a president. Modesty perhaps prevented him from explaining that we had also to elect vice-presidents. There were six vice-presidents who were chairmen of the six commissions of the Assembly, and there were six vice-presidents at large elected by the delegates present at the Assembly. I am sure it is a matter of congratulation to the House and the country that the chairman of the Canadian delegation was chosen as one of the vice-presidents at large of the first Assembly at Geneva. All matters which came before the Assembly were referred for consideration and report to one of the six commissions appointed by the Assembly. The subjects entrusted to these commissions were: First, Constitutional Questions; Second, Technical Organizations; Third, the permanent Court of International Justice; Fourth, the Secretariat and the Budget; Fifth, Admission of new States; and, Sixth, Armaments, Mandates, and the Economic Blockade. In the allotment of positions on these commissions it so happened that I was assigned to numbers one and two; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to numbers three and six; and the Chairman of our delegation, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) to numbers four and five. As the work of the Assembly progressed it appeared that commissions one and two, and four and five would meet at the same time; therefore Sir George Foster exchanged places with me, I taking his place on number five, and he taking my place on number two. Consequently in the general work of the Assembly the Minister of Trade and Commerce sat on commissions two and four, the Minister of Justice on commissions three and six, and I on commissions one and five.

Possibly the most important work of the Assembly was laying the foundations for the future. It was not simply an international conference at which men would meet to discuss certain matters and then separate, and the work would after-

wards have to be done over again. It was organizing a new body for permanent work, because any one who is interested in and believes in the future of the League looks forward to its future as not being a matter of years or decades, but a permanent organization, influencing and guiding the international life of the world. Therefore it was of the utmost importance at the first meeting of the Assembly that the foundations should be laid on sure ground, and that the Assembly in its deliberations should be kept on such secure foundations.

It followed that the questions that came before commission Number one, the commission on constitutional questions, had not only an interest for the present Assembly, but had a real bearing upon the future of the League, and I am sure you will think I shall be taking the right course this afternoon if I devote my time to questions with which I was most immediately concerned on the two commissions on which I sat. I am certain the Minister of Justice will give the House full information with reference to the work of the commissions in which he took such an important part.

Now, Sir, let me take first the rules of procedure. That sounds simple, but we had to decide in adopting these rules whether we would follow the British parliamentary practice or the continental practice; they were not the same. In the result a composite system of rules was adopted, some from the British parliamentary practice, some from the continental practice, and on the whole they were rules which appeared to the Assembly well designed to govern the deliberations of such a body.

There were two provisions in these rules to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, for they are important and significant having regard to the future work of the Assembly. They received emphasis at a later stage by the action of other committees. One of those rules required the budget to be submitted to the Assembly at its Annual meeting each year. Under the Constitution of the League both the Council and the Assembly have jurisdiction over matters of finance, but one of the first actions of the Assembly was to assert its authority in the voting of money for carrying on the work of the League. That will have a very important bearing on the development of the League in the future.

Another matter set forth and asserted in those rules was that each year the Council should report to the Assembly on the work done by the Council from the date of the preceding Assembly. While the Council is supreme in any action it takes within its own jurisdiction as outlined in the Covenant, yet the Assembly laid down the principle that the Council should report to the Assembly from time to time. The members of the Council present in the Assembly—all the States were present—accepted that statement of policy. It means that in future all acts done by the Council between the meetings of the Assembly shall be reported to the Asembly at its next annual meeting. That report will be open for discussion and review, just as the Speech from the Throne is open for discussion and review, and every action of the Council may be debated in that open forum in the presence of the nations of the world and before the press of the world. This means further that matters cannot be done in secret by the Council of the League, even though its meetings are not open to the public in the same way as are the meetings of the Assembly.

Then another matter of great interest and importance, having regard to the future of the League, was the discussion of the relations between the Council and the Assembly. There is a good deal of confusion in reference to what those relations should be; there was not a little confusion in the minds of the delegates themselves; and that was natural, because the Covenant does not draw a very clear line between the functions of one and the other. But this much is clear: In matters that are expressly committed to the Council, either under the Covenant or under any of the Treaties of Peace, the Assembly has no jurisdiction to render a decision. Similarly, where matters are expressly committed to the Assembly, either under the Covenant or under any of the Treaties of Peace, the Council has no jurisdiction to give a decision. In general matters both the Council and the Assembly are competent to deal with them as they arise.

There is a third class, and an important one as events at the Assembly showed, in regard to which neither the Council nor the Assembly has authority to take final action. I am now referring to matters included within what I have referred to as the secondary functions of the League, matters which come under Article XXIII of the Covenant. That article is prefaced with a declaration to this effect:

> That under the terms of international conventions heretofore or hereafter agreed upon, the members agree to do so and so.

In other words, in those matters coming within Article XXIII the members of the

League have not committed either to the Council or to the Assembly the final authority; they have said in respect to those matters: International conventions must be submitted to us, the terms agreed upon must be approved by us, those conventions must be executed by us, and then the Council and the Assembly may proceed to deal with those matters.

Another matter that arose in discussing the relations of the Council to the Assembly, and which occasioned a good deal of discussion, was: What was the position of a member of the Council in giving his vote in reference to the Government which appointed him; did he in giving his vote record his own opinion, or did he record the opinion of the state which named him? The question was raised in the Assembly by the distinguished representative of Italy, Signor Tittoni. He took the ground that the members of the Council were not representatives of their states, but occupied the superior position of magistrates, and were to dispose of matters on the grounds of equity and justice and the broad principles of humanity. Some of the members of the Assembly could not see any good reason why a member of the Council should not at the same time represent his state and dispose of matters on the principles of equity and justice and in the broad interests of humanity.

But that issue goes to the very basis of the efficiency of the League. If members of the League are simply there as a group of public men recording their own opinions, valuable as these opinions may be, you simply have an international debating society without power to achieve anything effective.

If, on the other hand, these delegates represent their Governments so that when they cast their vote the vote is that of their Governments and binds their Governments only of course to the extent provided in the Covenant—you have a body of plenipotentiaries capable of negotiating and settling matters of very great international importance, and you give to the decisions of the Council and of the Assembly a value and a dignity otherwise quite impossible. That question was carefully considered and the Assembly came unanimously to the conclusion that on the proper interpretation of the Covenant, while a member may express such opinions as he sees fit and is responsible only to his own Government for his opinions, when the vote is cast it is the vote not of the delegate but of the State he represents. So all voting in the Council and in the Assembly is by States and those votes bind the States to the extent but only to the extent mentioned in the Covenant.

Mr. McMASTER: May I interject a question? That will mean, will it not, that the representatives must always be drawn from the party which is in control of the administration of the country which they represent?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think so. The vote is cast by the chairman of the delegation, and he should cast the vote in accordance with the views of his Government. But that does not prevent the representation of other sections of the people, if the Government in question chooses to name them. It is for the Government of each country to name its delegates to the Assembly.

The only other important constitutional question to which I shall refer is that of amendments to the Government. There were three important groups of amendments: 1st the Scandinavian; 2nd the Argentine; 3rd the Canadian. Two important amendments were submitted by the Scandinavian group, first, to provide for compulsory arbitration or to give the new International Court of Justice, when created, compulsory jurisdiction; and second, to provide for the election of all the members of the Council. The Argentine delegation presented practically the same amendments; and Mr. Doherty on behalf of the Canadian delegation presented a proposal to strike out Article 10. The Assembly decided to refer all these proposals to the Council with the request that the Council appoint a Commission to consider these amendments and report to the next Assembly.

May I now refer to two constitutional questions which arose from out of the work of commission number two,—questions which have a very important bearing on the future development of the work of the League, and are of great interest to the people of this country. The first arose from the suggestion of Italy and Switzerland that the Assembly should take into consideration the question of monopolies in raw materials, and of the equitable distribution of the raw materials to the several countries of the world. It was not the first occasion on which the question had been raised. I understand, that before the Treaty was signed, Italy put forward proposals to the effect that the Cov-

enant of the League should cover this question. These proposals were not accepted. When the International Labour Conference met in Washington in the fall of 1919 the representative of Italian labour brought forward a similar proposal and asked that a resolution should be adopted calling upon the League to institute an investigation into the world's supply of raw materials with a view of securing their equitable distribution. On that occasion the representatives of the Government of Canada felt compelled to state clearly the position of Canada; that while she would administer her raw materials in the way that she considered just and fair to all interests involved, she could not permit any other power to interfere with the manner in which she handled this matter of purely domestic concern. When the question came up at Geneva the representatives of Canada took exactly the same position. But that did not stop the discussion. The Minister of Trade and Commerce can tell you that during the whole period of time that commission number two was in session, proposal after proposal was made; when one was unacceptable another, in modified form, was brought forward, with a view of committing the League in some form or other to this important principle. Canada, in her resistance to this proposal, was ably supported by the other Dominions and India; the brunt of the fight against the proposal rested upon the Dominions of the British Empire and India. Great Britain as a member of the Council had already assented to an inquiry into the question of raw materials on the motion of the representative of Italy; she was therefore not in a position to oppose the resolution in the Assembly, as the Dominions were.

The objections of Canada to the proposal were on three grounds. We said that the question did not come within the scope of the Covenant; that the League of Nations was not a super State with power to take up any question it might see fit to take up; but it was an agreement among States to co-operate for certain definite purposes in the manner provided in the Covenant, and not otherwise or for other purposes. The first objection, therefore, was that the question was not within the scope of the Covenant, and that to attempt to drag it in by a side door was not fair to the nations parties to the Covenant and not fair to the League itself. Secondly, even if you assumed for the sake of argument —though I am quite convinced you cannot do so—that you could stretch Article 23 so as to bring that question within, then Article 23 is quite clear that before you could have the right to deal definitely and finally with such a matter, you must have an international convention agreed to by the nations parties to the Covenant, and you could only act in accordance with the terms of that international convention. Just let me read the introductory clause to that Article, because we have not yet reached the end of this question. It is bound to come up in the next Assembly and at future Assemblies of the League, due to the great need of raw materials in certain countries of Europe and to the acute distress which exists because of that lack of raw materials. No one can learn the facts in connection with the industrial life of many of these Central European countries without sympathizing very deeply with them in their difficulties, and without being anxious to assist in providing some remedy for them. But that does not involve one's departure from the terms of this Covenant and embarking upon an impossible enterprise. The introductory clause of Article 23 is as follows:

> Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League:

And then I will come down to the provision they rely upon:

> (e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and of equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League.

Under that head of "equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the League" they claim to bring in the question of the supply of raw material. Now, as I have said, we claim that if by any stretch of construction this question could be held to come within Article 23, then there is no right to deal with it unless and until an international convention is agreed upon among the members of the League, and then whatever action is taken must be pursuant to the terms of that Convention. If that procedure were followed, the convention when drafted, would be submitted to the Government of this country, and the Government in accordance with the precedent established in dealing with important international agreements, would submit the Convention to this House for consideration and approval.

The people of Canada would have full opportunity of discussing, of considering and reaching a conclusion on this important matter before Canada was finally committed to the policy outlined. Therefore, one can see how important it is, if we are to reserve our legitimate control over matters which do, in some respects, touch our internal or domestic affairs, that we should follow strictly the terms of the agreement embodied in the Covenant.

The third objection was the practical one. You cannot undertake to control or provide for the equitable distribution of the world's raw materials unless you undertake a measure of control of the industrial life of all the industrial nations of the world. That is utterly impracticable. Who is to say what this nation needs or what that nation shall have? Therefore, while the question is one upon which Canada feels strongly because of her position, the proposal is objectionable not only from the standpoint of Canada but equally from the standpoint of the League itself. If you hold out to the nations of Europe, who are in great industrial distress to-day because of a shortage of raw materials, that the League will provide an avenue through which they can get raw materials, and they find, as they would find, that they could not get them from the League, then you turn their anger and animosity against the League and interfere with the League carrying out its primary functions. Instead of the League being an organ for preserving the peace of the world, you make it an instrument for international friction and trouble. On the other hand if you say that the League has power to do this, you create at once on this side of the Atlantic a sentiment against any league of nations which has authority to interfere in our domestic affairs. Whether it be North or South America or the newer countries of the Eastern world, they will all be opposed to a league which has any such authority. The ground taken by Canada was constitutionally sound; it was sound from a commonsense, practical business standpoint, and it was also greatly in the interest of the League itself.

I had intended this afternoon touching on certain other questions that arose under this article 23 of the Covenant, but I shall not do so. An opportunity will arise when the Estimates are up, if members are interested, in a discussion of those questions. Those were the proposals to create new international organizations as subsidiary of the League, one relating to communications and transit and the other relating to finance and economics. These give rise to one of the most important discussions in the Assembly. I shall now refer to the other commission upon which I sat, No. V—the admission of new states. No question excited more interest in the Assembly than the question of the admission of new states to the League. This interest, of course, related particularly to the admission of former enemy states. Austria and Bulgaria had applied for admission. Germany did not apply. The conditions which must be complied with in order that a state shall be admitted to the League are set out in article 1 of the Covenant and are as follows:

> Any fully self-governing state, Dominion, or Colony, not named in the annex, may become a member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military and naval forces and armaments.

Therefore, when Austria and Bulgaria applied for admission, the question immediately arose whether they were in a position to comply with the conditions of admission. Three sub-committees of commission V were appointed to examine the applications of the fourteen states which applied for admission. The sub-committees were asked to investigate and answer these five questions:

> 1. Was the application for admission to the League of Nations in order?
> 2. Is the Government recognized de jure or de facto and by which states?
> 3. Does the country possess a stable Government and settled frontiers? What are its size and population?
> 4. Is the country fully self-governing?
> 5. What has been the conduct of the country concerning both acts and assurances with regards to: (1) her international obligations; (2) the prescriptions of the League of Nations as to armaments?

In the case of Austria and Bulgaria, the only point of difficulty was the second last question—have these two countries given effective guarantees or satisfactory evidence of a sincere intention to perform their international obligations? That question had to be answered in the affirmative before those States became qualified for admission to the League. After the most careful investigation from all available sources, the commission reached the conclusion that both of those States satisfied that requirement, and they recommended the admission of Austria and Bulgaria to the League. That recommendation was

adopted by the Assembly, and those States and four others were admitted. No one who sees the situation as it exists in Europe to-day can fail to recognize the importance of this step. It is a real step towards the reconciliation of Europe and, however much we may feel the wrongs of the war, however much we may cherish the feelings that were bred of the war, no man who looks out upon Europe in its present disorganized condition, where in certain sections, the very future of our civilization is in jeopardy can do other than reach the conclusion that it is of the first importance to Europe and to humanity as a whole that this reconciliation should proceed; that Europe should get back to real peace and to the spirit of peace, and to production in order to repair the loss and wastage of the war. Therefore, the admission of those two States had more significance than simply their actual admission; it was a step towards the reconciliation of Europe.

The other States admitted were Albania, Costa Rica, Finland, and Luxemberg. The States rejected were Armenia, Azerbigan, Esthonia, Georgia, Latavia, Lichtenstein, Lithuania, and Ukraine. I will not discuss to-day the reasons for their rejection they all appear in the records of the Assembly, and if a discussion on them is desired, it can take place later.

Two or three questions of principle, however, arose before commission No. 5, and I wish to mention these questions of principle because they affect not only the present but the future. The first was —Did the admission of a State to the League amount to its recognition de jure by the powers? The opinion of the jurists of the League and of eminent jurists of the great powers who were present was asked on this question, but they could not agree. Some thought that admission involved recognition de jure; others did not so consider it. When it was proposed that we should settle this question by a vote, that is, which view we should recognize, common sense prevailed, we decided not to undertake to settle these questions of abstract principle upon which we might honestly differ; but to deal with each individual case and pass judgment upon the application of that State.

The question did arise in the case of Albania. The argument of the members of the committee who contended that admission to the League amounted to recognition de jure was that if it did amount to recognition de jure we should not admit any State not already recognized de jure. In the case of Albania the committee reported against the admission of that State until her status should be more clearly determined. The rejection of Albania's application was moved by France and seconded by Great Britain. South Africa moved that Albania be admitted, and was supported by Canada and a number of the smaller States. The majority in the commission, was against the admission of Albania. The matter was carried into the Assembly, and South Africa on the floor of the Assembly moved the admission of Albania. South Africa was supported by Canada, and in the discussion which ensued Great Britain and France withdrew the objections which they had made in the committee and Albania was admitted to the Assembly. That was the one case in which the report of the commission as to the admission of new States was changed. Why was Albania admitted? While the war was on, by the secret Treaty of London, provision had been made for the partition of Albania, without consulting her, at a time when she was occupied by the armies of the powers, and it was agreed upon by States who had guaranteed her neutrality. At a later date and in order to settle the dispute between Italy and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State it was proposed by the Supreme Council, that Albania should be partitioned. That proposition was vetoed by the action of the President of the United States, and when it was proposed that the case of Albania should stand over until her status should be more fully determined by the powers, the majority of the Assembly came to the conclusion that they could not recognize either the legality or the justice of any group of powers undertaking to provide for the partition of a smaller State which had done no wrong, and they determined to put it out of the hands of the powers to carve up Albania in the future by admitting her to the League, and by article ten all the States became guarantors of her territorial integrity. That, of course, particularly applied to her neighbours the other Balkan States, who were not particularly anxious to have her admitted.

One other question of principle came before this committee, which I wish to mention. It was proposed, in this case by South Africa, I believe, without full consideration, that hereafter no State should be admitted to the League unless that State entered into a Treaty similar to the Minorities Treaty entered into by certain of the new central European States as a condition of their recognition as sovereign

States. The Minorities Treaties provided for the protection of the racial minorities that were transferred by the terms of the peace treaty from their existing sovereignty to a new sovereignty. It guaranteed them their language, their religion, their schools, and Government grants. In other words, the design was to perpetuate the racial minority in all its rights and privileges and status. The objection to that proposal, as a general proposition, was twofold. First, we should not add to the conditions of the Covenant for admission to the League a new condition. The object should be to facilitate the entrance of States into the League, rather than to impose barriers against their coming in. Secondly, although that principle under the conditions existing in Europe was probably essential for the preservation of peace in Europe, it did not apply to the conditions existing in the new world. It did not apply to the conditions existing in Canada, where apart from the two great races and the two religions the policy is not to perpetuate the various racial minorities that come to us from Europe and other parts of he world. The policy is not to have a little England, a little Ireland, a little Scotland, a little Belgium, a little Germany, and a little France all over this country. The policy is to develop a Canadian nationality. The policy is assimilation rather than perpetuation of the divers races and creeds that exist in Europe. We do not want to transplant the troubles and the prejudices of central Europe to this new world, and therefore the position taken was that you should not attempt to lay down as a general policy covering the whole world a principle that is applicable only to a section of the world; that while, if you were dealing with a European organization only it might be perfectly proper to lay down that principle, in dealing with a world organization it was wholly wrong to lay down a principle that would not apply to the whole world. The resolution was therefore amended to meet these objections, and it passed, Canada not voting on the matter.

There was a good deal of informal conversation about Russia, the United States and Germany, entering the League, but I shall not enter into that this afternoon.

Everyone recognizes that the Russian situation must be cleared up in some way before Europe can return to normal conditions. One hundred and seventy millions of people in Russia have been producing in the past great quantities of food stuffs and raw materials for the consumption of the nations of the world. That production has largely ceased, and until it is restored the other nations will want for food and raw materials. On the other hand, Russia has been a great purchaser of the world's manufactured articles. She is no longer a purchaser, and until she becomes a purchaser again, there must be tens of thousands of workmen out of employment who in the past were engaged in the manufacture of goods for Russian consumption. The world is greatly interested in clearing up the Russian situation, but I think every one at Geneva recognized that the situation could only be cleared up by the Russian people themselves, and that the less outside interference there was with Russia the more speedily she would settle her own problems. Speaking for myself, I must say that I sincerely hope that the trade agreement which Great Britain has negotiated with Russia will be ratified by the two government, so that international trade may commence to flow again between these two countries, for I believe that nothing will more quickly bring the Russian people to an appreciation of the benefits of sound constitutional democratic government than free communication with the other nations of the world. So, while the Assembly was acutely concerned in the future of Russia, and in the attitude of Russia, I am sure the Assembly felt that the least said and the freer we left Russia to work out her own destiny and settle her own problems as to her form of government, the more likely we were to promote the peace of the world.

I shall not discuss the question of Germany. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) put the case, as I believe it was viewed by the Assembly, and he also, I believe stated the situation with respect to the United States in the way it was viewed by the Assembly.

I have only this remark to make. When one ask, will the United States come in? let me remind you that we asked exactly the same question during the first two-and-a-half years of war, while the United States discussed and debated the question, and events in that country developed. The result was that the circumstances of the situation, plus the conscience and judgment of the American people, brought them into the war and we know the powerful assistance and the hearty co-operation they gave towards bringing the war to a victorious conclusion. I believe the same result will follow in the case of the League of Nations, and that after they are through their discussion and consideration,

perhaps not exactly in the present form of the Covenant but in some satisfactory form, the events of the world, the compulsion that comes from world events, plus the judgment and conscience of the American people, will bring them into the League. Whether they come or not is a matter for themselves and for themselves alone to settle, but the nations of the world will give them a most cordial welcome into the League. Apparently one of the surprises of the Assembly was the independent attitude of the representatives from the Dominions of the British Empire. The representatives from the majority of the states apparently went to Geneva believing that the views of the Dominions and their votes would necessarily follow the views and votes of Great Britain; and when they found this view did not prevail, there was very great surprise. When one of the Canadian delegates incidentally mentioned, by way of illustrating a certain point, that we in Canada did not even permit the statesmen of the Mother Country, for whom we had the greatest respect and administration, to interfere with our domestic affairs, they thought it was proclaiming a revolution. They had an idea that the statesmen of Great Britain managed our affairs. The London Times correspondent remarked that the Assembly would have been worth while if for no other reason than to enable the nations of the world to see, by actual demonstration, what the British Empire really is. The representatives of the nations thought that an empire could not exist in which the various parts had freedom to express their own opinions. They failed to appreciate the fact that this is the very reason why the British Empire does exist, and that without freedom it could not exist at all. They had not realized that the self-governing Dominions have passed from the colonial status and are now free self-governing and sovereign states under a common sovereign, on an equality with the Mother Country. I am sure the experience of other delegates present at the Assembly will confirm the conclusion which I know I reached, that Canada had a larger liberty, a more real independence, and a vastly greater influence as one of the states of the British Commonwealth than she could possibly have as an independent state outside the British Empire. While we claim the fullest freedom for the individual parts of the Empire we must also keep in view the importance of maintaining the unity of the Empire as a whole. One is just as important as the other. When the forces of disintegration are at work among the various peoples and nations of the world, there is no force existing to-day with such a stabilizing influence for law and order, and peace and justice, as the British Commonwealth of free nations. I am asked if the League will succeed—

Mr. BELAND: May I say a word before my hon. friend considers that point. I thought he was going on to speak on the question of the admission of states to the League. Will he gratify the House by emphasizing somewhat the point regarding the admission of Germany, in regard to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) spoke? Is he in a position to say whether the general sentiments of the members of the League were in favour of or were opposed to the admission of Germany at the present time?

Mr. ROWELL: It is difficult to express any more than one's own personal opinion on such a matter. Germany did not apply for admission to the League, therefore the question did not come before the Assembly in any form on which it could take action. It was mentioned several times in the debates and many delegates expressed the hope that Germany would be admitted at an early date. One of the most striking incidents of the whole Assembly occurred during the discussion on the admission of Austria. M. Motta, President of Switzerland, and one of the ablest delegates in the Assembly, speaking on the admission of Austria expressed the hope that the time would not be far distant when Germany, the United States and Russia would be admitted, pressing the contention that the League would not accomplish its greatest results or perform its best service to the world until these other Great Powers were admitted. He had no sooner mentioned the word Germany than M. Viviani immediately arose and asked for the floor, and when the President of Switzerland resumed his seat, M. Viviani delivered the most eloquent and moving oration of the whole Assembly. When he resumed his seat he was given an ovation by the entire Assembly. In that very eloquent and impassioned speech M. Viviani based his argument on Article 1 of the Covenant, and his contention was that Germany had not yet given evidences of her sincere intention to perform her international obligations, and

speaking on behalf of France he said: "When Germany did give evidence of such an intention they would no longer object to her admission to the League." All that is the point upon which the controversy will arise, and it is a question upon which the various states would no doubt record their opinion, as they believed in the sincerity of Germany's intentions or did not so believe. In the provisions of the Reparations Agreement which was recently submitted by the Supreme Council to Germany and which is to be discussed at the Conference to be held in London next week, it was stated in the press that one of the penalties which was to be imposed on Germany if she did not carry out the agreement was exclusion from the League of Nations. That has been stated in several press despatches. I understand that that is not the form of the clause in the agreement. The clause is to the effect that they will not sanction the admission of Germany. The Supreme Council have no right to determine whether Germany shall or shall not be admitted. That is a matter which is left exclusively to the Assembly. The Assembly is the only body who can determine the admission of new states. I take it that all that this declaration in the Reparations Agreement means is that the powers represented at the Supreme Council, say to Germany; "If you do not carry out this agreement we will not ourselves sanction your admission," and they would justify that no doubt on the ground that if she did not carry out those terms she would not have furnished evidence of her sincere intention to observe her international obligations. I hope I have answered by hon. friend's question.

Mr. BELAND: Thank you.

Mr. ROWELL: You ask, Will the League succeed? Its form may change, but the ideals for which it stands will prevail because they meet a great human need. It has been said truly: 'Humanity has struck her tents and is on the march.' She is leaving the low plains, strewn with the bodies of her dead, where the sounds of her drums are almost drowned by the cries of the wounded and the dying. She is on the march to the high uplands, which promise a new order and a better day. The way may be long and difficult; there are many obstacles to be overcome and heights to be scaled; the journey may cost much in tears, in blood and in treasure—but the bugle will never sound the retreat. Humanity is on the march and will not pitch her tents till the heights are scaled and the uplands are reached. Canada, breathing the free and invigorating air of the new world, untrammeled by either the prejudices or the traditions of the old, is in the very forefront of this advance. If our faith and our courage fail us not we will keep our place until the goal is reached.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I will frankly admit at the start that it is not my intention to join in the chorus of praise and eulogy which has been uttered with respect to the new Prime Minister by the originators of this debate. Not that I underestimate the ability of the Prime Minister, but to my mind his name is associated with some of the nefarious measures which have been put through this Parliament and from which the Canadian people are still suffering. I consider him responsible to a certain degree for the feeling of unrest and mistrust which at present prevails in the country, and in strict accordance with the terms of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition I charge him with usurping power and occupying an indefensible and unconstitutional position at the head of a Government which has not been, and never will be, given mandate by the Canadian people. I am not ignorant of the courtesy that we should certainly accord to the right hon. gentleman, but I consider the debt has been paid, and possibly overpaid, by our leader himself, whose courtesy was met in a very strange way. What did the Prime Minister, with that sardonic smile and irrepressible irony which are customary to him, say to the leader of the Opposition. Let me quote the Prime Minister's words:

> I assure him here and now that if the essential humour of his addresses is always to be so thinly covered by a veil of argument and satire our relations will never be disturbed in parliament.

Possibly, Mr. Speaker, I should not interfere, but I may be permitted to say that if weak arguments make for good friendships we should not feel so bitter towards the Prime Minister on account of his last speech.

The debate on the Address and the amendment thereto has already lasted for a week and has wandered somewhat from the main point in discussion, as is often the case under such circumstances. My intention is to restrict my observations to the main point of discussion, and to discuss the right of the present Government to retain power and to administer the affairs of the

country under the prevailing circumstances. To do so it may be necessary to throw a brief glance at what has taken place in, or around, the Government since the last session. My right hon. friend became Prime Minister on a warm July day last summer. The Unionist party was dying, in fact it had become moribund, and it seemed imperative to its leaders that a new group, or the semblance of a new affiliation, should be formed; and much, Mr. Speaker, as Unionism had been formed in 1917 to cover the sins and the omissions of the war Tory party, this right hon. gentleman was entrusted with the task of forming the semblance of a new party to cover the sins and omissions of Unionism. Accordingly the right hon. gentleman was chosen—not by the people, not even by a convention representing the Conservative Party at large; he was chosen by a group of parliamentarians who formed part of the crumbling remnants of the majority of 1917. The right hon. gentleman was satisfied with the choice, and with the little authority that it conveyed, and he went to work on his programme and began his appeal to the people. Do not, Mr. Speaker, be deceived by this statement. When I say "his appeal to the people" I do not mean an appeal through the polls but an appeal through speeches. He did not tell the people "Vote and decide for yourselves." He said "Listen and see how nicely I can speak." Then my right hon. friend formed his Cabinet. He gathered around him some of the Ministers of the old Administration who were ready to serve under him and he infused new blood by choosing two of his partisans out of the majority of 1917. He was very careful to choose them in constituencies where there would be no risk in the by-election. My right hon. friend's party is bragging about these victories in St. John and Colchester; but, Mr. Speaker, it was not surprising that out of over one hundred partisans the Government was able to pick two constituencies where it could safely risk an election. I will frankly admit the personal reputation of my right hon. friend as a great debater. This it was that gave rise to the legend, very carefully spread throughout the country, that the new Saviour was born, that the old Tory Party had been rejuvenated, and that very bright days were ahead for the Ministry. By that time the magnates of the new administration had got together and had decided upon a new title for the Party. They gave it the compound and complex name of the National Liberal and Conservative Party. It is very striking, Mr. Speaker, how history repeats itself. We have read of another period in our history when something like this took place. A speech of Hon. Edward Blake has often been quoted in this House, reciting what took place when the Liberal-Conservative Party was formed in the Eighties. I do not now wish to quote from that speech more than a few of the more striking passages. Here they are:

> The Tory Party in the old world and in Canada has from time to time chosen to adopt aliases, it has chosen to adopt new names, it has designated itself by a variety of epithets which it thought from time to time would conceal its identity, and would enable it to mislead under a new and more attractive guise. It was not the Tory Party at all I had to oppose when I first came to the County of Bruce. It was the Coalition Party—the "Party of Union and Progress." They were quite insulted if you called them Tories. Then there was a No-Party Party. Then there was a Patent Combination Party. Then it became the National Policy Party. As Liberal principles grew strong they have from time to time called themselves "Liberal-Conservatives", in order that they might get weak-kneed Reformers to join them because of the name liberal.

These remarks of the Hon. Edward Blake are very striking because again to-day we have a coalition looking for a name, or rather we have a title which misrepresents as M. Blake pointed out; we have a few week-kneed reformers, trailing round behind the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government.

Anyway, the Prime Minister went on his great speaking tour, and he first staged his Barnum-like circus in Sherbrooke. We feel very grateful to him for having chosen our native province to make his initial bow as the angel of peace and harmony. What was his message to the province of Quebec? That all the misunderstandings of the past were to be forgotten, that all the slanderous posters, all the code telegrams and all the vote manipulations were to be ignored; nothing survived, Mr. Speaker, but his great love for the province of Quebec. And the host of paid supporters, who had been given free transportation from Montreal to Sherbrooke, surrounded him on the platform and applauded him so heartily that the Tory press throughout the country was enabled to report that he was winning the heart of the province of Quebec, and to spread the belief in Ontario and the West that he was winning fresh support from us. This comedy of the Sherbrooke meeting, coupled with the by-elections in the Maritime provinces, was framed, I say, to convince the people that this new party was going to be very vigorous under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman.

But alas, a series of mishaps followed, and soon dispersed to the winds the "thin humour," as my right hon. friend would say, of that comedy. The first of these mishaps was his vain effort to have the Canadian people forget his own record and that of the past Administration and to confine their attention mainly to the tariff. It is true, there had been war scandals; it is true, there had been a general state of waste and incompetency; it is true, there had been a lamentable disregard of public interests; it is true, there had been a disastrous railway policy, originated by my right hon. friend and carried out to the point of collapse; it is true, there had been electoral shifts and distortions which were due to my right hon. friend's inventive genius. But that did not count—nothing counted but the tariff; and the Prime Minister, called to the bar of public opinion, assumed the attitude of the defendant in a court of justice who asked on what ground he was first to be tried, and said: "Try me, not on what I did in the past, but on what I will do in the future."

Another mishap was that remarkable peroration delivered by the Prime Minister in Granby and other centres, when he portrayed himself as the nation's saviour and all his adversaries as nation wreckers, anarchists and bolshevists. I know that my right hon. friend has laboured very patiently to establish that he never said that, but even his own explanation retains very much of the doubtful flavour of the original declaration. Here is what the Montreal Gazette reported of his Granby speech:

> The Premier proceeded to show how the Farmer's Party was committed to free trade, and that the strength of that organization was enhanced by the undoubted fact that it had joined hands with and dragged behind it all the malcontents and restless elements of the country. "I do not say that the leaders of that party, much less their followers, want to overturn responsible government, but I do say that those with whom they have aligned themselves, as, for instance, the Winnipeg and Vancouver seditionists, had as their goal the upsetting of the system of government in Canada."

When the right hon. Prime Minister was confronted with these words this is the explanation he gave to Mr. Drury himself:

> A new party has arisen in Canada, best described as a farmers' free trade party. It has issued a platform. It demands to be placed in power in Canada. It has covered under its banner and trails behind it every class of theorist and malcontent, and to-day, beyond all doubt, it constitutes the most numerous and strongest organization opposed to the present Government. "Indeed," added the Prime Minister, "at other points I plainly stated that the farmers were not inimical to responsible government, but unfortunately had aligned with them many others who were."

In another instance when confronted with the charge of having said those words in Granby he was more concise—he flatly and emphatically declared that he had never said anything of the kind at Sherbrooke.

New mishaps came later in the shape of by-elections,—not in those safe constituencies which had been carefully chosen by the right hon. gentleman, but in by-elections in counties which were opened in the ordinary course of events. It is not my intention to analyze the vote in Yale,—that has been done before, and we all know that the majority of the Government dwindled practically to nothing. Nor is it my intention to analyze the vote which was given in East Elgin, an old Tory county, where the Farmers' candidate was elected.

But perhaps we should stop, and it is very refreshing to do so, at the result in West Peterborough. We now have the official figures of that election, and what do they show, Mr. Speaker? They show that not only the Liberal candidate had a plurality of over one thousand, but also that the Government candidate was defeated by the combined registered vote of his opponents to the extent of over four thousand. But we hear them say that the Tory vote was split between Mr. Burnham and Mr. Denne, and that the support given to Mr. Burnham would have been transferred to the Government's candidate had Mr. Burnham not been in the field. Well, let us see the kind of appeal Mr. Burnham made to the electorate in that particular instance. I have here his manifesto, but I will quote only the first two paragraphs, as they are very interesting: He states:

> Owing to my resignation a by-election will be held here on February 7th. I resigned because when Liberals and others joined in electing me to support the Union Government of Sir Robert Borden in 1917, I promised, as did Sir Robert Borden and those supporting him, to go to the people in a general election when the war was over. Without that promise it would have been useless and unfair to ask for Liberal support. Union Liberals were warned against a trap, but they could not believe that anybody would betray their trust. And who would have believed it? The Union Governement was elected for the period of the war, and no longer.
>
> But the war eneded and the Union Government ended,—

So states Mr. Burnham.

—and why was the promised general election not held? Because, without any mandate or mission from anybody on earth but themselves, Messrs. Meighen and Calder seized the reins of

power and announced to an astonished Canada a new Government and a new party? "The National Liberal and Conservative Party." The members of the Conservative Party and of the Liberal Party were directed to hand in their submission to the new Party without delay. Was there ever such a hold-up staged before? This is the age of hold-ups, it is true, but till now no one has attempted to run off with two parties and a whole state.

It will be seen from this manifesto of Mr. Burnham that not only the Liberal vote and the Farmer vote of that constituency went against the candidate of the right hon. Prime Minister, but also at least fifty per cent of the Conservative vote polled by Mr. Burnham.

So significant was the result that the next morning an editorial appeared in the Montreal Gazette, which said:

Why not an appeal?

The Government has declared its intention to live out its term, and constitutionally has a right so to do. Its parliamentary majority may prolong its existence for nearly another two years. But, will it continue as a strong Ministry for that period? A majority somewhat perilous when Parliament prorogued has been reduced. The bye-elections won by the Government mean merely the retention of seats, and indicate no new popular confidence, while the contested seats like East Elgin and West Peterboro have swung to the Opposition, and weakened to that extent the strength of the Ministry. Governments are not constitutionally upset by loss of a bye-election or two, but no government can disregard the hand-writing; and above all no government can gain in the present, nor survive in the future, that does not owe its existence to popular support.

Further, the Gazette says:

If more time permitted, Parliament might have another session, and, after redistribution of seats, dissolve the House. In ordinary course, this would be the way of procedure, the way we have hoped would be pursued; but in the circumstance of adverse results from recent by-elections the situation is changed, and the advice we have to give to the Government is to proceed with the Supply Bill and then permit the electorate to express its preference for parties in order that stable administration and confident policy may be carried on. The situation is now uncertain; the life of the Ministry hangs by a thread; and under this circumstance strong and effective administration of affairs is impossible.

Did my hon. friend pay any attention to this advice from his friends?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. RINFRET: Did he pay any attention to the popular verdict in Peterborough? Did the Government decide to appeal to the people? A few days later we had the reply in the Gazette correspondence emanating from Ottawa, with the following headlines, which were very clear:

New Ministers have already been Selected. Problem now is to Create Necessary Vacancies. By-Elections as Test Government's Fixed Policy—

"Fixed policy."

—is to retain power for Two More Sessions.

I will not read the correspondence, but I would like to read the last paragraph:

If such an amendment was adopted, or the Government lost further by-elections, an early appeal to the country would be obligatory. Under such circumstances the Government will carefully select test constituencies, except in the Province of Quebec, where the choice is very limited. The Ontario constituencies in view are counted safe for the Government, as are the Western constituencies that will be offered representation in the Government. It is the fixed policy of the Government to retain power for two more sessions.

The Gazette had foreseen the amendment which came from the Opposition.

Quite a curious policy. That was the response to the people. But, Mr. Speaker, the verdict in Peterborough was not "Reorganize;" it was: "Clear out." But my hon. friend will not clear out; he will reorganize in choice constituencies, of which the number is "very limited" in Quebec.

My right hon. friend has been angling for months in Quebec for a fish, as the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) very aptly and very properly put it yesterday. But the fish do not seem to be in biting form just now. The hon. gentleman has come to us begging for support. In 1917 we were bad, disloyal citizens, pro-German, slackers; but now my hon. friend comes to us and begs us to aid him against another class of bad citizens—those anarchists, Bolshevists and revolutionary farmers from the West.

The action of the Ministry in my province has been very properly compared to that of the old farmer's dog which goes part of the way with every passer-by but always comes back alone. One of the passers-by has stopped at the gate—possibly I should say, sat on the fence, but in this case it seems that after looking him over the dog decided not to come back. Such was the situation when the House met a week ago.

After the Address in Reply had been moved the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) very properly offered a motion of non-confidence in the Government. By what right, asked the leader of the Opposition, does the Government hold power? If it is a new Government it should appeal to the people. If it is an old Government, its mandate ceased with the war.

He showed very clearly that the main issue in 1917 was the war, the sending of reinforcements to the Canadian Army in the trenches.

Mr. McMASTER: By conscription.

Mr. RINFRET: By conscription. The Prime Minister himself said that he based his appeal on the rock of compulsory service. Possibly he thinks he is now consistent when he seeks to impose compulsory government on an unwilling people.

The leader of the Opposition further established that in all civilized countries—in fact, in all countries except Russia—elections had taken place since the conclusion of the war. The reply of the Prime Minister to the speech of the leader of the Opposition was short, occupying less than an hour. To those who have heard him on former occasions and know what a pugnacious speaker and an astute lawyer he is, it was very easy to understand that he was labouring under a great difficulty; that he had to defend a very bad case. He went on, anyway, and offered a series of arguments which I wish to deal with very briefly before I resume my seat.

In his first argument he took exception to the form of the amendment itself. He found fault because, he said, the amendment was presented in naked form and that no reasons were stated in the amendment in support of what it called for. But, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is a motion of non-confidence in the Government, and the speech of the leader of the Opposition is full of reasons for the presentation of that amendment.

The Prime Minister went further and said that he held office by right of the confidence of the majority of Parliament elected by a majority of the people. Well, we have questioned that very often. There is the question of the war mandate, and also the question of the manner in which the elections were carried out in 1917. I shall not go over the whole field; I wish merely to remind the Prime Minister that the majority of the war Government was over seventy and that that majority had dwindled down to twenty-five or twenty-six on the occasion of the last important vote in the last session of Parliament. And you must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that fourteen of the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite were elected not by the civilian vote, not by the soldier vote, but by those bunches of soldier votes which were so freely applied to the constituencies in which they were needed. Here is a list of those constituencies: Brant, Essex South, Nipissing, Perth South, Cape Breton South and Richmond—two members—Cumberland, Hants, Pictou, Skeena, King's, P.E.I., Queen's, P.E.I., Edmonton West, and Yukon, a total of fourteen seats. If you take those fourteen votes from that side of the House across to this side, you will understand that makes a difference of twenty-eight in the counting of the votes. Therefore, even if we take the verdict of 1917, my right hon. friend to-day has actually no majority even in the House.

Then there was another argument. My right hon. friend said that the winning of the war was not the only issue in the last election. Oh, he was very careful; the way he said it was this. He admitted that the winning of the war was the great issue, the overwhelming issue, the issue that overshadowed all others; but yet not only the only issue. And he said: There are problems arising out of the war that we must deal with. If we reason in this way, when you take into account that some members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force are going to be pensioned for possibly fifteen or twenty years to come, if this Government is going to stay in power until all the problems arising out of the war are settled, we might as well go home. But he said: There have been other examples; in 1904 the election was waged on the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific; yet after the Grand Trunk Pacific had been started, the Government remained in power; in 1911 the election was waged on the reciprocity issue, and yet, after reciprocity was put aside, the Government remained in power. But really this is not a serious argument. Who does not know that in 1917 the situation was not an alignment of one party against the other, but the calling in of members from all parties around the one issue of the war and nothing else. There is no precedent in our country for an election such as the one in 1917.

Then the Prime Minister dealt with the by-elections. But the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has dealt so well with that subject that I wish to make only one remark in regard to a point which possibly has not been exemplified fully in the discussion. Since 1917, there have been, all told, sixteen by-elections, of which the Government has won five, the Liberal party has won five and the Independent Party—Farmers and Labour—has won six. That means that the Government has won less than one-third of the total. But there is one

more important point. The five elections that the Government has won are elections in counties that it has itself chosen to open. The county of Kingston was opened for the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton); the county of Victoria, for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie); the counties of St. John and Colchester, for the two new ministers; and the county of Yale was laid open in order to appoint the ex-Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue to a Parliamentary Librarianship. These are the five victories the Government has won, choosing five counties out of the 232 seats in the Dominion. But if you stick to the elections in counties that have been thrown open in the ordinary course of events, the Borden Government and this Government have not won a single election.

The redistribution argument has also been dealt with. We had the same case in 1911. We all know that every ten years a census must be taken and that the year after there must be a redistribution. But is there any provision in the law that if an election is pending, say a year before the census or a year before a redistribution, there must be a delay in order to have that work done? In 1900, there was an election, and in 1901 the census was taken in the regular way. In 1911, the census was going on when there was an election on the reciprocity issue. As regards redistribution, I must altogether take exception to the statement made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) who claimed that in Quebec the people did not want an election; that they wanted to wait because their condition was to be improved by the census. Every member from the province of Quebec knows that the moment you set foot on the pavement of your county—or, if it is a rural county, on the road—your electors will flock around you asking: "When are you going to have an election?" The people of Quebec resent their isolation; or rather they do not feel that they are isolated; they feel that they are with the rest of the country against an isolated Government. There are things you must isolate yourself from—at present the province of Quebec is isolated from smallpox.

I shall take up just one more argument that the Prime Minister has used in the debate, and it relates to the tariff. Oh, the tariff! It would be such a nice thing if you would be talking of nothing but the tariff. The tariff is everywhere in his speech; it comes in here and there, and it adorns every page of the Hansard report of his speech. The Prime Minister takes exception to action of the leader of the Opposition because, while last year the latter was discussing the tariff this year he moves an amendment that the Government has no mandate to revise the tariff. This is not illogical at all. The stand taken by my hon. friend last year and again this year is that the Government has no mandate; but if this servile and easily convinced majority decides that the Government will go on, will that mean that we shall have to fold our arms, and let everything go through? Again this year. I, and certainly we all, intend to discuss the tariff if the majority will not throw the issue before the public, but there is nothing illogical about that stand. The argument goes further.

My right hon. friend says: We will not have an election because the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the leader of the Opposition do not agree on the tariff. This is a wonderful argument. Have you ever heard a Prime Minister tell the country: We will not have an election because groups of my adversaries do not agree upon a certain matter? This is the most extraordinary argument that has ever been uttered in this House. What has this supposed or real disagreement between the hon. member for Red Deer and the leader of the Opposition to do with the right of the Prime Minister to sit in his chair? How does it affect the constitutional question? What is the argument in a discussion of this kind, whether the leader of the Opposition is inclined to a tariff for revenue or whether the hon. member for Red Deer is a free trader? It has nothing at all to do with the discussion. The Prime Minister, dealing with one argument from this side the other day, made the remark that it was verging on the absurd. My impression, if I am not too rude, is that in this case the argument is not only verging upon but diving head forward into the uttermost depths of absurdity. Such is the argument, or rather the lack of argument, of the right hon. gentleman in response to the amendment from this side of the House.

The next member of the Government to rise and speak on this matter was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and he was so much impressed with the soundness of the attitude of his Government on this point that he never spoke a word about it, but gave us a very interesting address on the League of Nations. In fact, I have heard so far

only two speeches in support of the attitude of the Government, the speech of the Prime Minister himself and that of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier), the one because he does not want to get out and the other because he is very anxious to get in. But the Government and its supporters have offered no argument; they have not even attempted to justify their course of action, their usurpation of power, their desperate clinging to office in face of an unwilling and ever protesting people.

But they say they we are not sincere. They say we are moved by political considerations. They say we are bluffing. Well, if they think we are not sincere, if they really think we are bluffing, why do not they call our hand? I say Mr. Speaker, that we are animated by no such motives. We are not seeking any party advantage. We are merely conveying to the foot of your Chair the persistent and ever-growing clamour of the Canadian people for a general election. This clamour can be heard all over the Dominion. It comes from the Pacific coast, from the mavellous region of the Rockies, from the great billowy plains of the West, from the industrial centres and the farming districts of Ontario, from the ever loyal and over-slandered province of Quebec, and from the peaceful yet progressive provinces by the Atlantic. All with one voice are claiming a right dearly fought for in earlier years, and enjoyed in the past, but which is denied them to-day—the right to elect their representatives. It may be that the general elections will bring back the Liberals to power; it may be that they will return the Farmers; it may be that they will give the victory to another group or party. But that is not the question; we are not arguing for advancement, we are arguing principles and the constitution; we are not clamouring for power for ourselves, but we are asking for power for whatever party can command a majority in a proper and newly elected Parliament representing the paramount will and the indestructible rights of the Canadian people.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my humble word of praise to those which have already been passed upon the mover and the seconder of the Address. I also wish to avail myself of this opportunity to convey to the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) my most hearty congratulations on his elevation to the high position which he now occupies. I think, Sir, when we lay aside our party differences, we are all agreed that the people of the Dominion of Canada, as much as the people of any other country in the world, have reason to be proud of the men who from time to time have occupied the position of Prime Minister of Canada, and it is my firm and pleasing conviction that in the present Prime Minister we have a man who will maintain the best traditions of his office, and be worthy of his distinguished predecessors.

The hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), in the course of his admirable address, made specific and special reference to the question of apples. It may be of interest to that hon. gentleman to know—and I desire to bring this up while the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is here, if he would not mind staying for a moment—that last year this question was brought up in the House in a speech made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). On that occasion the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) asked this question of the hon. member for Marquette:

> Is the hon. gentleman in favour of making apples free?

The answer given by the hon. member for Marquette was:

> Certainly, I am in favour of making apples free. My hon. friend from Annapolis is badly mistaken if he thinks he is putting a poser to me in that regard.

I commend the hon. member for Marquette for his candour in answering that question. There was no equivocation, no side-stepping, no quibbling. He was not at that time disposed to deal with that particular item of the tariff at all events, by a method which has since occurred to him—the method of easy stages. Now we know where the hon. member for Marquette, the leader of the Southeast party here, stands in regard to that particular item in the tariff. We also know the attitude of the Government. The Government stands for protection for the fruit industry. Now the question I wish to address to the hon. leader of the Opposition is the question that was put last session by the hon. member for Annapolis to the leader of the Southeast party. I wish to ask him this question: Are you in favour of making apples free? I trust my voice carried across to the hon. gentleman's desk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. While the hon. member for Frontenac is quite within his right in submitting a question, I must point out to him that it would be a most

unusual proceeding if an hon. member who had the floor were at liberty to interrogate individual members in their seats and expect a reply. It is not in order. Ia has never been done, and it may not be done. The only occasion upon which a question can properly be put and an answer be expected, is when an hon. member who is speaking is addressed by an hon. member from his seat.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member for Frontenac is in order in defining a party by a point of the compass?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think that it would be easy to define the party to which my hon. friend belongs by anything more definite than a point of the compass. I was alluding to its location in this chamber. It remains to be seen whether the party itself will define itself any more definitely in the future. Before I sit down I shall endeavour to show that it has not definitely defined its position so far, but as a matter of fact has shifted its position on many occasions, as my hon. friend from Red Deer has done more than once.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Not on that question.

Mr. EDWARDS: I quite agree that it is within the right of an hon. member who is addressed not to answer or to answer as he sees fit. I do not think I am the first who has put a question of that kind. My object must have been very apparent. I thought it advisable to get a little definite information as to the attitude of the different parties in relation to the tariff. We know the attitude of two parties, and I thought it would be nice to get the attitude of the other party. But if the hon. leader of the Opposition does not choose to answer my question I have no right, of course, to press for an answer.

The leader of the Opposition, in the course of his speech the other day, dwelt entirely with the question of the right of the present Government to hold office. That was the burden of his song through out the whole of his lengthy and rather vociferous speech. The hon. gentleman contended that Parliament should dissolve. On what does he base that contention? Let us briefly examine his remarks and see. He gave as one of the reasons, that some of the ministers who were in the cabinet in 1917 are not in the present Government. Well, I think I am correct in saying that the Hon. A. G. Blair, who was a distinguished member of the Laurier government, at one time saw fit on a matter of Government policy to resign his portfolio, but I have never heard of anyone bringing that forward as a reason why the government of that day should dissolve parliament.

My hon. friend says that the prime minister who led the government in 1917 has resigned office, and a new Prime Minister has come in, and he gives that as a reason for dissolution. Well, that was not considered a sufficient reason for dissolution in 1896, when the late Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat resigned his position as Prime Minister of Ontario to take a seat in the Laurier Cabinet at Ottawa. A new Prime Minister was chosen for that province, but no person at that time considered, and least of all, the Liberals, that it was a reason why an election should be brought on in that province. At the same time, in the province of Nova Scotia, the present member for Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding) resigned the Premiership and a new man was appointed to take his place. No one advanced that as a reason for dissolution of the Provincial Legislature. Nor was it advanced as a reason for dissolution of Parliament when the late Rt. Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell resigned his position as Prime Minister of this country. That being one of the contentions advanced by the leader of the Opposition has nothing to back it up.

He says that the Government has no right to carry on because a number of hon. gentlemen who formerly sat on this side of the House have withdrawn their support from the Government and now occupy seats across the floor. Well, if the leader of the Opposition could say to the Government: "A number of Liberals who were elected in 1917 as Liberal-Unionists have withdrawn their support from the Government of the day, having seen the light in the window, and have crossed over to my side of the House and now give me the allegiance which they formerly gave you," —if he could say that, he could at least draw some comfort from the fact and his arguments would show some force. But if we examine the departure of gentlemen who formerly sat on this side of the House and are now opposite, we find that the very fact of their segregating themselves in a separate part of the Chamber, the very fact which is taken by the leader of the Opposition as an indication that those gentlemen no longer have confidence in this Gov-

ernment, or at least can no longer give it their support, is also evidence that they have no confidence in the party led by the leader of the Opposition.

But Mr. Speaker, if defections from a party are a reason for dissolution, then what is the position of the leader of the Opposition? Have there been no defections from his ranks? In this House yesterday we listened to a very vigorous speech delivered by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), and I do not think that any one who heard that speech could gather from it that that hon. member, one of the most stalwart Liberals of Quebec, has any confidence in the present leader of the Opposition or would like to see him at the head of a Government. I could not gather anything like that from his remarks. But not only in this House, but from one end of this country to the other we have ample evidence of defections from the Liberal party as at present constituted and led.

The leader of the Opposition put the question several times: By what right does the Prime Minister lead the Government? I should like to ask him a similar question. By what right does he continue to lead the Liberal party? What is a party? Is it merely an aggregation of men who blindly follow some one who has been chosen as leader? Or is an aggregation of men who subscribe to and endorse certain political platforms and policies? I could not do better, perhaps, than to quote the definition given by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) yesterday. He said that a political party is an association of men who have joined themselves together for the purpose of advancing the public interests on certain principles of policy which they hold in common. Well, if we are to judge the Liberal party by that definition, we are in the position of having no party to judge.

The Liberal party to-day in this House is a thing of shreds and patches. I doubt very much if you can find half a dozen men sitting behind the Leader of the Opposition who come under the definition given by the member for Brome, as holding views in common. In one part of the country one of them is a free trader, so he says; in another part of the country some other member of the same party is an ardent protectionist. The same convention which in August, 1919, selected the present leader of the Opposition to that position also framed a political platform. Has the leader of the Opposition lived up to the pledge he gave to carry that platform into effect?

[Mr. Edwards.]

My hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) referred to by-elections. Let us see what some of those by-elections disclosed in the way of departure from certain principles which were laid down in that convention. In the constituency of Yale we find the present leader of the Opposition supporting a candidate who declared that he stood for protection, repudiating that particular part of the Liberal platform dealing with the principal necessaries of life in the way of food. In the constituency of Peterborough we find him supporting a candidate who repudiates the platform of the Liberal party in so far as the tariff as it affects industries is concerned. The Liberal candidate in Peterborough did not say that he endorsed or stood by the Liberal platform. On the contrary, he says: "That is not my platform. My platform is contained in the word "Peterborough" and I stand for the retention of the tariff, for the retention of protection to Peterborough industries. In the constituency of East Elgin the Liberal candidate did not come out as endorsing the platform formulated in 1919 but on the contrary said that his views had not changed, that his views were the same as they were before that platform was formulated. The leader of the Liberal party went to East Elgin and in endorsing the candidature of the Liberal candidate he repudiated the whole of the Liberal platform, as he repudiated it in part in Yale and also in Peterborough.

By what right then does the present leader of the Opposition assume to lead the Liberal party? There are, I venture to say, many men in this country who gathered at the Liberal convention of 1919 and helped to formulate the platform—men who have not been trained in political acrobatics as the leader of the Opposition has and who find it impossible to follow the contortions of that gentleman in political matters. I cannot conceive and I cannot believe that the men who gathered at that convention from all parts of Canada and after careful deliberation formulated a platform, can continue to recognize as a true leader a gentleman who has sacrified them—sacrificed his party, the platform of that party, and every pledge he made—on the altar of political expediency, at one time in one constituency supporting a candidate who repudiates most emphatically one part of his platform and on another occasion supporting another candidate who repudiates another part of his platform. It seems to me, Sir, that the leader of the

Opposition, in view of his record during the past year, is the last man who should ask the leader of the Government by what right he holds his present position.

The leader of the Opposition has accused the Government of being usupers. Usurpers indeed! Are we then to consider as usurpers the men who have consistently adhered to a policy which has been the recognized policy on tariff matters in this country for forty years? Are we to consider those men usurpers and to regard as bona fide a gentleman who for the sake of attaining to the position of leader of a party endorsed a platform in its entirety and broke almost every plank of that platform as soon as he assumed the office which he now holds? If any person is entitled to be called a usurper of office it is the present leader of the Opposition.

That hon. gentleman has stated that in the election of 1917 there was only one issue before the country and that issue was the war. He laboured at some length by quotations from the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side to show that that was the only issue in the election of 1917. I think he exerted himself needlessly in that regard. There was one issue in the election of 1917 and that issue was of such vast importance as to overshadow every other thought that might be in the mind of a man running for Parliament. I think, therefore, it is quite right to say that the issue, and practically the only one, in the last election was the war and the carrying of it on to a successful conclusion. There were strong reasons for doing what was done at that time; there were strong reasons why that should be the issue. In 1914 we obtained by voluntary enlistment some ninety-six thousand men in Canada. In 1915 we obtained one hundred and ten thousand. In 1916 we obtained one hundred and seventy-nine thousand. In 1917 we obtained only fifty-six thousand. No one will claim that the need for men was less in 1917 than it was in any of the preceding years—the need was greater.

In Great Britain the need was recognized by all classes of the population and by none more so than by the women. Sir, some two million eight hundred thousand women in that little island were engaged in what may properly be called war service. Two hundred and seventy thousand of them were engaged in agriculture, tilling the fields and reaping the crops. Eight hundred and nineteen thousand were engaged in the metal trades; over seven hundred thousand were engaged in making munitions, and sixteen thousand five hundred were working in the shipyards. There was strong need if we were to maintain our national honour and be true to our pledge to back up the boys who had gone overseas, for the action that was taken in 1917, and good and sufficient cause why the war should be the main and practically the only issue.

During the years up to the election of 1917 the Government of this country was burdened with such responsibility as I venture to say never fell to the lot of any previous Government in Canada. Nevertheless they carried on. During those years the present leader of the Opposition was in a foreign country in close association with the greatest and most unscrupulous profiteering plutocrat on the face of the earth. When the election came on and the issue was whether Canada was true to the boys overseas or not—that in a word was what the issue amounted to—the present leader of the Opposition returned to Canada, became a candidate in the election, and did all he possibly could to prevent reinforcements from being sent overseas.

That was his attitude at that time, and no amount of declamation, no amount of bombast and no amount of vociferous vituperation on the part of the leader of the Opposition can hide that record. It is there, the people of this country know it—and when I say "the people of this country" I mean the people of all parties in this country. I am sure I am speaking what is right when I say that thousands of Liberals from one end of Canada to the other will never follow the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, and that they would regard it as a calamity if he ever came to occupy the position of Prime Minister.

My hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) said it was striking how history repeats itself. Yes, there are some striking examples of that. Away back in 1867, when men were just as strong-willed as are the men of to-day, when they were just as partisan as are their descendants of the present day, there were men big enough and broad enough to lay aside their party differences of opinion and to unite for a great purpose. Fifty years later history repeated itself, and the descendants of those men, to the everlasting honour of Canada, were big enough and broad enough to lay aside party differences and unite for a great purpose—the purpose of keeping faith with the boys who went over-

seas. Everybody knows the attitude of the men who were elected in 1917 on that great issue, and everybody knows the attitude of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. No amount of eloquence on his part can cover up his attitude at that time, nor make the red-blooded people of Canada have confidence in him.

The hon. the leader of the Opposition says that this Parliament has no right to deal with the tariff issue. He asked the question: Will any one say that the tariff is an issue arising from the war? Well, I would say: Yes, most emphatically, beyond question the tariff is an issue arising from the war. Can any person question that we have changed international commercial relations to-day, and that those changed relations have been brought about and are directly due to the great conflict through which we have passed? Every country in the world has been forced to recognize the effect which that war has had upon international commercial relations, and every country is studying the problem now and taking steps to adjust its tariff to meet the changed conditions. Most certainly the tariff, as it has been forced upon us by the war, is a condition arising from the war. The hon. gentleman says that we should not deal with the tariff, that it should be dealt with only by a Parliament truly representative of the people. Well, he did not hold that view last year. What has brought about the change in his mind? In the debates of last session he thought it was all right for a tariff resolution to be brought down and debated. What makes the difference between now and this time last year with regard to this Parliament dealing with the tariff?

But let us take him at his word. The tariff is a very important matter. I could quote from a great many public men, including the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), who for fifteen years held the office of Finance Minister and had much to do with tariff matters—I could quote him and many others to the effect that the tariff can not be tinkered with every few months, but has to be dealt with periodically. While I quite appreciate the importance of dealing with the tariff, my own opinion is that this Parliament would make a mistake if it dealt drastically with it at this session. It may be advisable to make certain changes and alterations, but I do not think the present time opportune to make any very general changes, especially in view of the fact that our principal trade is with our neighbour to the south and with Great Britain. A new party has been elected to office in the United States, a party which gave very definite and positive pledges in regard to tariff revision, and it seems to me that it would be the part of wisdom for this Parliament to defer a general revision of the trtiff until our neighbours to the south have given some indication, as they are bound to give, in redemption of their recent election pledges. We are more dependent upon the United States so far as this matter is concerned than they are upon us.

But appreciating the importance, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with the tariff, if it is advisable that it should only be dealt with by a Parliament truly representative of the people, then it seems to me that the leader of the Opposition in that very circumstance has advanced a good reason why there should not be a dissolution. This Parliament cannot be taken as truly representative of the people from the standpoint of representation by population; that can only be remedied after the census is taken. A few months from now that census will be taken, and after a redistribution we will have a Parliament truly representative of the peoeple, assuming, of course, that the redistribution will take into consideration the changes in population in the various provinces and in the various centres. No one can reasonably argue that an hon. gentleman representing a constituency of fifteen or twenty thousand people should have a say which would be as strong as that of three representatives from other parts. Yet it is true that until redistribution is effected we shall have some members representing a population of 70,000 or 80,000, while others, as in the case of the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster) represent a population of 13,000 or 14,000. So far as the matter affects the question of a parliament truly representative of the people dealing with the tariff, I do not think it needs any argument.

The member for St. James stated that fourteen members had been elected to this side in 1917 by the soldier vote; at least, that is the way I understood him. The statement of the hon. member is absolutely incorrect. I have before me a summary of the general election returns for 1917. All but four of the 82 members who were elected to this House from Ontario were elected by the civil vote, without regard to the soldier vote at all. Of the four, three were Conservative-Unionists and one

was a Liberal-Unionist. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the member elected for any constituency would have obtained at least as large a proportion of the votes of the soldiers overseas as he would of the votes of the soldiers who cast their ballots at home. If you allowed the member for Essex South only the same percentage of overseas votes as he received of the home soldier vote and gave the other votes to his opponent, he would still have a comfortable majority. That narrows it down to only three seats in Ontario which could possibly have been affected by any manipulation of the soldier vote, and there has been no charge that the slightest attempt was made to manipulate the soldier vote in Ontario.

Let us consider the province of Quebec. Out of sixty-five seats it is true that on that occasion only three supporters of the Government were elected. The hon. Minister of Marine had 1,446 of a majority of the civil vote, and 1,957 of a majority of the soldier vote, so that he could have made a present of 1,000 votes to his opponent and still have a majority of some 1,400. The member for St. Antoine had a majority of 1,583 of the civil vote; he could have given his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have had a majority of 1,100. In the case of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), he had a majority of 2,099 of the civil vote, and could have given his opponent 1,000 of his soldier votes and still have had a majority of 1,930. Surely the members of the Opposition who were elected by acclamation in 1917 have no grievance so far as any alleged manipulation of votes is concerned. I do not think that many hon. gentlemen on the other side were very deeply concerned or very much affected by the soldier vote. The member for Yamaska got eight soldier votes, all told. The member for St. Denis got 199 and one of his opponents got five. The member for Kamouraska received 11 soldier votes and his opponent 4. The member for Joliette received none and his opponent 3. So that for some reason the soldier vote did not seem to cut much ice down there; there did not seem to be many soldier votes in the province of Quebec.

I could give the details of the votes in all the other provinces, but I will sum it up in this statement which I have made before in the House, and which I am prepared to prove; that not one hon. member sitting in this House owes his majority to any manipulation of the soldier vote. Every hon. gentleman elected to this House in 1917 would have been elected if you accorded to him the same percentage of the overseas vote as he received of the home soldier vote and gave the balance to his opponent. I have the figures which will prove my statement to the hilt. Therefore, the remarks of the hon. member for St. James this afternoon in this connection are not borne out by the facts. The hon. member for St. James referred to several things in connection with which he considered the Government delinquent. But he did not go into details; he simply made a general, blanket statement, asserting that the Government's railway policy was wrong, that there had been extravagance, and so on. I can only assume that the reason why the hon. member did not attempt to back up his general statement with details was because he had no details with which to back them up—that is the only conclusion that I can come to.

But I should like to ask the hon. gentleman: If the Government was guilty of any of the sins or delinquencies which he charges them with, why did his leader move an amendment in such bald and naked terms? Why did his leader not move an amendment condemning the Government for some act that the Government had performed or some delinquincies on the part of the Government? It is strange that in all these by-elections, in all the speeches made from one end of the country to the other by the leader of the Opposition and those that supported him, they have unconsciously paid a tribute to the Government that, they say, should resign office because, while the Government has had a lot of work to do and has had to deal with millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, particularly during these years of the war, the Opposition, in all their speeches have made no specific charges against the Government in regard to their conduct of public business. They have not said: This Government should resign office because, during the years since 1917, it has failed to redeem its pledges to the people; it has failed to do properly the work which fell upon it to do. The only reason advanced by the leader of the Opposition is in effect: You have performed the work that you were supposed to perform and you have done it well, so well indeed that I am not finding any fault with it; but we want you to step down and out, because we want a chance to get in. Talk about holding on to office! There never was, I suppose, an hon. gentleman who took any part in the

political life of this country who has manifested such a crazy eagerness and at the same time an entire unfitness for office as the leader of the Opposition.

By-elections! West Peterborough, the one to which my hon. friends like to refer! Well, the by-election in West Peterborough resulted as it did. West Peterborough at least elected a man who repudiated the platform of the leader of the Opposition and was assisted in the election by that leader himself. That is the situation so fas as West Peterborough is concerned. But the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) quotes some remarks made by the former member for Peterborough West, Mr. Burnham, in which he expresses his opinion as to what should be done, and says that Parliament should dissolve, that there should be a general election. Does the leader of the Opposition hold that view? Apparently, yes. Why does not the leader of the Opposition show by acts that he holds that view? Why is it that he permits one of his principal lieutenants to hold two seats in this House? Why does he not prevail upon him to resign one of those seats and bring that question up as a great issue? The reason why, it seems to me, is about the same as the reason why his amendment is so naked and bald as it is. We are told by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) that one of the constituencies to which I refer is a constituency which would be disposed to favour free trade and that the other constituency is just as strongly disposed towards protection. The leader of the Opposition, who is so extremely courageous in regard to wanting a general election, is afraid to open the constituency which favours free trade for fear that he would have to appear on the platform and endorse, rather more openly than he cares to do down in this part of the country, the doctrine of free trade. He is equally afraid to have the other constituency opened for fear that he would be obliged, more openly than he cares to do, to advocate a policy of protection and thus lose some of the support which he hopes to get in the West, and which he will never get. That is one of the reasons why, I think, he does not allow one of those constituencies to have representation in this House, why he does not test out his view by having the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), who represents Gaspé and Maisonneuve, resign one of those seats and give an opportunity for an election. The leader of the Opposition has not shown any very strong disposition for an election in the past. It is true he has talked of elections, but when the elections were on in St. John and Colchester, the hon. gentleman, who was talking of elections and saying: "Oh, yes, we want to go to the country; we want to test public opinion, did not put up a man in Colchester and test public opinion. He took good care not to go down there; he went three thousand miles away. That is characteristic of the hon gentleman; he has done most of his fighting at a distance of about three thousand miles.

I could quote from remarks made, in times past, by many hon. gentlemen opposite, which, I think, would very strongly support this Government in the attitude it has taken, and support the members on this side in taking the course which they are taking. We have on this side men who, it is true, were elected as Liberal Unionists, others who were elected as Conservative Unionists, men who previously to 1917 followed one or other of the old political parties. On the other side of the House we have some hon. gentlemen saying that certain gentlemen on this side are untrue to Liberal principles in staying on this side of the House. I could quote from the utterances of a number of very prominent men to show that any Liberals who were elected in 1917 to sit on this side of the House are more consistent in sitting here and supporting this Government than they would be if they went across and sat behind the leader of the Opposition. What was the attitude of the Liberal party as regards the tariff for the fifteen years it was in power? Was its attitude for the fifteen years it was led by the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in keeping with the platform of the Liberal party as laid down in August, 1919? Not by any means. Take for instance, the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in regard to the industries of the country. I am quoting now from a speech which was sent broadcast throughout the country, a speech delivered by that right hon. gentleman on the 7th March, 1911. He says:

> I pass to a more important objection—

He was speaking of reciprocity.

> —really the only objection of any consequence that I know of. That objection is that this agreement will imperil our industries. How will it imperil our industries? This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in it except agricultural implements.

He might have gone on and said there was no very serious reduction made on agricultural implements. It is true that the attitude of the Liberal party of that day, led by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was in favour of taking the duties off foodstuffs, but so far as manufactured articles were concerned he made it very clear indeed that his attitude and the attitude of his party was not to interfere with the industries of this country. Therefore, I say that hon. gentlemen who are sitting on this side of the House are more consistent in their attitude on the trade policy of this country, which has been followed by all Governments for the last forty years, than are hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, and who laid down a platform—and that is the only guide we have as to their views—which they say themselves it is not advisable to attempt to carry out. Take, for instance, the statement of the hon. member for Shelbourne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in the House last session. Discussing the tariff, he said:

> I do not think myself, as things are going now, that we can look to that party for a sound tariff policy.

He was speaking of the Farmers' party. I entirely agree with him. I do not think we can. He went on:

> What then? I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal Tariff platform. I think myself that we will find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise, and we all find when we come to the responsibly of office that we may have to modify our views.

What faith, Mr. Speaker, can you place in a party which has for one of its principal men a man who can make a statement like that? The hon. member for Shelbourne and Queen's took part recently in the election in Peterborough, and of course he was told by the Liberal candidate there that it would not do to talk free trade in Peterborough, but, on the contrary, an assurance must be given to the people of that industrial centre that their industries would not be imperilled. What was the attitude of the hon. gentleman? Did he get up and quote to them from the platform of the Liberal party framed at the convention in Ottawa in August, 1919? No, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary he gets up and says: Why be alarmed, you Liberals, for your industries? Did we not make promises previous to 1896? Did we not say from one end of Canada to the other that if we only had an opportunity we would destroy protection root and branch, obliterate it entirely,—that was our statement in 1896, but gentlemen, did we do it?—for fifteen years we went back on the pledges and promises we had made previous to 1896; for fifteen years we proved false to the pledges which we had given throughout this country in the preceding eighteen years, so, surely, you men of Peterborough need no further guarantee that we can be false to our pledges again.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr Speaker, I had just about concluded my remarks before recess when you called it 6 o'clock. I have very few words to add to what I have already said, and I shall therefore occupy only a very few minutes more. I was about to call attention to a remark by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), who referred rather slightingly to certain members on this side of the House as weak-kneed reformers, and I believe that in connection with that remark he quoted some statement made some years ago by the late Hon. Edward Blake. Well, I presume there were people, tyros in politics like the hon. member, who years ago called Edward Blake names when he saw fit to dissociate himself from his leader on a great matter of public policy. I think, therefore, hon. members on this side may pass very lightly the derogatory remarks made by the hon. member for St. James in his speech.

Now, I want to put this question in all seriousness to the members of this House: Suppose this amendment should carry, what then? Let me give the opinion of the leader of the Opposition on that point. Speaking in the Peterborough election, as reported in the press, the hon. gentleman said that if this Government did as he claimed it should do and resigned, the constitutional procedure would be for His Excellency the Governor General to call upon the leader of the Opposition to form a Government and that the leader of the Opposition—of course, there is no doubt about this—would immediately accede to the request. That would not mean a general election; it would mean that the Cabinet ministers selected by the hon. gentleman would have to go to the country for election. So that in the event of this amendment carrying, the constitutional procedure would be that the hon. gentleman, on the advice of His Ex-

cellency, would endeavour to form a Government to carry on for the rest of the life of this Parliament, another year and a half or two years. On what mandate would he carry on? Is there any doubt that this is the course he would take? He has intimated that he would not proceed with a general tariff revision until he had put his house in order, and perhaps it would be several years before the question would be submitted to the people in regard to the tariff. The whole attitude of the hon. gentleman, borne out by his own speeches, goes to show that he is not, and has not been, actuated by high motives and lofty principles in making the demand he has made upon the Government to resign, but that he has been impelled solely by the desire to obtain office with the fruits thereof for himself. That is the situation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure the hon. member will allow me to make a statement in correction. He is purporting to quote a speech I made at Peterborough. If he will look at that speech he will discover that it is exactly the opposite of what he has said. What I stated in Peterborough was that if the present Government were defeated on a want of confidence vote, and the leader of the Opposition were called upon to form a Government, the Government so formed would not proceed to deal with the tariff, but would dissolve Parliament and have a general election and that the issue on the tariff would be discussed at that election. Nothing would be done by this Parliament to deal with the tariff one way or the other. This is the opposite of what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I wonder just how much nearer the people would be to relief if the hon. gentleman had his way, than if this Parliament continued for the rest of its term. The hon. gentleman says he would go ahead and form his Government. That would take some time; the year 1921 would be well on the way. I venture to say that if this motion carried and the hon. gentleman were called upon to form a Government, he would take good care that he put his fences in order as well as he possibly could. I think I am absolutely safe in saying that he would carry on until after redistribution had taken place. If he were called upon to form a Government, some time must elapse before he could get under way and the census, or at least that part of it relating to population, would have been taken. Does he mean to say that he wouid disregard that and proceed on the present distribution of constituencies and go to the people? I should like to ask him that question.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Ask him now.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have been reminded that while it is perfectly proper for an hon. member to ask me a question it is not competent for me, under the rules of the House, to ask another member any questions.

I do not intend to be called to order in that regard again. There is only one other thing to which I wish to refer. In the speech made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and also in that of the hon. member for St. James, we find very slighting references by both gentlemen to what they term a desire on the part of the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen) to court the favour of the province of Quebec. They declare that the Prime Minister has endeavoured to get Cabinet representation from that province; that being eager to obtain increased representation he has made overtures to the province of Quebec in that direction. Well, suppose that were true; is there anything unworthy in the supposition?

The province of Quebec is the oldest, the largest, and certainly one of the most important, of the provinces of Confederation. I am sure every person realizes and regrets —no one to a greater degree than the Prime Minister himself—the fact that Quebec has not greater representation in the Cabinet than it has to-day. Is it unworthy on the part of the Prime Minister that he should like to see that province with proper representation? Is that something to provoke sneers from hon. gentlemen opposite? It seems to me that the thinking men of the province of Quebec will view this matter in a different light from the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite regard it, if we are to judge from their remarks.

What does it disclose? We had some time ago, and from time to time we still have, little scraps in the Globe. The editorial utterances of that paper indicate the object and purpose of the whole propaganda. The Globe on the 4th August last said that the present Prime Minister had made a speech in this House bitter and stinging in its hostility and antagonism to the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister, speaking in the city of Sherbrooke, referred to this statement of the Toronto Globe and explicitly and most emphatically denied it, and he asked that paper to publish one single line or sentence

that he had ever uttered at any time indicating hostility or unfriendliness to Quebec.

Up to date the Globe has made no attempt to justify the lying assertion which its columns contained on the 4th August. It was and is a part of the plan of that paper to assist gentlemen like the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), the hon. member for St. James, and others, in carrying on a propaganda the purpose and object of which is to solidify the people of that Province against this Government by appeals to race prejudice. That is the whole purpose and object of these gentlemen, and that is what is behind the sneers which they pass across the floor of the House to the Prime Minister who in exhibiting friendliness for the province of Quebec to-day as Prime Minister is exhibiting a sentiment no different from that which he has manifested throughout his public life. It is a cheap kind of political propaganda, it is an unworthy propaganda to carry on, but it is the kind of propaganda which has been and is still being carried on by certain hon. gentlemen opposite. I am glad to know that there is at least one member from the province of Quebec, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) who has disassociated himself from such unworthy attacks as those indulged in by the member for Brome and the juvenile member for St. James.

I challenge the leader of the Opposition, or any of those sitting behind him, to quote one single sentence, one single line, one single thought expressed in words by the present Prime Minister of Canada at any time, in this House or out of it, which has indicated the slightest feeling of hostility or unfriendliness to the people of the province of Quebec. I do not wonder at the member for Brome giving utterance to such statements as those referred to, but the member for St. James is a young man and being a young man he should have one of the characteristics of youth—he should have courage and he should have the courage to tell the truth. And Mr. Speaker while the Globe took a course in regard to the Prime Minister which it could not justify and has never attempted to justify, the member for St. James this afternoon was careful not to make a specific charge of such a character against the Prime Minister or any member sitting on this side. In the speech that he had prepared for circulation in the province of Quebec he arranged his words for the express purpose of conveying a thought which he had not the courage to give utterance to in this Chamber.

I, Mr. Speaker, have more confidence in the judgment and sense of fair play of the people of Quebec than have these hon. gentlemen who profess to speak for that province, and my confidence in their judgment and sense of fair play is such that I believe in the course of time they will ask the men who are making these charges and indulging in these unwarranted statements to back up their charges and assertions with facts, and back them up in a way that will leave no doubt as to their truth or falsity. Because you cannot fool the people all the time My hon. friends from Brome and St. James may think that they can make unfounded statements with impunity, statements which will be accepted by the people of Quebec, but the time will come when the people will demonstrate that they are fair minded, and that they are going to judge these questions on their merits and judge public men according to their undoubted record. On that issue, and judged in that manner, I have no doubt as to the result of the next election when it comes.

This Parliament was elected for a period of five years. It has carried on during the very trying years of the war and during the years which have succeeded the war—the years of reconstruction, perhaps even more trying than when the war was actually in progress. Because, Sir, while the war was on there was the cement of a common peril and a common danger to hold in check the making of reckless statements by certain hon. gentlemen opposite and some others throughout the country. But at the conclusion of the war unrest developed, as it always has developed after every great struggle, and the difficulties of the Government were accentuated. The problems which faced the Government, and the burden of responsibility which rested upon them, should have been such as to appeal to all patriotic Canadians to refrain from other than constructive criticism and to give a helping hand in the heavy task which confronted the Administration. As I said earlier in the day, one of the best tributes paid to the efficiency of this Government has unconsciously been paid to it by the leader of the Opposition, and those who toured with him, in the speeches they delivered in every province, because the burden of their cry in those speeches was not that there had been mal-administration or lack of efficiency by the Government or any of

the departments in handling public affairs. It was merely the clap-trap in regard to a mandate such as we have heard from that leader and from some of those who have attempted to echo his words.

Extravagance and bad handling of the finances of this country! What have they brought in support of such general statements? If you compare the financial situation of Canada on the 31st March, 1920, with its position on the 31st March, 1914, you will certainly find that the national debt has been largely increased; but if you look carefully into those finances, and the records of the Finance Department will bear me out, it will be found, Mr. Speaker, that taking into consideration some $246,000,000 of capital expenditure other than investments, in the period of time I have mentioned, the Government of Canada not only carried on under their heavy burdens and responsibilities, but out of the revenues of the Dominion they paid off obligations to the extent of over $640,000,000, nearly twice as much as our net debt the year before the war.

And, Mr. Speaker, they also make charges against this Government regarding its management of the finances of the country. I ask those who make those charges to compare the financial position of the Dominion with that of other countries engaged in the war. They will find—and I make this statement believing it to be true—that the financial position of Canada is better than that of any other belligerent country, with the exception of the United States, and that the debt per capita at the conclusion of peace was less than that of any other country engaged in the war, with the exception of the United States.

Not only that, Sir, but during the war, while the Government practised the most rigid economy in regard to public expenditure, there was one class to which they gave special consideration. I refer to the agriculturists. I think the records will bear me out that during the years of the war and since, notwithstanding the financial obligations which were pressing upon us from all sides, federal assistance to agriculture was from three to four times as great as it was in the years previous to 1914. Add to that the fact, Sir, that our forests and mines and fisheries during the years I have mentioned have doubled their production, and that agriculture and manufacturing have trebled their output since 1914; and add to that the further fact that notwithstanding the generous contributions of the people to the various Victory Loans, amounting to about $2,000,000,000, on the 31st March, 1920, the savings deposits of our people were 87 per cent greater than they were on the 31st March, 1914, or 7 per cent greater than those of the people of the United States for exactly the same period of time. These figures do not indicate that the country has been going to the dogs under the Administration which has held power during the years of the war and since. These figures do not warrant the talk, unsupported by anything in the shape of detailed information, of hon. gentlemen opposite. And it is no wonder that the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) limited himself to a mere general blanket accusation against the Government.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. the leader of the Opposition and his followers are asking for the resignation of this Government; but the very reasons advanced by these hon. gentlemen are an unconscious tribute to its efficiency. If the hon. the leader of the Opposition could have brought charges against this Government or against any department of it of mismanagement of our national affairs, does any person think for one moment that he would not have included them in his amendment? But no; that was not the purpose and object of the hon. gentleman. On the contrary, he presents a mere naked, bald amendment. For what purpose? To prevent an amendment being moved which might possibly divide hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, and naturally that is something he did not want to do. I commend again to the hon. leader of the Opposition, as I did this afternoon, the frank stand taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) when a question was put to him last year. Any public man, if he has the courage of his convictions, should not be afraid to answer a straight question candidly and say where he stands on the tariff.

But the hon. the leader of the Opposition is afraid to move an amendment to the Address in reference to the tariff, although an invitation to do so is contained in the Speech from the Throne. He is afraid to move an amendment embodying in distinctive and definite form a statement in regard to the tariff for fear he would find hon. gentlemen sitting across on my extreme right not exactly agreeing with such an amendment; he is afraid to move an amendment containing some of the views which he and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) expressed in Peterborough in order to pull

the wool over the eyes of the people in that constituency who are interested in their local industries; he is afraid to move an amendment along the line of his speeches in Peterborough for fear that he would not get the votes of the hon. gentlemen to my right on the other side; he is afraid to move one along the free trade lines which he advocated when he was out in the Prairie Provinces, telling the farmers that there is really no difference between the Farmers' platform and his platform. He dare not come down to the province of Ontario or to the province of Quebec and make such statements. It would not do. He is in the position of either simply voting for the motion on the Address, or of moving this naked, bald amendment of his, because he dare not move anything more specific.

Well, I should like the people all over the Dominion to compare the wabbling, twisting, tortuous course of the leader of the Opposition with the straightforward attitude assumed by the leader of this Government, as exemplified in their speeches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Why, the twistings and turnings and contortions of the hon. the leader of the Opposition on political matters would make a snake turn green with envy. Where does he stand? He stands nowhere; he is like Mahomet's coffin—suspended between Heaven and Hell, and fit for neither place.

Mr. EMMANUEL d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before entering upon the few remarks I am about to make touching the amendment submitted by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to answer very briefly the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I wish the hon. gentleman could understand me as well as I understood him. However, he was entitled to use his mother tongue and I shall avail myself of the same privilege.

The hon. member from Frontenac wonders how it is that the hon. Leader of the Opposition should claim the right of leading the Liberal party in this House, and throughout the whole country. The hon. member ought to know that in November, 1919, there was held in Ottawa a large convention attended by delegates from every section of Canada, to elect the leader of the Liberal party who was to succeed the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That Liberal convention was evidently a democratic one.

Consequently the hon. Leader of the Opposition can say that he is really the leader of the Canadian Liberal party and he has a perfect right to claim, before this House and before the country, that he holds in his hands the destinies of the Liberal party. Quite another thing was the choice of the present Prime Minister. He was not chosen by a great democratic convention of delegates from all parts of the country called for the purposes of choosing a leader; the hon. Prime Minister was chosen by his partisans in this House, and as the hon. members who sit at your right, Mr. Speaker, do not represent the public opinion of the whole country, he is therefore not the choice of the whole of Canada.

The hon. member for Frontenac says also that thousands of Liberals, not only from the province of Ontario, but from all the provinces of Canada, refuse to recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition as the leader of the Liberal party. Well, he forgets the result of the election which has just taken place in Peterborough West. At any rate, if he be so confident, if he is so sure of his statement, let him advise the hon. Prime Minister to dissolve the House, and he will see that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has followers everywhere in Canada.

The hon. member for Frontenac claims that not one of the members who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, owes his election to the soldiers' vote. He forgets the message which was sent, in Algonquin dialect or in gibberish, I don't know which, by the hon. Prime Minister of to-day, directing that the soldiers' votes be distributed a little everywhere in different Western constituencies. This was never denied, and moreover the hon. Prime Minister himself has claimed in this House that he was perfectly justified in this course and that the electoral law was broad enough to allow it.

In reference to the election in West Peterborough the hon. member for Frontenac said that the hon. leader of the Opposition had contradicted himself in that county. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, that election took place after the resignation of Mr. Burnham, given on the ground that he claimed to have been elected as a partisan of the Union Government and that this government was to cease to exist at the conclusion of the war. He showed a little more courage than his friends. True this brought on his defeat, but at any rate the electors of Peterborough had an opportunity of making their views known, not on the question of the tariff, not on the question of free trade or protection, but on the question whether the electors of Peter-

borough as well as those of the rest of Canada were asking the overthrow of this government. The four opposition candidates were asking for a vote of non-confidence in the present administration, and the answer was eloquent.

The hon. member for Frontenac is also one of those who have fallen in love with the province of Quebec. It will be something new for the whole country to learn that the hon. member for Frontenac is holding Quebec close to his heart—especially its population. Never since the hon. member has held a seat in this House has the province of Quebec had a more violent traducer. But the disciple is worthy of the master. He follows his leader, the present Prime Minister, who now tries to fawn upon the province of Quebec, after having been the instigator of all the insults, the cowardly outrages and accusations heaped against that province in 1917. This party, in anticipation of its defeat, is ready to fall on its knees in the hope of roping in the province of Quebec and maintaining itself in power. Of the genuflexions of these gentleman I want none, but it is a pleasure to me to see them in such posture. One thing, however, must not be forgotten. If the province of Quebec knows how to forgive, it also knows how not to forget, and when the time comes it will remember the campaign of slander and calumnies which has been carried on through the whole country, and the principal instigator of which was the present leader of the Government. It will be all very well for him to try and make love and offer kisses of dubious sincerity to the electors of the province of Quebec, they will remember that he has been the chief organizer of that campaign of slander and race hatred carried on in order to juggle away power in 1917.

The hon. member for Frontenac talks of the fair play of the province of Quebec, That was not the talk we heard in 1917. We were then a disloyal province, a band of slackers. To-day, the province of Quebec is the model province, the Mecca of Canada. It is the fount of good principles, the resort where one may breath liberty and peace.

For Quebec, now—we can say it with pride—holds one of the most enviable positions in the Confederation, not only in respect of the liberty enjoyed by all its citizens, but also of the wise and progressive administration which directs its destinies.

[Mr. d'Anjou.]

Mr. Speaker, many members have occupied the floor since the beginning of the present debate. No one, however, has spoken in the French language, which is one of the two official languages of the country. In accordance with my custom I wished to pay my tribute to Her Majesty the French language, and I wanted to be the first one to do so. Since I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House—an honour I owe to my good and faithful friends the electors of the county of Rimouski—I have always, at every session, protested against the refusal of the Government to recognize the rights of the French language in this parliament. Thus, at every session, with the exception of that of 1918, the mover and seconder of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne were English speaking members, completely ignorant of the French language and consequently incapable of making their speech in French. The Government has no valid reason to cloak their refusal for, as I have often had the opportunity of stating, they have in the ranks of their followers a member who is very well qualified to move or second the Address in quite good French, I mean my hon. friend the member for Edmonton East (Mr. Mackie).

It may perhaps be said in certain quarters, that this is after all but a question of detail, and that I attach too much importance to the matter. What might be said does not much matter; I am conscious of doing my duty by protesting as I do at this moment and as I did in the past. The saying is always true that the best, the surest way of keeping a right secure is to exercise it. That is why, every time I have had occasion to take the floor in this House, I have always used my maternal tongue—the beautiful French language—for I always attached, as I still do the greatest importance to the survival in this country of our sweet parlance from France.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. d'ANJOU: I saw with great pleasure that the mover of the Address in the Senate paid us the delicate compliment of using French in the first part of his remarks. This honourable gentleman is to be congratulated, and he may be assured of the gratitude of all the French Canadians of the Dominion. It is evident that he did not consult the members of the Government before taking this gracious course, as otherwise he would have been given the formal order not to pronounce a single French word.

The new Prime Minister—the chief of the new tri-colour party—has missed a fine occasion to prove his sincerity towards the province of Quebec, which he has wooed and so frequently complimented since the usurpation of his present office.

If the province of Quebec is now dear to his heart, why has he not recognized the rights of the majority of its inhabitants by calling upon some of his partisans to move or second the Address in French? He has not done so, because he is not sincere. Besides, nobody can believe in the sincerity of the chief of the political mountebanks who, in order to win the election of 1917, did not hesitate to defame the province of Quebec and besmirch everything that is French in Canada.

The right hon. Minister of Commerce, in the course of his address about the League of Nations, told us that the two official languages at the assembly of the League were French and English. He even added that French was the dominant language at the assembly. French is the diplomatic language, and those who plume themselves upon belonging to the superior race should be able to understand and speak that language if they really wish to show their superiority over all other races.

Again, I condemn with the utmost energy the refusal of the Government to do justice to the French element in this country, by denying to the French language the place of honour which it has a right to occupy in the deliberations of the Canadian parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as most of the hon. members who have preceded me, I will not tarry over the discussion of the more or less important questions brought forward in the speech from the Throne. The main question at this moment is whether in truth the present Government have a mandate from the people for the administration of the affairs of the country.

In the magnificent and powerful speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition he over abundantly proved that the present Government have usurped power and that they have consequently no authority to direct the destinies of Canada.

The Prime Minister answers the arguments of the hon. leader of the Opposition by saying that he will remain in power as long as he can command a majority in the House of Commons. His majority, however, is but one of some twenty votes, fifteen of which are of members who have no right to their seats in the House since their election was due to the soldiers' vote. Such, Mr. Speaker, is what the hon. Prime Minister calls commanding the confidence of the House of Commons and consequently of the country at large.

At any rate, either this Government is the heir of the Union Government formed in 1917 for the duration of the war, or it is a government with a new head. In either case they hold no mandate from the people to govern the country.

It must not be forgotten that in 1917 this Government was constituted for one object only: the carrying on and the ending of the war. On all the hustings of the land, it was declared that this coalition was to end with the war. As you know, the war has long since come to its end, but nevertheless these gentlemen contend that they have the right to continue to direct the affairs of the country, because, as they say, they have behind them the majority of the House. They may truly have a majority, but, as I said a moment ago, what sort of a majority? A majority composed of members elected through the manipulation of the soldiers' vote, thanks to the iniquitous War-time Elections Act, thanks to the disfranchisement of loyal Canadian citizens. And it is with a majority thus obtained that the Government mean to carry on the affairs of the country.

As I said before, the last by-elections, and particularly that of West Peterborough, are an indication of the popular will. I am convinced that they reflect the sentiment of the whole electorate of Canada. The question was clearly put by all the candidates, and the answer was a signal one—the majority of the Opposition candidates was overwhelming.

For my part, I do not believe that the Prime Minister could have the respect, much less the confidence, of the Canadian electors. It is he who has shaped, who has conceived all the iniquitous laws from which we have suffered during the war. And he himself dared to boast of it in Sherbrooke, when he asserted that he was the father of conscription, and that if the thing was to be done over he was ready to repeat his measure.

The hon. Prime Minister is the man who in all circumstances was the instrument of the Government. He it was who devised the closure, the muzzling of the members of the Opposition and of all those who were here to defend the interests of the people. He was also, probably, the one who contrived the censure of the press in order to prevent the electors of Canada from being

informed as to the doings of the Government. Not only were mouths closed in parliament, but newspaper men were bought, with the result that it became impossible for the Liberal Opposition to make its contentions known to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have said enough to show that the leader of the Opposition was absolutely justifiable in offering his amendment to the House. One thing is sure, it is that the gentlemen on your right, Mr. Speaker, are not anxious to go before the people, for most of them are aware that they will never come back. Most of them, I repeat it, owe their election to the soldiers' vote. To-day, as was stated by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Power), the veterans are clamouring for elections. They are against the Government, and their votes cannot be controlled as they were at the election of 1917. All sections of the people, all those who wish the welfare and advancement of the country, the farmers, the workmen, the veterans of the great war, everybody; all those who wish to see the country come out of the slough into which it has fallen, all those who want to see the country marching towards the great destiny which Providence has in store for it, all those who long for the return of those bountiful days of 1896-1911; those, in a word, who wish to see Canada great and prosperous, are demanding a general election, and I am convinced that all the members on your left, Mr. Speaker, will vote in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. They will thus fulfil their duty not only towards their electors but towards the country as a whole.

Mr. F B. STACEY (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion presented by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaacs), means, in substance, the endorsation of the record and policy of this Government, and I also understand that the amendment offered thereto by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is a vote of want of confidence in the Government—in other words, its condemnation on its record and on its policy. I have as a member of this House listened very attentively to all that has been said in support of the amendment. I have also, in common with some others on this side, been honoured with a special invitation to support that amendment, and have naturally looked for good and sufficient reasons for taking such a step.

I consider that at any time in the history of this, or indeed of any country, it is a very important and serious matter to move for the condemnation of the Government. There are times, Sir, when such action is doubtless called for and warranted, and if, in my judgment, the present circumstances, the present conditions, the present situation, called for such a vote, I should not refrain from giving it. I have not, however, been shown that the present circumstances, the present conditions, the present situation, warrant me in accepting the invitation of the gentleman on the other side of the House.

I have said that I have listened in vain for sufficient reasons to give the vote solicited. Failing to hear any advanced, I have endeavoured in my own mind to search for sufficient reason to justify that course. As I understand the situation, three reasons might possibly be urged on behalf of a vote against the Government. If any one of these three was sufficiently substantiated, the casting of the vote asked for might be justified. If two were substantiated the justification would be increased, and if all three were proven there would be no escaping the responsibility. It is my purpose to examine the three reasons which appear to me to be worthy of consideration by every member of the House when the vote is called for.

I believe, Sir, that one reason—I shall take them in order—that might justify a member's voting in favour of the amendment would be the failure of the Government of the day to implement its pre-election promises. Let us consider carefully whether or not this Government should be condemned because of any failure to implement its pre-election promises. Has the Government failed to carry out its pledges made to the people in 1917? Various statements have been made in this House as to what was promised, what was pledged, what was understood in 1917. I take the word of no individual member; I take the word of the official statement made to the country when Sir Robert Borden formed a Union Government and appealed to the people. His platform was composed of twelve planks, and in the introduction to it are the words upon which the people of my constituency and, I believe, the people of my province and the people, in the main, of this Dominion, based their judgment and their decision. These are the words upon which his platform and policy were formulated and upon which our action was based:

'The lines of policy to be followed chiefly relate to the prosecution of the war and to

the consideration and solution of problems arising during its progress or which will supervene upon the conclusion of peace.

Then followed the twelve planks of the Union platform of 1917. You will note that there is virtually a division of the programme into three parts: the prosecution of the war; the consideration and solution of problems which would arise during the war; the consideration and solution of problems which would supervene upon the conclusion of peace. Let us, Sir, examine these seriatim.

First of all, did the Government redeem its pledge to prosecute the war to the utmost of its ability? I need but ask the question to secure, not simply from this House, but from the country, a most emphatic, unanimous and positive answer. Whatever the Government failed to do, whatever mistakes the Government made, this can be said: The Government did not fail to implement its pledge in its determination to prosecute the war to the very uttermost and to the very last. It did so in the face of no small opposition; it did so when it was opposed by forces that, I think, will, in after years, regret the action taken in their opposition to the purpose of the Government. I remember when this city was almost invaded by an army of men who besought the Government to let up in its efforts and grant certain exemptions; but the Government kept its pledge; there was no let up; the war was prosecuted to the end, and I am told that at the last the Canadian forces were in the van, so that the Government did certainly redeem its pledge in respect to the first portion of its programme.

I take the second section of this programme. Did it consider and solve the problems which arose during the war? I have only to refer to the records of this House during the sessions of 1918 and 1919. There can be no question whatever but that to the very utmost of its ability, the Government endeavoured to solve and did, in no small degree, succeed in solving the problems which arose during the continuance of the war.

What about the problems which have arisen since the declaration of peace? If I read the speech from the Throne correctly, the bulk of the matter contained in that speech is centered around problems which have arisen since the declaration of peace, so that while two-thirds of the programme has been virtually completed, one-third is in process of fulfilment. This is the fifth session since this Government was elected, and a most unique situation obtains. I have not heard, and I do not think any other member in this House has heard the charge preferred that the Government of the day has failed to implement its pre-election promises. In bygone days, such charges were made; they were sometimes fearlessly made and successfully proven; but I know of no Government, provincial or federal, which has so effectually and successfully redeemed every pre-election promise as the Union Government has done since 1917. What does this mean? It means simply that the Government, having undertaken two-thirds of its programme and now endeavouring to redeem the remaining one-third in the closing years of its existence, should be voted out of office and we are asked to support a motion of want of confidence in it, because it has redeemed its pre-election promises. That is the reason. Conversely, what follows? It follows, that when a Government fails to redeem its pre-election promises, when it utterly ignores its pledge to the country, then it should be continued in office indefinitely. That is a high standard of national ethics to set up before the country! That my reasoning is correct follows clearly from what I have said; that is, if you vote a government out of office because it keeps its promises, you must vote to keep a government in office because it fails to redeem its promises.

A second reason which arises in my mind as a good and sufficient reason, if sustained, why I could vote want of confidence in the Government of the day is this—the formulation of charges, and accompanying proof, of political graft or corruption, the misappropriation of public funds for private purposes or any other maladministration of public funds contrary to the will of Parliament and the known will and desire of the people. As this matter has been so thoroughly canvassed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I shall not dwell upon it at length; but I shall only say that the country has yet to hear from any member of the Opposition one single charge of misappropriation of public funds or any other maladministration of funds contrary to the will of Parliament and to the expressed desire of the people of Canada. That is something to be proud of. If the Union Government had done nothing more than that, it would have accomplished a great deal to have set before the country an example of a Government against which, during the entire term of its administration, no single charge had been laid with regard

to the misappropriation or the maladministration of public funds.

A third reason which has suggested itself to my mind as a good and sufficient one why, if sustained, I could vote against the Government, is this—the enunciation of such a policy as, in the judgment of the members of Parliament, is detrimental to the prosperity and welfare of the country. If this Government were to enunciate and set forth such a policy as, in my humble opinion, would be detrimental to the prosperity and welfare of the Dominion of Canada, I should feel bound to support the present amendment. But what are the facts of the case? They are that the policy, so far as it has been enunciated in the spoken word and the published statements of the first minister of the Crown, is such as commends itself most heartily to my mind and judgment. I believe that policy, as clearly as I can understand his words, is in the highest interest of the country from a commercial, social and national standpoint. Why then should I vote against such a policy? I endorse the spirit and also the substance of his published language and of his spoken word, because those words have been uniform. I have heard him in the province by the Pacific; I have heard him in this city; I have read what he has said on the prairies; I have read what he has said east of the Ottawa river, and in every place and in every province he has told the same story.

There has been the enunciation of the same fiscal policy, namely, proper protection for all Canadian industries. I would that I could emphasize that little word "all," because, Sir, it includes the labour of the entire Canadian population. The policy looks towards the protection, not of any one class, or of any one people, or of any one section of the community, but it is a policy which aims to foster and promote the highest development and prosperity of all our Canadian industries, and our Canadian industries are manifold. They are not restricted to the manufacturers; they are not restricted to the cities; they cover the country from ocean to ocean, and, Sir, a fiscal policy that seeks to protect and preserve and encourage all legitimate Canadian industries is a policy such as I feel disposed to endorse and support.

There is another thought in the published statements and spoken words of the Prime Minister which appeals to me very strongly. I know that it has not been very seriously emphasized in this debate, but I see in it possibilities of great things in the future. I refer to what I believe to be his honest and sincere and genuine purpose and intention to do all within his power as First Minister of the Crown to unify the Canadian people. Sir, this is no time, even by insinuation, and much less by ridicule, to throw any slur or cast any reflection upon such a high and noble purpose. It may be said by some that unification is impossible. I grant that in some respects that is true, but in other respects unification is not only possible, but in the interest of Canada it is absolutely necessary. True it is, that from ocean to ocean there are varied interests, and in some respects we cannot all be united. We may never be united in our religious convictions. There is no desire on the part of any one, I hope, to have a recognized state religion in this country. We do not wish that; the country repudiates the thought. The desire of the people of Canada is that every man shall have the right of private opinion and action with regard to his own religious views and further that there should be no official recognition by the State of any particular body, class or creed but that all should stand on a common footing before the law of the land. There canont be unity so far as a great national religion is concerned. Nobody wants it, nobody expects it.

Neither can we be united politically; I suppose that goes without saying. But there is a sense in which I believe the Prime Minister is looking towards unity on a higher, or national plane; that is to say, we can be divided in opinions, but united in aim. This may be old and oft-trodden ground, but, Sir, we cannot traverse it too often. There is in our country room for division of opinion on great national questions, on great political principles, and so long as the division is along the line of principles I have absolutely nothing to say against it. I welcome it. I believe it is a healthful sign of public thought and public sentiment. What I deplore is the existence in this great country of anything which would even appear to divide province against province, or class against class, or one section of the country against another section. We may be divided on great national issues; we should on these be divided; but in the name of our common country let us divide on lines of principle or policy and not on lines of class, not on lines of religion, not on lines of race, not even on lines of language. We cannot afford it. Our country is too big

and potential, the future of this Dominion is too vast in its importance to allow anything of that character to interfere with or retard our true national prosperity.

There has been, in late years, arising a class consciousness as we are all aware. There is room for a class consciousness, and there will issue from it certain results to the advantages of the class, its progress and development, locally, and socially, but when we step into the larger realm of national affairs and national policies, I claim, Sir, that we should be first, last, and always, Canadian citizens. I sit in this Chamber by the grace of the votes of my people, a fruit grower, here to my right is a lawyer, to my left a manufacturer, behind me are two doctors, across the aisle is a grain-grower from Saskatchewan, and another from Manitoba; but we are not here as lawyers, or grain-growers, or doctors, or manufacturers: we are here as Canadian citizens.

During the last few months we have had two by-elections in the province from which I come. Considerable has been said in this House about by-elections, and I want to tell you something about these two by-elections in my province. One was in the city of Victoria, the other in the constituency of Yale and, Sir, it is a matter of history, a matter of fact, that in neither of these cases was there an Opposition candidate in the field representing the official Opposition in this House. In the city of Victoria there was a combination of opponents of the Government, but without an issue, without the semblance of a platform—they were simply against the Government. What did we find in Yale, where the second by-election took place? We had the Government candidate standing on the Government record and on the Government policy. Did my Liberal friends put a candidate in the field in Yale? No, they did not, although at one time, I am told, they intended to. What was done? It was decided by the Liberals of Yale in written resolution that in view of the situation which obtained, all the opponents of the Government candidate, should unite in order to "defeat the common enemy" and therefore they endorsed the Opposition candidate.

That was the situation in Yale—no policy, no principle, simply a combination of some Liberals, some returned soldiers, some farmers, and some extreme Labour men who united their forces in support of one man who, when he received their endorsation, turned round and said: "I repudiate the whole of you; I will be an independent." My friends the Agrarians, through their representatives, have been doing their utmost to win to their political bosom the farmers from my province. That is perfectly legitimate. I presume that courtship is always in order. Up to the present the farmers in my constituency—and I have the honour to represent one of the finest rural constituencies in the Dominion of Canada—and the farmers of my province as a whole have not responded to their solicitations. They have stretched out their hands across the Rockies and with a firm grasp have said: "We are brithers a', but first and last we are Canadian citizens and we shall not enter into any political alliance with the agrarian movement of the Prairies."

Now, I stand here to-night as a farmer, but not as a class man. I believe that it is the right and the privilege of the members of any class to unite for the advancement of their own local interests, of their own business or profession; but in the higher sphere of national deliberation, let us meet as Canadian citizens
9 p.m. to promote the interests of all classes and conditions of people in the country and of the nation as a whole, irrespective of the occupations which we as members may individually pursue. I have examined as closely as I can the three main reasons which could possibly be adduced why a man should vote against the Government of the day and in favour of the amendment as proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and by way of brief review in reply let me say that this Government has kept its pre-election pledges. It has prosecuted the war to the utmost of its ability, and history will determine, as we cannot do to-night, the measure of praise which is due to Canadian arms in the final victory that was won in 1918. Now, because this Government redeemed every one of its pledges, and is now in process of winding up the business in the closing years of its record, am I to vote want of confidence in an Administration that by redeeming those pledges has brought honour to our country and established for her no small place of influence among the nations of the world? No charge of any serious character has been made against the Government. Why then should I vote against it?

The general future policy of the Government as enunciated by the Prime Minister in his address commends itself to the people

of the Dominion, I believe. It is useless for my friends on the other side to say that the country wants a change. There is no use in saying that: the mere assertion does not make it a fact. I know that in many districts of this Dominion the people are satisfied with the present Government, and it is a weakness on the part of the Opposition to simply ask the Government to resign, and to reinforce that request by calling them names. That is only the method of school-boys in the primary classes. To say: "You are usurpers, office seekers, etc." is the policy of children and not of statesmen. Who are the office seekers? Ask that question in my district and people will smile, as well they might. When the First Minister of the Crown paid a visit to the province of British Columbia he left an impression of candour, of sincerity, of ability, and of personal power and magnetism that even his enemies admitted. More than one said to me in private: "I do not see how I can vote against a man of that calibre;" and so to-night, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in answer to my hon. friend from Brome that I cannot accept his invitation. I shall vote against the amendment and in favour of the motion.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the subjects contained in the Address, I desire to pay my tribute of congratulation to the mover and seconder, both of whom discharged their duty in this respect in an admirable manner. While I do not endorse some of the sentiments expressed in the speeches of those gentlemen, I must say that my hon. friend who moved the Address has undoubtedly displayed on this occasion literary attainments which are not frequently met with in our day and that in his short address he has expressed noble thoughts in noble language which I am sure we all appreciate. All together he has given unmistakable evidence of the fact that the "Garden of the Gulf" can produce the best elements of humanity as well as of nutriment. My hon. friend from Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) who has made his debut is also well equipped as a parliamentarian; he shows great command of language and much depth of thought, and the House may well regard him as a valuable acquisition. Naturally the hon. member for Yale is interested in apples and wants this commodity protected. Were I in his place I would endeavour to have this choice fruit enjoyed not only in the neighbourhood of its culture, but would have it sent across the boundary to the South so that it might tempt the American as well as the Canadian epicures. There are thousands of Canadians who would certainly greatly appreciate the extension of the field of fruit production and such an extension would be in the best interests not only of British Columbia but of the Dominion as a whole.

We now have a Prime Minister administering the destinies of the Dominion. Were the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) present in this Chamber I think he would permit me to state that from the first day he made his appearance among us I have acknowledged his talent, his ability, his legal acumen, his subtlety and ingenuity, and, recalling the first of his speeches in Parliament, there has come to my mind this evening an incident in which there figured an old deskmate of mine, who departed this world only a few months ago, and myself. The gentleman in question enjoyed the admiration and the love of the House during the years he sat beside me—I refer to the late Mr. Leblanc, who for years sat beside me in this Parliament and who made way for the present member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger). We had both carefully watched the young man who was to become the future Premier of Canada, and whose health seemed to be so frail. My deskmate of that time, who could not always follow closely the utterances of members, was accustomed to ask me what they had said and what my opinion was of their speeches. One day he inquired of me "What do you think of that young gentleman?" meaning the present Premier. I replied, "If he lives, he will rise."

My prediction has been fulfilled. The young member of that day has lived and has risen to a most commanding position, and he will undoubtedly bring to the administration of public affairs in Canada that talent and that ingenuity for which he was conspicuous when he first entered Parliament. Despite his mental equipment it seemed to be the fate of this young man to be plunged into difficulties, and in the exercise of his high duties he has undoubtedly at times been placed in a position before the country and before the Empire which perhaps he has not always enjoyed. His generosity has induced him to do his utmost to preserve his party from the fate which threatened it, and perhaps it is not too much to say that but for his ability it would have gone under before the year 1917 was reached.

In spite of my opinion of his talents I am bound to say that the present learned and capable Prime Minister has done things which have aroused suspicion in the minds of the people. Many of the doings of Parliament during the last ten years, it must be admitted, do not commend themselves to the calm judgment of the electors of Canada, including old time Conservatives as well as old time Liberals. It seems to me that his party have profited by his devotion and his talents to—I will not say ruin—but to lessen his reputation, for he was called to a better destiny than has been permitted to him as the result of his choice of followers and friends.

May I recall one of the first pieces of legislation with which he was identified and which had an important effect upon the procedure of Parliament? I remember well the manner in which it was introduced and how it blocked our late lamented leader, who was so greatly beloved not only by Canadians but by the world at large. As a result of the change in the rules of the House, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier on rising to speak on an amendment was obliged to sit down and to suffer in silence. He was debarred from speaking, although he had a perfect right to. When a vote was reached, I remember as well as though it were only yesterday the desertion of some seventeen or eighteen French-Canadian members elected as Nationalists. There was one exception, the then member for Bellechasse. With him blood was thicker than water, if I may use the phrase, and he voted on the side of the Liberal leader. But each of the other members to whom I allude rose to plant a dagger in the heart of the great Liberal. The time came when every one of them disappeared from political life, with the exception of one who managed to save himself when his political ship was foundering.

Other acts of the present Prime Minister when he was Solicitor General or Minister of the Interior have not commended themselves to public approval. His coming to the front, as he has done, denotes that his talents were far above those of the rest of his colleagues in Parliament. Let me say in this connection that we have not forgotten our former great leader. As the member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville said yesterday our former great leader is dead. True he is dead but his spirit survives and will live for centuries to come.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, for a long time to come.

Mr. TURGEON: He has gone to join the late William Ewart Gladstone, Daniel O'Connell, Edmund Burke, Lafontaine, and Cartier. In union with those great souls he will enjoy a glory acquired from devotion to the sacred cause of uniting people of different races and creeds and of maintaining the great constitutional principles that governed the British Parliament throughout the last century. But I wish my right hon. friend the Prime Minister every possible consolation he may derive from the almost superhuman tasks which have been placed upon his shoulders. For the present, let us as true Canadians be animated with the hope that everything will happen for the best and that the prosperity of our country will not be impaired.

The people of Canada are in a condition of mind which prompts them to regard the future from the experience of the past. The world to-day is not in a normal condition, and the public mind in the war-swept countries of Europe is not perhaps what it ought to be. And one of the reasons given by the Prime Minister in his speeches in the West for not holding a general election was that it would not be prudent under present conditions, implying, apparently, that the people under the excitement of a general election would not be animated by a spirit worthy of themselves. But I should like to remind my right hon. friend that the first paragraph of the speech from the Throne contradicts him, for there the Governor General states:

> I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the relative prosperity of the country and its comparative freedom from the feeling of unrest which has agitated countries not so fortunately situated.

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has brought in an amendment declaring that this Government has no constitutional mandate from the people to continue in power. It is passing strange to be told by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his supporters that because our parliamentary term is limited to five years, a Government once returned to power has a constitutional right to continue in office for the full term, notwithstanding an adverse expression of opinion from the people whenever a by-election affords them that opportunity. We have to respect not only the letter of the constitution, but its spirit. Were we the United States, the government would be at liberty to continue in office for the full four years of its mandate, and the people would have to suffer or otherwise, as the case might be. We have always boasted that democratic as is the constitution

of the United States our constitution is still more democratic, in that the voice of the people could be given effective expression to when the Government for the time being had forfeited the confidence of the country.

What are the circumstances to-day? I may be permitted to recall the conditions and the principles upon which Union Government was made possible in 1917. As a close personal friend and an enthusiastic admirer of the Hon. Frank B. Carvell, who became Minister of Public Works at the formation of Union Government, I had particular occasion to remember the conditions on which he became a member of that Government. The primary condition was that the Government of that day was formed for the period of the war and until demobilization, and no longer. My hon. friend the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) yesterday with his usual eloquence recited to this House the explanation given at the time by the then Minister of Public Works respecting the formation of the Union Government, and that he would retire when he thought his mission was over. I wish to emphasize his election addresses at the beginning of the campaign of 1917, when he stated to the country the conditions upon which he and his colleagues entered that Government; and it must be remembered that he was telling the people those conditions before they voted, that the Government candidates were to be elected only for the duration of the war and demobilization, and no longer.

I see my sincere friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) looking in my direction, and I am sure that his expressions at that time were similar to those voiced by the then Minister of Public Works. They told the country that they and their colleagues were joining the Union Government for one purpose only, for the carrying on of the war, and when that had been brought to a successful conclusion they would return to their party. They did not say that they were joining the Government for a term of five years; no, they were educating the electorate to the fact that as soon as the war was over they would all return to their own fold and leave the Conservative party to its own fate.

Let me quote from a speech delivered at Sarnia, Ontario, by the then Minister of Public Works, Mr. Carvell, at a convention for the selection of a Union Government candidate. I take this report from the St. John Telegraph, a publication which was most devoted to the minister during that campaign, so that the correctness of the report cannot be doubted. Among other things the report says:

> Mr. Carvell told of the great efforts made to prevent a rupture in the Liberal ranks,—but it failed.
>
> "But we men who disagreed with Sir Wilfrid are Liberals yet, and when the war is over, we will start again where we were last week."
>
> Mr. Carvell declared that the Liberals in the Government would not remain unless profiteering was stopped, and unless certain things happened which he thought ought to happen.

He was telling the members of the old Government that they had been helping profiteering, and the members of that Government assented to his profession when they accepted him and kept him in the Ministry. He said that that profiteering would have to stop. Quoting Mr. Carvell, the report goes on to say:

> "When things don't suit us, there is no reason why we should remain. I am going through this campaign as a Liberal, as a man who has joined with his opponents for a definite time and for a definite purpose. I would a thousand times rather have gone to the country with my own party, but it was not to be."

It was stated, therefore, to the electors of Canada in November, 1917, that this union was formed for war purposes and that after the war was over the Liberals who had joined the Government would return to their party.

My right hon. friend claims that he is in the same position as other Prime Ministers who were called to office during a term of Parliament. Reference has been made to Sir John A. Macdonald and even to the successor of Sir Lomer Gouin in the province of Quebec. But in these cases the Parliaments had but recently been elected; the Governments in question had the confidence of the people; nothing had happened to bring about changed conditions in the ranks of the Government party or in the public mind. The conditions were not similar to those in the present case; therefore the comparison cannot fairly be made.

Well, the war being over, demobilization being completed, and a number of Government members having withdrawn their support from the Ministry, a caucus was called of the remainder of the supporters of the Government for the selection of a leader in the place of the then Prime Minister, who was retiring. The selection of the present Prime Minister may have been a wise one, but that does not alter the fact that the right hon. gentleman holds office unconstitutionally. He has

been elected not by the voice of the people, but by a remnant of supporters of the Union—a union which still remains to-day, though it has no further assistance or support from those who maintain true Liberal principles. His position, therefore, is entirely contrary to the spirit of the constitution.

Had the Prime Minister appealed to the people when he was selected for the office which he now occupies, he would have been defeated, but he would have come back with a stronger following than he will have when he does appeal to the people. I wish to tell him as a personal friend that the longer he delays his appeal to the people the smaller will be his guard when he comes back to this Parliament as leader of the Opposition. Possibly he would be more comfortable as leader of the Opposition than he now is as leader of the Government. I do not say that the people of Canada would be very badly off in having my hon. friend as leader of the Opposition; I would tell my Liberal colleagues that they would have to be careful in their administration so that they should not give him the chance to attack them with all the arms which he has at his disposal.

The people to-day are clamouring for an election. The returned soldiers in every province are clamouring for an election. We say that we have done a great deal for our soldiers, but we can never compensate them for the immense sacrifices which they have made. From the very beginning of the war I took a consistent attitude among the people of my constituency. I travelled over every part of my county and talked to boys, not merely to those on the street corners, but to those whose fathers and mothers had been friends of mine and who had by them been entrusted to my care and counsel. Many have come to my private office seeking aid and encouragement, which were freely given. Before conscription came into effect, 1,350 young men had left my constituency, impelled by the spirit of sacrifice, to serve their country, and of that number of young men who one after another responded to my call, 1,150 were French-Acadians. To-day those men who have returned want an election. They do not all approve of the way in which they have been treated. We told them that if they would go to the war Canada would be theirs when they came back, but on their return they have not been treated as they deserve. Every man in every walk of life in Canada to-day wants an election; they want an expression of their will according to the Canadian constitution, the Canadian and British spirit.

I shall not enter into a discussion of the tariff. My views on this are well known, and I may have something to say when the Budget is brought before Parliament; but I should like to mention one statement made by the leader of the Government which is not justified by the situation in the country. He repated in his speech the other day that the Government of the day had reduced the tariff by a considerable amount since the conclusion of the war and had again reduced it last year. That reduction consisted in the removal of the extra duty of 5 per cent on British imports and 7½ per cent on other imports which was introduced by the Conservative Government at the beginning of the war; it was added on to the tariff which the Liberals had left to their successors in office. It was added as a war measure and, in my estimation at the time and in my estimation still, it was a pure war measure, and when they say they have reduced the tariff by so much since the conclusion of the war, the fact is that they have only eliminated by degrees, in two sessions, that extra tariff duty of 5 and 7½ per cent which was imposed as a war measure. It was, therefore, right that they should expunge it from the tariff of Canada, and for their action in doing so they deserve no eulogy, and, indeed, no consideration.

There are others who claim that the Government of the day has not given the people of Canada justice. We know what has happened since last session as regards the increase of rates on the railways. My position is not new; I did not remain silent until a clamour arose from the Atlantic to the Pacific against that increase of 40 per cent in rates on Canadian railways granted for the benefit of the board of administration of the National Railways, the experts of Mackenzie and Mann; at the last session on more than one occasion I protested in this House to the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) against the idea of an increase in freight rates at this time, until conditions became more settled, until we saw what the board of administration of the National Railways of Canada would be able to do. On more than one occasion from my seat in this House I directly warned the Railway Commission against granting an increase at that time, and I begged the Government not to ask the Railway Commission to look into this request for an in-

crease of rates by the railway administration. I knew that the granting of such an increase would be a death blow to many of our industries, and I said so at the time. Notwithstanding the warning which was given, the Minister of Railways or the Government called upon the Railway Commission, and a fruther increase in the rates of transportation was requested at a moment when the fate of every industry was trembling in the balance. What has been the consequence? I know the Prime Minister in his travels through the West has heard enough about the matter. He has been told, what I told him in this House at the last session, that the country could not stand an increase in freight rates; that the railway administration was not what it should be, and that, therefore, it should be left to its fate for a longer period until we could see what best should be done. Every farmer in the West has suffered as a consequence. The effect in the West has been that the grain has been routed through the United States, thus depriving our railroads of the longer haul from the West to our Canadian seaports of St. John and Halifax.

I see the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore) in his seat. No one personally wishes him better success in life than I do. At the same time, he represents the city of St. John, with its great open harbour, not the harbour only of the citizens of St. John, but the harbour of the Canadian nation. This harbour should be developed and equipped in such a way as to be able to receive more traffic than it has received so far and, indeed, to receive the traffic which in the near future we shall be able to bring to our ports, in winter more particularly. This increase in rates has been detrimental, not only to the harbour of St. John, but more particularly to the producers of grain in the West. In order to be able to meet the market prices, western grain producers have routed their products via American roads, and the farmers of Alberta have routed their grain to the Pacific coast and through the Panama canal. The farmers of Alberta have been able to effect a saving of three cents a bushel against the present rates, but at a loss, notwithstanding, of four cents a bushel as against the old rates which would have taken their grain to the open harbours of Canada, St. John and Halifax in winter and Quebec and Montreal in the summer.

What has been the consequence of this increase in rates? It has ruined the lumber industry of the Maritime Provinces and has affected that industry in Ontario and Quebec as well. Since this increase of 40 per cent has been put into effect by the Railway Commission, the lumber industry of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia has been paralyzed. Our lumber yards are at this very moment full of lumber cut and sold last summer, but unable to be delivered. It is standing in the yards waiting until conditions change, and it will be transported by water next summer, so that the railroad has lost that traffic. In reply to the argument put forward by members of the Government and their supporters that wages had to be increased, I say that by the extra raising of the rates the railroads have lost more in freight than the difference in the wages, because if the rates had been left as they were, the railways would have got the extra traffic. They could have raised the wages to their present level and left the rates where they were and then there would not have been such a large deficit. As it is, the railroads have been equipped for a larger trade, and they have not got it just because the rates compelled the producers of lumber and grain and other products to ship in other ways.

The people of this country are clamouring for an election; yet the Government wishes to retain office for two years longer. There are many more considerations which I could present in support of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. We know that the census of Canada is to be taken this year, followed by a redistribution based on the census, and this matter of redistribution has never been so important as at the present time, particularly in view of the known intentions of the present Government, who are holding on to power in the hope that the redistribution may possibly save them. Of course, it may not have that effect, but that is their object. This is a matter of national importance to every constituency in Canada; it is of importance to the East, and of greater importance still to the West, whose people are living in anticipation of a larger representation. Just in order to give the West a few more members the Government say: We will wait, we will hold on for another two years. But will the West get many more members after redistribution? I do not think they will get as many more as some pretend to believe, for in the last decade, and more particularly in the last

10 p.m.

five or six years, the population of the western provinces has not increased very much.

Immigrants, for many reasons, have not been coming in as they used to. There was the war, for instance. Then a large number of immigrants that did come to this country have left for the United States, so the increase in population in the Prairie Provinces will not be so very great, and will not entitle them to a large number of additional representatives. The object of the Government, if not of their supporters, is to offset this additional representation in the Prairie Provinces by increasing the number of city representatives, based on a unit of representation of 40,000. That will work to the advantage of the cities and to the detriment of the rural districts. I repeat, this is a matter of national importance, for if you nullify the efforts of the representatives of the rural districts in this way, Canada is gone.

The rural districts must have their say in this Parliament. The producers of the east and of the west have the right to be fully represented here. I am not one of those who fear for the future on account of the development of the west. I have all the time been in favour of everything being done for the happiness and prosperity of the west because the prosperity of the western provinces means the prosperity of the east, and more particularly the prosperity of the ports of St. John, Halifax and Quebec. Let us give them all possible representation. But if I were a representative from one of the western provinces I would make every possible effort to avoid waiting another two years for redistribution from this Government, which has not a mandate to provide for the future of this country.

I ask my hon. friends, what will become of Canada when fifteen of twenty members are taken away from the rural districts of Quebec and given to Montreal? What will become of Ontario when twenty members are taken away from the rural districts and given to Toronto and four or five given to Hamilton, and two or three to the other cities in Ontario, from rural districts? What will become of this province and of Canada? This is an important question, It is the life of Canada and its future that is at stake. It is a question of a government by the people for the people, or of government by the interests for the interests. You must choose between. That is the situation, and for that reason, if for no other, I would vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, who calls for the resignation of the present Government and the dissolution of Parliament in order that the people of this country may elect a parliament that will be representative of its principles and aspirations.

The aspirations of the people of Canada to-day are for more production and more population. We must produce. It is necessary not only for the existence of our own people, but for people outside of Canada. We complain of unemployment. Why is there unemployment? It is because the other nations have not the means to buy our products and we are reduced to producing for the people of Canada alone, and therefore we cannot provide sufficient employment for our people. We must produce food to help suffering humanity in the Allied nations and in Central Europe to-day. Patriotism, as Edith Cavell has said, is not enough alone. It is not enough alone for Canada, or for the other nations of the world. We must have love and affection for other countries, and for their children who are dying to-day in thousands for lack of nourishment, and it is only by production that we can help humanity, which to-day is calling upon us for the necessities of life. Let us therefore take every possible step to increase production, and to put Canada in a position where we can face the future with courage, and help the other nations of the world. We must do that if we wish to help the League of Nations in its efforts to avoid another world war or a war in any corner of the world.

I shall vote with pleasure for the amendment. There are many other things which I should like to touch upon, Mr. Speaker, but as I have already occupied the time of the House at some length I shall conclude by expressing the hope that the Prime Minister will appreciate the trend of public opinion and, if he realizes that the people have lost confidence in this Administration, will accede to the wish of the majority of the people and lay down the reins of government.

On the motion of Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka) the debate was adjourned.

PRINTING, LIBRARY, AND RESTAURANT OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker informed the House that a message had been received from the Senate communicating to the House the names of the senators appointed to act

on behalf of the Senate on the joint committees of both Houses on Printing, Library of Parliament, and Restaurant.

On the motion of the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Monday, February 21, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Financial Statement, covering the last fiscal year, of the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific Industrial Research. —Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the season of 1920.—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

On the Order, First Reading of Bill No. 2 to Amend the Dominion Elections Act. (From the Senate):

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I desire that the first reading of this Bill be taken up, and in doing so I wish to make a statement to the House as to the purport of the Bill and the necessity therefor. Under the amendment to the Canada Temperance Act, passed at the session before last, various provinces of the Dominion were enabled by the process of taking a plebiscite to decide whether or not certain provisions of that Act would become applicable to the province so deciding. If it became applicable, then the prevention of the importation of, and some other transactions in, liquor, making in effect total prohibition, became the law of that province. Under the Dominion Elections Act which passed last session there was a provision that in the event of any vote in any province taking place before the end of the year 1920, that vote should be held upon the then existing lists, which were compiled a year or so before, but that should the vote take place subsequent to the 31st December, then there should be a total revision of the lists for the purpose of the vote. It was the intention that polling for this purpose in the province of Ontario should take place on the 25th October, which was the day fixed for the vote in the three western Prairie Provinces and in Nova Scotia. Representations, however, were made to the Government from various organizations, including particularly the Great War Veterans, which established that should the vote be taken on the 25th October, or any date last year, it would result in the disfranchisement of very many thousands of men, principally returned soldiers. These men would be disfranchised because of the fact that when the list was compiled they had not returned. In other words some thirty thousand had returned after the compilation of the lists and before this vote could take place. Of this number, it was represented, a very large proportion would be in the province of Ontario, possibly one-half. Many thousands of others, at the time of the compilation of the lists, were in hospitals in Toronto, or elsewhere, and these, it was stated, would have dispersed to their homes in distant parts of the province and consequently could not be on the lists and so would be disfranchised. These considerations seemed to make it imperative indeed that the vote be postponed. We could not see how we could justify allowing a vote to take place which would be so unsatisfactory as one taken on lists disfranchising so many of those who should really be entitled to have a voice. The difficulty that then confronted us was this: Should the vote be postponed to a date immediately succeeding the New Year, or any date in the New Year, it would necessitate a revision of the entire Ontario lists merely for the purposes of this vote, whereas, as a matter of fact, in the rural districts of Ontario, under the statute, a voter is enabled to swear his name on the voters' lists, and consequently the necessity for revision in those districts was very slight, if indeed it existed at all. The practical difficulty, then, in the way of the Government was that it would cost the Treasury of the country, for a complete revision of the Ontario lists, according to the figures submitted to us by the Chief Electoral Officer, Colonel Biggar, approximately $330,000 to $350,000. On being asked for an alternative plan Colonel Biggar suggested that if the vote were postponed to a date which would enable a Bill to pass this parliament designed to meet his viewpoint, there could be a revision in the cities and towns, and inasmuch as a voter could be sworn on in the rural districts, in his opinion, that would meet all the practical necessities of the case, and result in an expenditure only approximating $30,000, thereby saving the country an outlay of $300,000. That is the suggestion the Government accepted, and accordingly the vote

was fixed for the 18th of April of this year. This Bill has been prepared by Colonel Biggar for the purpose of enabling that revision to take place in cities and towns in Ontario at the cost that he estimates, and of saving the country the sum of approximately $300,000 that would otherwise be entailed. I have very briefly, and I hope clearly, stated to the House the objects of the measure. In a word they are these: To enable such revision to be made as meets the situation, gets rid of the injustice of a disfranchisement, and at the same time saves that wider general revision throughout all the rural districts which, under the present state of the law is not really necessary, but which the law actually calls for; and thereby to save the Treasury a sum of approximately $300,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should point out that the motion for the first reading of a Senate Bill is not debatable, but in this instance, inasmuch as the first reading is, in effect, the introduction of the measure to this House, I felt it was due to members that a Prime Minister should have the right of making his explanation, hence the rule in that respect was relaxed. Should the leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) desire to make any remarks on the motion, I am quite sure the House will grant the same indulgence to them.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper to direct your attention to the amendment to the Address that is before the House at the present time. My right hon. friend, in the first motion to be made by him as Prime Minister this session moved

> That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Tuesday next, and that this Order have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

He now comes forward with a second motion to defeat the purpose of the first. As I understand the motion which my right hon. friend has just made, it means the adjournment of the debate on the amendment expressing want of confidence in the administration, and taking up the consideration of a new measure. That raises a rather important consideration, it seems to me, to those of us on this side of the House who have taken the position that the hon. gentlemen opposite are usurping power in presuming to continue to occupy the Treasury Benches. We take the position that without the confidence of this House and of the country they are not entitled to introduce a bill or to spend a dollar; and unless my right hon. friend can show us some precedent for adjourning the debate on a motion of want of confidence in the Government to take up another matter, we would be justified I think in adhering to the position which we have taken from the outset, namely that the Government lacks the confidence of the country, and therefore is not entitled to proceed with any legislation.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are certainly anxious not to embarrass any section of the public in the matter of an expression of opinion on a question of public interest, and we are ready to do anything constitutionally possible to enable the people to have the benefit of such expression of opinion as may be in the public interest. It is unfortunate, however, that in our desire so to do we have to take steps to make good the limitations and defects of the Government. I might point out to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that if he had acted upon the suggestion which we on this side of the House made at the close of the last session of Parliament, and had summoned Parliament at an earlier date in the year—which I think would have made for the convenience of all hon. members—he would not now be pleading with Parliament for this opportunity to reverse his first motion and to take up other business while we are engaged in what may be perhaps the most important debate which we shall have this session.

I might also point out to my right hon. friend that when the Dominion Elections Act was before Parliament last session we on this side called attention to the fact that so far as Ontario was concerned the Government was adopting a course which would lead to great expense in the preparation of lists, and we suggested that the municipal lists should be accepted as the basis in that province. Had that suggestion been accepted, my right hon. friend would not now be obliged to come along with his request.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House unduly, Mr. Speaker, but I would point out to my right hon. friend that if our action on this side of the House in permitting the Government to proceed, even to further the public interest, were likely to be construed in any way as an evidence of lack of sincerity in the amendment which we have before the House, I

would not for a moment consent to consider his request. But I would say to him that if he can cite a precedent indicating wherein it would be proper to adjourn the debate in order to take up another matter, while a vote of confidence in the Government is being considered by Parliament, we will be prepared to consider such precedent and give him an answer perhaps to-morrow as to the position which the Opposition will take. I think I am justified in asking my right hon. friend to allow me an opportunity of conferring with my colleagues before I come to a conclusion regarding his exceptional request. If he is prepared to do that, I am prepared to say that we will if possible consider sympathetically any precedent he may cite which will enable the public to give expression to its views on any question of public interest at the least possible cost and with the least possible delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I omitted to state, when I addressed the House first, Mr. Speaker, that the will of Parliament on this Bill requires to be known within a reasonable time. There is time enough for Parliament to consider it, but there is not time for delay because the revision is called for before the 18th April; or if the will of Parliament should be that this Bill do not pass, then it is necessary to know still earlier, because in that event, should the plebiscite go on, the entire revision would take still more time.

I am not endeavouring to controvert my hon. friend, and to have the last word, as to the statement that if the municipal lists had been taken this Bill would not be necessary, for that is entirely aside from the mark. We have lists which would be a much closer basis than the municipal lists. It is the revision that takes time and expense, and it is unnecessary revision only that we are trying to avoid in order to effect a saving of $300,000.

I may say that I assume, and I think correctly, that first readings of bills do not require unanimous consent and do not come within the purview of the motion which I made: the second reading, of course, would, and there is no use having the first reading without the second.

Inasmuch as my hon. friend takes the stand which he has stated to the House—and I may say that he was good enough to advise me of it before the House met—I will ask only for the first reading to-day. Then I will give notice of such motion as may be necessary to enable the House to proceed with this Bill, notwithstanding the order which was passed, and which is the usual order at the opening of the House. In the meantime my hon. friend can come to such conclusion as he may deem advisable on the stand he should take. The matter of precedent therefore need not be discussed now. I do not apprehend that I will have much difficulty on the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand the hon. the leader of the Opposition to press his point of order as to whether it is competent to move the first reading of this Bill. But the motion which was carried is, that the Address shall be considered and that that debate shall take precedence of all other business except the introduction of Bills. I think undoubtedly the first reading of a Senate Bill may be properly regarded as the introduction of a Bill, and therefore would come within the spirit at all events, of the Order of the House; and therefore it would be quite competent to give first reading to the Bill.

I would point out further that it is not necessary to delay the debate on the Address, for the reason that the motion is not debatable; when the Bill is given first reading, not further action can be taken on the measure, unless the House changes the Order which has been already made.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2 to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED MEMBERS —THE LATE Mr. TOM G. WALLACE

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House is called upon to lament the loss of one of our number by the hand of death. Yesterday morning there passed away Mr. Tom G. Wallace, member of Parliament for the electoral division of West York. Mr. Wallace was taken with a very severe illness immediately prior to the opening of this session—an illness to which he succumbed.

It is well known to all that Captain Wallace was a son of a former member of this House of much distinction, Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, who in his time was a member of the government. Captain Wallace himself served his country first in the capacity of a soldier in the South African war to which he went when only in his teens. His career as a soldier was marked by sincere devotion to duty in all capacities, however humble, and by a love of country that

has characterized every act of his life. Returning to Canada he contested a seat for this Parliament in the election of 1908 and was successful, and in the elections of 1911 and 1917 was again returned. His most marked characteristic as a member of this House was the degree of popularity and personal devotion which his character commanded. As a member of the House he devoted himself unstintedly to its work, with an entire thoughtlessness of self, a desire to help and advance others, and particularly a desire to advance legislation of the character that he was most interested in, such as went for the uplifting of Canadian national life. Captain Wallace enjoyed this distinction: that among all the members on this side of the House, where he was best known, no other member had a larger personal following, if I may use the term; no other could pass from us whose loss would be the subject of keener and more lasting regret. I came to Parliament with him. I myself shall very much miss his face here, and I am sure that all members of the House will share with me the unescapable and lasting regret that we shall know no more of his friendship, his companionship, and his service.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my right hon. friend in, and to associate this side of the House with, the tribute which he has paid to the memory of our late colleague and the extending of our sympathy to his relatives and friends. Like my right hon. friend, I entered Parliament at the same time as the late Mr. Wallace, and have had the privilege, therefore, of a long personal acquaintance with him. Hon. members who have shared that privilege will, I am sure, feel that the Prime Minister has expressed sentiments which will be entertained generally among the members of this House.

My right hon. friend made reference to the circumstance that the father of the late Mr. Wallace was also a distinguished member of Parliament. That, perhaps, is deserving of more than passing mention. There is a tradition with regard to public service which is stronger, perhaps, in the Old World than it is in this, which unites families in a common devotion to their country. Mr. Wallace, by succeeding his father in the service of his country in Parliament and, in addition, serving his country in the South African War, where he distinguished himself, maintained in a worthy manner this finest of family traditions. Let us hope that the example he set in this particular will prove an inspiration to the younger men of Canada. Mr. Wallace, though one of the older members of the House in point of service, was one of the youngest in point of years. I am sure we all feel that in his early death the country has lost not only a generous and chivalrous spirit, but one who, had he been spared, would have continued to render useful service to his country.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the right hon. leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition in the remarks they have made concerning the loss this House has sustained in the death of Captain Wallace. He was a much older member of this House than I am, but I had known of him before I came here and had known of the distinguished services rendered to his country by his father. All who have been associated with the work of this House will remember the kindly greeting, the glad hand, the open spirit, that was characteristic of Captain Wallace. His taking away is an evidence of the shortness of the span of human life, but I am sure that his memory in the precincts of this building, and particularly in this Chamber, will be cherished to the end of their days by all who have been associated with him.

Let me say a word also in respect to the loss this House has sustained in another direction. Since the termination of our session last summer, the hand of Death has been heavy upon this Chamber: three other members distinguished in the House have also been called to the Great Beyond. It was not my privilege to have had a very close acquaintance with the late Mr. Gladu, who represented Yamaska, but one was struck by the diligence of his efforts in the performance of his legislative duties. And he had also—no higher testimony can any man have—the respect and esteem of those who were associated with him.

Colonel McLeod was a well known figure in this House. In more fields than one he had rendered distinguished service to his country and his taking away in the very prime of his life came as a surprise and a shock to us all.

I was better acquainted with the late Mr. Sifton than I was with any of the others who have gone. Mr. Sifton's name was a household word in Western Canada. In many ways he rendered distinguished service to his country, not only in the

Legislature of the Northwest Territories, but on the Bench and in this House as well. It is not too much to say that Mr. Sifton's career on the Bench in Western Canada in the formative period of its development had a great deal to do with the establishment of law and order—and, more than that, Sir, with the respect for law and order which is inherent in British peoples. I recall very well a conversation I had with him upon one occasion. We were discussing the laws passed by our Dominion and Provincial legislative bodies, and how it not infrequently happened that laws were hastily passed, and, after the test of experience, found to be unsound. He made this observation: "Whether a law is a good law or a bad law, it should be rigidly enforced. If it is a good law, it will do good; if it is a bad law, the people will waken to the consequences of it. Above all we must have, in the development of this country with its cosmopolitan people, a respect for law and order; for only upon such a basis can we build up a true and solid society." These words struck me, Mr. Speaker, as being pregnant with wisdom. Mr. Sifton was not a "mixer," as the ordinary term is, but those more closely associated with him knew the value of his friendship. We can always look back upon his career as having been a distinguished one in the service of his country. Those who knew him best will miss him greatly; those who knew him less intimately will have the memory of the respect that he earned in all his associations in this House and in other fields of activity in Canada.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH —ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency, the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Friday, February 18.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the amendment which has been moved to the motion for an address illustrates two things: first, lack of courage on the part of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King); second, the poverty of his political equipment. It had been heralded throughout this country that the leader of the Opposition had at last found his fighting spirit and that he was coming to this House with his batteries all massed and his artillery in order so that he could lead an attack that would wipe this Government and this Parliament out of existence. After he has spoken for some two hours, what do we find? We find that he has not one word to utter in condemnation of any legislation of this Parliament and that he has absolutely no policy to offer to the people of this country. In my opinion, a vote of want of confidence is and should be and, I think, has in history been based upon one of two things: first, the exposition of some policy which the mover thought it was in the public interest to adopt: second, the condemnation of some legislative acts of the Government. What do we find in this case? After addressing the House for about two hours, the leader of the Opposition admits that he has no policy and proves that he has no case against this Government. He simply talks, crying, as it were, on the outside of the citadel in the hope that the ramparts will fall down and he may be wafted into office. Who could imagine a Gladstone, or a Salisbury, or a Disraeli, asking any Parliament for a vote of want of confidence without having some policy to offer or some condemnation of the Government? What I have said exemplifies two things: first, lack of courage on the part of the leader of the Opposition, and second, lack of political equipment on his part. Stripped of all its verbiage, what does this mean? It means simply this, that if this debate is to be carried on as it should be, we have nothing left to debate but the fitness of the leader of the Opposition to occupy the position of first minister of Canada. God forbid that this party and this Government should lead this hon. member to his political doom through a path so tortuous and rocky as that. Rather would I throw the curtain of oblivion over him and leave him in peace; for I can assure him that when he goes to the country he will find plenty to contend against without that.

But, supposing this amendment should carry and this country should be precipitated into the throes of an election, I should like the hon. member to say where he stands on the great question of taxation. What are his plans and projects for carrying and paying off the great debt which the war has placed upon this country? Has he any policy? If he has, he is entitled to place it before this Parliament. What is his policy regarding the great railway mixup which this country is in at the present time, and which is incidentally due to the party of which he is at present the

leader? What is his policy as regards repatriation of Canadian soldiers? What is his policy regarding pensions for those who were wounded in the battlefields of France? These are some of the things on which the hon. member should have stated his position before this House when he asked this House to vote a want of confidence in the present Government. What also, might I ask, is his policy regarding some of the things mentioned in the speech from the Throne? He has occupied the position of Ministér of Labour in the Government of this country, and I should like to know, and the country would like to know, what his attitude is to-day on unemployment insurance. Unemployment is, to my mind, one of the great causes of unrest to-day; nothing is so conductive to unrest on the part of the labouring man as when he finds that his employment is wanting; that he has nothing laid by for his wife and family, and that poverty is more or less confronting him. In a country like Canada, where, by the nature of her climate, employment is more or less seasonal, this is one of the great problems that has been laid before Parliament during the past two years and one on which the leader of the Opposition is called upon to give an opinion. I hope the Minister of Labour may be successful in finding some solution for this problem and also for the question of old age pensions, mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Nothing is so sad in my experience than to see a man or a woman who has passed the earning point of life and who, through sickness or disaster, is faced with poverty. In Canada no man or woman has a right to be placed in that position. I do not agree with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that this is something to which the country should pay no attention. The aged and the poor are just claims upon—I was going to say charity, but it is not that—the Government and the people of this country. Many men and women have reached that state through no fault of their own, and it is the duty of every country to look after its citizens who have become impoverished through sickness or death or accident, and to see that they are not left in want in their old days.

Let us look for a moment at the official Opposition and see where they stand. I have stated that the leader of the Opposition has no policy to offer why we should vote this Government out and them in. Some one may say that they set a platform before the people in this country in 1919. That is quite true, but where do they stand now? Shortly after that, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) through a paper which he owns, stated that platforms were made to get in on and not to stand on. Following that up he went to Peterborough where he told the people they could trust the Liberal party because they had failed for fifteen years to carry out their promises in relation to the tariff, and what they had done once they could do again. Another member of the Opposition stated that they had a platform and in that there were certain provisions for tariff revision, but he would have nothing done until he had gone once or twice before the people of Canada for their endorsation. What kind of a government would you have, if elected on issues like that? Then, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) who so often amuses this House has another theory; he has gone into the subterranean passages of time and there amidst the dust and cobwebs of antiquity he has got hold of that bundle of straw called free trade, and he hands that out to the people of this country in 1921 as a means for their national sustenance. These are some of the views held by hon. members who sit opposite us and who hope to be voted into power. The hon. member for Brome may speak for the county of Brome, but I doubt if he can speak for the province of Quebec. I am quite positive he cannot speak for Ontario, a province the product of whose people last year, if converted into dollars, would be sufficient to pay off the whole national debt of Canada; a province in which are invested hundreds of millions of dollars in manufacturing plants, employing some four hundred thousand men. That is the condition of affairs in the province of Ontario. What would be the condition if the hon. member for Brome had his way? I say that free trade would mean industrial stagnation and poverty for the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. It would mean the turning out of employment of hundreds of thousands of working men, and throwing their families destitute, more or less, upon the rest of the province. I ask any man who will look over the history of this country. Are you prepared to vote for a party that takes no stand on the fiscal policy of this country? Are you willing to trust a party that does not even know its own mind or its own policy for twenty-four hours at a time. That, I think, is the great issue before this country to-day. It is a question that has affected every country in the world, and

nearly every nation has been driven to the policy of protection to protect its own interests. Here, in Canada, an agitation has been started to tear down the bars and make this country practically an adjunct to the United States. Free trade in Canada would mean industrial stagnation, particularly in the East, and I think that before any hon. gentleman attempts to lead the Opposition in this country, or is entitled to seek power, he should tell the people of this country just where he stands on the fiscal question, and what he intends to do if he gets into power.

The hon. leader of the Opposition also says that we do not represent the people, and he asks Parliament to vote the Government out on that ground. I would like to ask by what right or authority he speaks for the people of the province of Ontario. Twice the people of Ontario had a chance to elect him to this House, but he was ignominiously defeated on both occasions, yet he stands up and tells the House that we do not represent the constituencies which we are here to represent at the present time. I would like to know by what right or authority a man makes such a statement who has been twice defeated for a seat in this House, and was eventually returned only through the courtesy, more or less, of this Government. I think it is an arrogant assertion for him to make, and that it is only made in desperation because he has no other case to make out.

What is the record of the present Government? Has the leader of the Opposition any fault to find with their war record? Has he any fault to find with taxation in this country, or with the way the public moneys have been spent? Does he find fault with the Government's efforts to repatriate the soldiers, or in the matter of pensions? If so, he has been beautifully silent. This Government spent $1,600,000,000 of the people's money in our war effort. Has the hon. gentleman ever challenged the expenditure of one dollar of that amount on the ground that it was being misspent? If so, he has not done it in this House. Has he challenged any of the acts of the Government? He says we are extravagant, but he produces no figures to prove his contention. I would like to ask him whether he finds fault with the great prosperity this country has enjoyed during the last five or six years, in which time almost every branch of commerce has doubled or trebled. Field crops, for example, have grown from 33,000,000 to 55,000,000 bushels in the last few years, and their value has increased from $660,000,000 to $1,500,000,000 per annum. Land has increased in value from $35 to $52 per acre. Mineral production has increased from $91,000,000 to $173,000,000. Fisheries have increased from $29,000,000 to $60,000,000. Manufacturing industries have increased from $1,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000. Do these figures show that the country has been mismanaged, or that we are now struggling in the throes of poverty? These are a few of the questions which the hon. gentleman might ask before he attempts to turn out this Government on the ground of extravagance or carelessness.

But we are going to have an election, and it may not be so very far off. I do not speak for the Government, but I want to tell the leader of the Opposition and hon. gentlemen opposite that if he thinks we on this side of the House are afraid to go to the country, he is quite mistaken. There will be an election, and when it is over and the leader of the Opposition surveys the political battlefield, he will see many an ambulance carrying the political corpses of his friends. Could the hon. gentleman himself find a political asylum other than Elba or St. Helena? If he could, he would be very lucky indeed. I do not think he will find it in the province of Ontario.

The leader of the Opposition says the Government has made mistakes. Supposing it has. Where is the man that has not made mistakes? Has the hon. gentleman's career been so free from mistakes that he can hold up to ridicule any party or Government that may have made mistakes? Is the history of his party free from mistakes? Did they not make a mistake when they guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern from Port Arthur to the East? Did they not make a mistake when they built the Grand Trunk Pacific forty or fifty years before its time? Have they not made mistakes later than that? Did Mr. Balfour not make a mistake when he opposed giving to South Africa perfect political freedom? Did Webster not make a mistake when he refused to join the Abolitionists, and Lee when he joined the Secessionists in the United States? Did Hannibal not make a mistake when he crossed the Alps? Did Mark Anthony not make a mistake when he succumbed to the bewitching wiles of the Egyptian Queen that cost him the sceptre of Rome? Who does not make mistakes? Does not even

the sun suffer an occasional eclipse? It is only the leader of the Opposition who stands out on the great canvas of time and says: I am the spotless one; vote the Government out because their record has not been perfect. I ask, is that fair? Is not the fair thing to test the Government by the average working of its legislation and its effects? I ask this House to look over the Government's record during the last five or six years—trying years when the people of this country have been forced to do things they did not want to do, and pay taxes they did not want to pay, and eat things they did not want to eat, and say whether or not the Government has done well on the whole. I believe that when the time comes to appeal to the country, the people will endorse the Government's record which was made, let us remember, in the most trying times in history.

But there is more than that. This Government has duties to perform, and I think that one of them is to see that when a new Parliament is elected it will fairly represent the people. And I think that the western members are the ones who will gain most by this. Personally—and I think this applies to many in Ontario—I am of the opinion that we should be much better off going to the country before rather than after redistribution. But that is not the principle. The principle for this Government and for Parliament is that of administering justice, and only strict justice, to the people of the country, and when a Parliament is elected it should be elected on an honest and just franchise. But, Mr. Speaker, if those from the West, who have most to gain by this, think differently and vote accordingly, then I say to this Government that they can well consider their obligations in that respect fulfilled, and they might be justified in appealing to the country at any time they thought best.

Now, I would add a word by way of congratulation to the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen), whose career I followed for many years before I entered the House. I have seen him rise from a humble member until he now occupies the highest position in the gift of the Canadian people, and I sincerely congratulate not only himself but his party and the country as well. We have in him a leader who is not afraid to nail his colours to the mast, and he may rest assured that he has behind him a party that is willing to fight, and fight until the last trench is won. I tender him my heartfelt congratulations, for I think it is a source of pride to us that a young man, without any financial assistance and without influence of any kind, can in this country rise to the greatest position which the people can offer him. It must be a source of pride to the right hon. gentleman, and no doubt it is to the people of Canada, that he has risen to that eminence. He has, in the language of Tennyson:

> Lived to clutch the golden keys,
> To mould a mighty state's decreess.
> And shape the whispers of a throne.

Hon. HENRI SEVERIN BELAND (Beauce): My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) will not, I hope, expect me to follow him closely in the remarks which I intend to address to the House at the present time. I may, however, refer at once to his closing words, in which he asks the House and the country whether anybody can claim for himself that he has never been in his life guilty of a mistake, implying thereby that the present Government and that which immediately preceded it have been in many instances guilty of serious mistakes. Let me say that whatever the past mistakes of this Government may have been, the gravest and most serious of all is that of refusing, in such a determined manner, an appeal to the people, which is claimed by the whole country.

Although the question of the League of Nations is in the present debate only of secondary importance, two of the ministers who have seen fit to address the House have confined themselves entirely to that subject. The time for discussing the League of Nations is properly during the Budget debate. But you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, just for a few moments to say, in reference to the matter, that the expectation of the House and of the country that the representatives of Canada in Geneva would furnish the people with a report or a summary of the work accomplished there, as well as of the constitution of the League and of the part played by those representatives themselves, has not been frustrated. We have heard, first, my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who, in a pointed, clear, and concise discourse, rich in adjectival description, outlined for us the structure of this international edifice known as the League of Nations. With his unusual power of eloquence, he has unveiled to us a part of the future. He has depicted that future to us as an earthly paradise, where all men will live like brothers.

When he sat down and I found myself back to earth, I had somewhat of the distressed feeling which was experienced by Edward Bellamy's hero in "Looking Backward", after he had awakened from his dream of the conditions of the world in the year 2000. The wars are still raging. But then the hon. the ex-President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) came to his colleague's rescue and explained it all. It was true he told us, that wars were still raging in Russia and in the Near-East countries, but he explained that the primary duty was not to restore but to maintain peace; that the duty of restoring peace amongst the nations at war did not fall to the lot of the League of Nations but was incumbent on the Supreme Council. There we have seen the judicial mind strictly applied. But I desire to congratulate the hon. member for Durham on the special position he took in Geneva on the important question of the distribution of natural resources. It was the affirmation of national autonomy and the confirmation of a policy which has been dear to the hearts of members of the Liberal party. We have now to hear further from my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty). What has been said by the two former ministers is quite clear; but may I say, with all due regard to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that I dread his explanation of the whole issue, for I fear he will complicate it beyond repair. The interpretation of international law is full of possibilities and, as we know, even purely national law is very much involved. I hope, therefore, the Minister of Justice will not torture the text too much.

The feature of this League of Nations is the International Tribunal. We realize fully that the important step to be gained, when passion is unchained, is delay. This applies as between nations as well as between individuals; and in the application in Canada of the Industrial Disputes Act we have in many instances recognized the truth of the assertion, that when you can once obtain a delay the situation is safe. In the case of the International Tribunal though it will not have a compulsory character, we believe that by wise delaying the barriers of discord existing between two threatening nations will be removed, even barriers which at one time seemed insuperable. Who would for one moment deny that in the year 1914, in the fateful July days at the time of the Austro-Servian embroglio, if this case had been referred to an international tribunal the most terrible conflict in the history of the world would have been avoided? Let us hope that the League of Nations will be a success. There are many difficulties in the path. There is this Article 10, which has prevented an important nation from joining; and in connection with this Article may I say the attitude of the Liberal party in the session before last, and during last session, has been fully vindicated. Now that a memorandum has been published which reveals the attitude of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who led the previous administration, we learn that he had proposed or advised the Peace Conference to do away with Article 10. When the Treaty was under consideration we on this side moved that Article 10 be accepted only with a reservation, but our motion was turned down by the then Government. Before the members of the Assembly in the month of December last the Minister of Justice moved an amendment to the Covenant of the League of Nations to strike out this famous Article 10. I would have been glad had the ministers who represented Canada at Gevena discussed clause 18 of the Covenant which refers to the registration of treaties. Not a single word however, has been uttered in regard to that, though it is a matter of public knowledge that two nations who were charter members, so to speak, of the League of Nations have signed an important treaty between themselves and have refused to register it with the Secretariat.

There is another feature, though I do not want to labour the point too far, in connection with the League of Nations, to which I would like to refer. It is the question of expenses. The League of Nations, Mr. Speaker, promises to be an expensive venture. In a report which has been published by Mr. Noblemaire, a Frenchman, the salaries of the officials are given as follows: The general secretary receives a modest salary of $40,000 a year. The under-secretaries, two of them, each receive $16,000 a year. A special under-secretary receives $20,000 a year; six directors about $10,000 each; and one head of the International Labour Bureau, a Socialist by the way, receives the modest remuneration of $24,000 a year. The monthly cost of the League of Nations is reported as being £400,000, equivalent to $1,600,000 per month. The share of Canada, it will be found, will be very large. As we are aware, it is calculated upon the fact that

the nation is a member of the International Postal Union. It is difficult to find a basis on which to establish the proper proportion that each country should pay. But would you think it is fair for Canada, with its population of 8,000,000, to pay as much, as, for instance, Great Britain with a population of 45,000,000, or France with a population of 40,000,000? What should be used as a basis is difficult to find. It cannot be based on area, it cannot very well be based on population; perhaps it could be based on the annual budget of each country. However, that remains to be settled later. All I can say with regard to the League of Nations is that I wish it Godspeed. It appeals to me, and its underlying principles, its noble ideals, I think, should appeal to all men who are concerned for the peace of the world. If properly constituted and well supported it ought to avert war in the future if any machinery or any policy can do so. The main object of the League, as stated by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) is the doing away with the balance of power and replacing this old system by the concert of nations which would bring, as it were, the nations to think of other nations as eventual friends instead of possible enemies. In this regard I would say that war teaches us that alliances call into existence counter alliances, and that in my opinion any system of political confederation of the British Empire would be looked upon with dismay by the nations inside of the League, and nations that are still outside of it which every one would wish to see coming in. Yes, I repeat, any form of Imperial federation, of parliamentary federation, of executive federation, or of administrative federation, will only increase the difficulties now in the way of the successful establishment and complete maturity of the League of Nations.

During last session it was my privilege to address the House and to mention that there existed a powerful and carefully prepared organization to prmote in the nations within the British Empire a movement in favour of centralization. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who spoke on that occasion almost scoffed at the idea; but to-day it cannot be denied that such a movement is alive throughout the British Empire. Some sorely tormented souls think they have discovered that the British Empire has reached the turning point in its history; something appears to them to be wrong with the Empire. What is the matter with the British Empire now? The answer that would come to every man's tongue would be, in the vernacular: The British Empire is "all right!" But political heelers have sprung up from every corner bringing in their medicine chests, as it were, a panacea. What is their panacea? To centralize in London the political, the military and the naval power of the British Empire. I say the British Empire is not suffering from any incapacity. That does not mean that it is not confronted with very serious problems—and one problem in particular which we hope will be solved to the satisfaction of all concerned, but in which Canada has only a very remote interest, if any interest at all.

As I said, there exists two schools in England, in Canada and in the other British dominions: One school works for centralization; the other works for local control. Something transpired during the recess to which, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House. We had a visit of the Imperial Press Conference delegates. They landed at Sydney on the 28th July, 1920. The head of that delegation appeared to us all to be Lord Burnham. It is, I think, out of place that I should at this moment delay the House by describing who Lord Burnham is. If not the most eminent, he is at least one of the eminent newspaper men of England. Let me quote to you the words uttered by Lord Burnham at Sydney on the 28th July last in responding to an address that had been read to him:

> We have not come to lay down the law, to teach you how to run your own show, or still less to tell you how much better we would have done it if it had been at home. We do not do that because we do not believe it is true.
>
> We have not come as preachers or teachers. We have come to learn for ourselves the secret of the great success of the Dominion, and to learn how she has managed in so short a span of years to accomplish such immense things.

Nobody can take exception to those words. As a matter of fact, we had expected Lord Burnham to speak in that strain. A few weeks later, on the 2nd of September, 1920, in Edmonton, the same Lord Burnham expressed himself, according to a report in the Montreal Star of that date, as follows:

> The creation of a common council sitting in London, on which the Dominions would be represented by resident Ministers for the purpose of taking their proper place in Imperial affairs, was advocated by Lord Burnham, speaking at a banquet given to the Imperial Press Conference delegates by the Government of Alberta here—Edmonton—last night.

Viscount Burnham alluded to what might be the constitution of such a council given executive as well as judicial powers, but they would have to determine what was necessary and then constitute the machinery to meet the case.

Then he goes on:

I venture to propose this because I believe that you are anxious to bring into unity the various parts of the Empire and guard against any breakdown in the future.

Was there any breakdown in the past I wonder? Now my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will realize that there is an important movement on foot. But that is not all. Lord Cave on the same date expressed himself in the city of Ottawa, on the occasion of a lunch given by the Bar Association, in the following terms:

For a generation some of the ablest statesmen, of the time—Rosebery, Chamberlain, Grey, and others whose names will occur to you,—were considering how best a further link could be forged between the central and Dominion governments which should be neither so stiff as to gall, nor so weak as to break under a strain. It may be that the problem has been solved quietly and almost unconsciously, (as our habit is) by the establishment of the Imperial War Cabinet as an effective council of the Empire. That Assembly of the leading statesmen of the self-governing parts of the Empire, first called together in 1917 for the purpose of discussing the conduct of the war and some of the higher issues of Imperial policy, proved to be of so much service, both to its members and to the countries concerned that it was unanimously determined at the instance of the British Prime Minister to keep it in being. And so other meetings took place at a later crisis of the war, and again when the terms of peace were under consideration.

Now comes the crucial phrase:

The experiment,—for at first it was nothing more,—proved an unqualified success.

I believe that. It was a war measure, but, as my right hon. friend said the other day, "war is the negation of order."

And to many of us—

continues Lord Cave:

—it seems possible that the Imperial War Cabinet may, (if the Imperial Conference should so determine) drop its middle name, and while remaining wholly voluntary and consultative may become in world affairs the nerve centre of the autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth.

If you drop the middle name "war," you get the title "Imperial Cabinet."

Those who believe in a greater expansion and a greater development of Canadian autonomy will read with some dismay what is being said by those important British statesmen and public men. The question is not: Shall the British dissolve, or shall the British Empire endure? There is in this country as, I think, there is in every domininon of the British Empire, only one opinion: that the British Empire should last, should endure, should persist, should continue, for the good of the world; because the British Empire can and does play an important part in the world's affairs. We on this side hold to-day the view that was held by the Liberal party at all times—the view of Alexander Mackenzie, of Sir Oliver Mowat, of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, of Mr. Blake—that the British Empire will endure only through the exercise of the largest possible measure of local autonomy. Let us rebuff all attempts, patent or veiled, to sink Canada's individuality, Canda's self-consciousness, Canada's self-reliance—in a word, Canada's national pride and autonomy, in the vortex of Imperial Federation.

There are two reasons, equally important, why we should resist any such attempts. One is with regard to the League of Nations. The concentration of the political powers of the British Empire would evoke suspicion in the minds of other nations; would provoke a spirit of rivalry, and, perhaps cause another race for supremacy in armaments. Furthermore, let us oppose the scheme, from whatever source it comes, on the ground that any such attempt to centralize political power in the metropolis of the British Empire would tend to the disintegration of that Empire.

There exists in Canada at the present time a good deal of unrest and dissatisfaction. That has been confessed by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. What, Mr. Speaker, in your opinion, is the cause of this dissatisfaction? Is it the direct and immediate result of that most terrific conflict which was inflicted upon humanity? Partly, yes. The fact that fifty thousand Canadians laid down their lives in the Great War; that at least fifty thousand homes mourn the loss of dear ones; that one hundred thousand Canadians have been maimed, incapacitated, disabled, partially or totally—certainly these circumstances are sufficient to create a certain amount of restlessness. But the main and the fundamental cause of the unrest and dissatisfaction in Canada to-day is to be found in the utter disregard of public opinion on the part of the present Government. Not only is public opinion disregarded, but our parliamentary institutions have been treated cavalierly and in a high-handed manner. It was my privilege to visit all the provinces but two during the

recess, and I found, from the Atlantic to the Rockies, a general opinion prevailing among the people to the effect that this Government has outlived its mandate, and concurrent with this opinion is the universal desire for an appeal to the people. It would be over-stating the case to contend that there are not a few friends who desire to see the Administration remain in office—a few personal friends, a few courtiers, a few sycophants, a few interested persons; but these exceptions only go to prove the rule.

Listening the other day to the right hon. gentleman's able address, I failed to detect any good ground upon which he could base his refusal to consult the Canadian people. The only ground upon which he could pretend to base that refusal was that the Canadian West was entitled to a larger representation in Parliament; that that larger representation could be obtained only through a redistribution of seats; that a redistribution of seats could be effected only after a census had been taken; therefore it was his duty, he thought, to postpone the general election till that redistribution had taken place. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is only a simulacrum of reason, it is a mere pretext. I am an admirer of the West; one cannot be indifferent to those immense plains which conceal in their bosom the food of nations. The immense coal deposits of Alberta, which could supply the motive power of numberless industries, cannot but appeal to the imagination. I repeat that I admire the West, and I would be very glad indeed to see their representation in Parliament increased. But what are the conditions? Since 1913 immigration in Canada has almost been at a standstill, though the pivotal province of Canada, Quebec, has very largely increased its population. It is no secret that no seats can be gained outside the province of Quebec unless there has been an increase in the population proportionate to the increase in the province of Quebec. However desirous one may be to see the West gain more representation in this House; the contention, I feel, that the West will gain substantially after the next redistribution cannot be entertained. I readily understood the right hon. gentleman when he pointed his artillery towards my friends sitting to my left. "Will you not have ten more seats?" he said. "Will you not have fifteen more seats, perhaps twenty-five, for all we know?" But I think the range was too long and that his projectile must have passed over the heads of my good friends the Agrarians. My right hon. friend claims that the West may have twenty-five new seats. Well, I will set my prophecy against his: that after the next census the increased representation to the western provinces will be nearer one than ten, and between the two. But, for the sake of argument, let us say that it will be ten, fifteen, twenty, or even twenty-five. Does anyone amongst my friends the Agrarians, who know the adroitness of the Prime Minister, for one moment think that they will get one of those seats? Everybody knows how skilful a drafter of a measure is the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and with what immense success he was able in the past to send home those men who did not wish to share his political views. No, my friends the Agrarians will find out after the next census that if the West is entitled to five seats more, ten seats more, fifteen seats more, they will be taken away from the rural constituencies and given to the urban centres. The odds are entirely against the Agrarians in this regard. In a moment of apparent tender compassion the right hon. gentleman turned to the group which, as he says, is angularly situated, and he said: "See what confronts you. If you have dissolution now, you loose fifteen, twenty seats; whilst if you will vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, you will not have the elections now and then you will have fifteen more seats and your group will be so much increased." I do not know my good friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) very well if I cannot imagine coming from the remote bottom of his heart the groaning remark "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes—I fear the Greeks even when they bear presents." There was no other reason he could invoke, on the contrary he has found very much comfort in the result of the Peterborough election. He says that the Peterborough election is a vindication of his fiscal policy. If it is possible for my right hon. friend to confine the discussion in a general election to the tariff issue, if it is possible for him to ignore or make the people of Canada ignore all the mistakes and blunders of his administration; if he thinks that all his sins and those of his predecessor are already forgotten or at least forgiven; if in a word his appreciation of the Peterborough verdict is just and correct, why not appeal to the people and he shall be supported by the country at large? He will not do that; he will cling desperately to the rudder in a frantic effort—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To save the country.

Mr. BELAND: No, but to avoid the rock which awaits him, the rock of popular disfavour and indignation; he may not however do that indefinitely; he may postpone the evil day a week, a month, a year——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh no, never.

Mr. BELAND: —but the time will come when Its Majesty, the Canadian Constitution, will send him before his natural judge, the Canadian people.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Good old judge.

Mr. BELAND: That will condemn him. He has selected his ground — the tariff issue; he will not have anything else, and he protests very much when we Liberals charge him with being the instrument of the big financial interests of this country. He asks: "Where is your ground for the assertion?" This reminds me of the story of a lover who paid a visit to his sweetheart who was a little shy. He asked her: "Do you love me?" She did not answer. "If you love me, say so; if you do not love me, say so, and if you love me and do not want to say so, squeeze my hand." In this case, I think the big interests have come to the right hon. gentleman and have asked him: "Do you love us?" He did not answer. "Do you not love us?" He did not answer. "Well, let us settle it this way; if you love us and do not want to say so, squeeze our hand," and the right hon. gentleman has squeezed the hand of the big financial interests.

The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. P. McGibbon) was asking us: "What is your policy on the tariff question? Have you a policy at all?" And all of those gentlemen on the other side to whom it has been my privilege to listen since the beginning of the debate have put the same question and have charged the leader of the Opposition with having no policy at all on the tariff question, of refusing to state his policy publicly. It has been my great advantage and pleasure to accompany the leader of the Opposition at some public meetings in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and at every meeting the leader of the Opposition has made a clear exposition of his fiscal policy. When the time comes, on the Budget debate, to discuss the Liberal platform, I think my friends will be satisfied; but let me say that the Liberal platform has a few advantages which I will summarize as follows: The Liberal fiscal policy harmonizes the diverse interests in Canada. It avoids extreme protection and its curses. It preserves in Canada the legitimate industries, especially those industries which are based upon our natural resources. It relieves the great body of agriculturists in Canada from the burden of taxation which bears upon them, and thereby enhances production. It renders more accessible to the housewife and to the workingman the procuring of the necessaries of life. It ensures revenue which is so necessary to face the present financial obligations, and it has the stabilizing effect which is all-important in this agitated epoch and period. We are here face to face with a case of personal power. If you wish an instance of personal regime in Canada, since the right hon. gentleman has taken the reins of office, the House will remember that last session and the session before last, measures were introduced into Parliament to create what was known as the Canadian Purchasing Commission. At the session before last this Bill which was introduced was never enacted into law. At the last session, the same fate met the same proposition. The session came to an end on the first day of July, 1920, or thereabouts. The right hon. gentleman was selected as the Prime Minister of Canada, and two or three weeks had not elapsed before he convened around the council table his advisors and passed an Order in Council, in face of the refusal of Parliament in two sessions, creating the Canadian Purchasing Commission. If that is not a case of personal power and personal regime, I should like to know what is. All trace of a personal regime passed away in England with William IV, and indeed in France one has to delve back in history some two or three centuries to find an absolute monarch, Louis XIV, who when he was reproached for having ordered an iron mask on a man's face, answered, "I, I alone, I am the King." That is the language spoken to-day to the people of Canada, through the House of Commons, by the right hon. gentleman. Now that the war is over, now that the majority of the members composing the Union Government has left it, now that the leader of the Unionist party of 1917 has resigned and has almost entirely disinterested himself from the public life of Canada, the proper course for this Government to take is plainly indicated; it should dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people of Canada for a new mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few more remarks to offer, and they are on the Quebec situation. A situation has developed in Quebec which seems to have attracted a large measure of attention on the part of the press outside of Quebec, of the population in general, and of the public men of this country. It is claimed that Quebec is isolated. I have never been able to understand from what, and from whom. Has not Quebec been in as complete intercourse with the other provinces of Canada as heretofore? For my part, I have never visited more of Canada than during the last two years-and-a-half. The personal and social relations as between province and province have certainly not been altered in any way. So much for the social aspect of the case. As far as commercial intercourse is concerned, competent authorities will tell you that the trade as between the province of Quebec and the other provinces of Canada is more flourishing than ever. In an international sense also, Quebec is not any more isolated. She trades with the Mother Country and the rest of Europe, with Asia, Africa, Australia, the United States, and the countries of South America. Numberless bottoms ply down the St. Lawrence in the navigation season laden with the magnificent produce of Quebec's arduous labour in the mines, in the forest, on the land, and in the factories. What is wrong? Is there anything wrong?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: The Tories are wrong.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) has laboured the contention to the breaking point, as it were, but one could not help observing this anomaly in his comparison. St. John the Baptist, to whom he humbly compares himself, lived in a desert. Why should he seek company? And is he not aware that the very place where he seeks company is the most isolated in the world? Or perhaps I am wrong. Maybe he is looking for deeper isolation, and that is why he is going to the other side. The population of French race, Mr. Speaker, are in point of number but meagrely represented in this Government. No member of the Canadian Government belonging to that race has been returned from Quebec. I do not wish to re-hash what passed during the fateful and famous elections of 1917, and shall confine myself to giving advice to the Government. The election of 1917 was an abnormal or, at least, an extraordinary election. It was a war election.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Debauchery.

Mr. BELAND: We had in 1917 a war general election: what is the matter with having to-day a peace general election? Let us have the election, let us bury the old feuds. Mr. Speaker, I would be the last man to seek political advantage out of appeals to racial prejudices, and in my twenty-four years of public life one would vainly search for a line or a word or an act of mine tending to create ill-feeling between the noble races which make up the population of Canada. Yet I feel bound to-day to bring to your attention and that of the country some accomplished facts, which may be, and as a matter of consequence, are more eloquent than words. The remarks I am about to make, Mr. Speaker, apply equally to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-day and the right hon. gentleman, his predecessor, whose administration he claims he is responsible for, and rightly so. Therefore, he cannot have any objections to my holding him responsible for the actions of the Borden Government, and it is proper that it should be so.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the declarations made by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, in Sherbrooke, in Granby, in Montreal, lately, and in Stirling, Ontario, as well as the challenge issued two or three days ago by the hon. member for the county of Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) I would not have laboured the point any further, but let me call your attention to some of the deeds of the Borden Government and some of the deeds of the Meighen Government.

We have in Canada a Board, constituted by Act of Parliament, called the Canadian National Railways Board. It comprises nine directors. Now the population of Canada is about nine millions, and the French population is in round numbers three millions.

I will read to you the names of the directors of the Canadian National Railways: Hanna, Mitchell, Wood, Riley, Hobson, Bell, Laporte, Cantley, Barnhill. One man of French race. Does my right hon. friend think that is a fair distribution of public offices? That is one example. The French race comprises one-third of the population of Canada. Now, let us take the Board of Commerce. Here is the first board: Robertson, O'Connor, Murdock; secretary, White; four men. Is any one of them of

the French race? None. Take the year 1920; the re-constituted Board of Commerce consists of the following gentlemen: White, Acland, Allan; no secretary. Is there any man of French race among them? None. Take the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the Sugar Board?

Mr. BELAND: Here is a board created to deal with the big question of pensions to Canadian soldiers and their dependents. The French race, I make bold to say, furnished 35,000 men at least to the armies that went from Canada to the other side. Thirty-five thousand is my figure; of these, a few thousands have laid down their lives across the ocean for their country. Many thousands more are disabled to-day and have to deal with the Pensions Board, and it will be interesting to see of whom this board is comprised. Its personnel is as follows: Thomson, Margeson, Davis; and secretary, Ahearn. Any man of French race among those gentlemen? None. Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that when I refer to these gentlemen who happened to have been appointed to any of these boards, I do not desire to imply, in the remotest degree, that they are not qualified for their positions. Not at all. But that is not the point; it is not the question under consideration. Let us go one step further; let us take the International Joint Commission. There was at one time Mr. Casgrain, who was later called to the Government of the country, and was replaced by Mr. Mignault. The latter became a Judge of the Supreme Court during, I think, the administration of the hon. member for King's Nova Scotia, (Sir Robert Borden). What is now the composition of the International Joint Commission? Here are the names: Magrath, Powell, Hearst, and Burpee, secretary. Any man of French race there? Is the French race, the third of Canada's population, represented there? No. Let us go another step further.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Commercial agents.

Mr. BELAND: In 1918, after the armistice was signed, the question came up of selecting three men to represent Canada at the Peace Conference, in the heart of France, at Versailles, a few miles from the great French centre, Paris. Now, here is one-third of the population of Canada comprised in the French race, and although three men are selected to represent this country in Frence, not a single one of them is of the French race or tongue. They were Sir Robert Borden, the Hons. Foster and Doherty.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. BELAND: Here now is the first meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva, where three gentlemen were apointed to represent Canada. Who were they? The Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir George Foster; Mr. Rowell, the ex-President of the Privy Council; and the present Minister of Justice, Mr. Doherty. Is there any man of French tongue among them, any man of French race? Not at all. Now Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that this matter has been brought up in the House, and I bring it up not because I want to complain but because we were challenged. Were we challenged? Let me quote to you the words of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), uttered the other day:

> I, Mr. Speaker, have more confidence in the judgment and sense of fair play of the people of Quebec than have these hon. gentlemen who profess to speak for that province, and my confidence in their judgment and sense of fair play is such that I believe in the course of time they will ask the men who are making these charges and indulging in these unwarranted statements to back up their charges and assertions with facts, and back them up in a way that will leave no doubt as to their truth of falsity.

On the other hand, my right hon. friend spoke in Montreal about three weeks ago and said that you could not point to one single sentence of his or a word uttered by him in the course of his public life that could be interpreted as being hostile to the French race in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and is it any wonder to my hon. friend if the heart of Quebec is somewhat wounded? Is Quebec isolated? No, Mr. Speaker: Quebec is not isolated. She has a warm place in her heart for other provinces, and I venture to say that the provinces of Canada have a warm place in their hearts for the province of Quebec. And the hands of Governments are powerless to destroy feelings and sentiments that are three-quarters of a century old. Quebec's scientists, literary men, traders, bankers, capitalists, and manufacturers are in daily contact and constant communication with the scientists, the literary men, the traders, the bankers, and the manufacturers of the other provinces; and there is not in the province of Quebec so remote a hamlet in the centres of colonization, there is not a roof in the whole province but where and under which the hard-working, the law-abiding, the liberty-loving peasant has not in his heart a warm feeling of human fraternity

and christian love for his brother,—his brother the miner in the coal mines either of British Columbia or of Nova Scotia, his brother the fisherman of either the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts, his brother the working-man in the factories of Toronto or of Hamilton, London and Halifax, his brother the hardy tiller of the western plains. Isolated? Quebec does not feel isolated; it feels that the rest of Canada is with it. The average French-Canadian feels that the rest of Canada is in sympathy with him. And I have for this man boundless admiration and the profoundest respect, because he is in Canada to-day an element of stability, a factor of ponderation and a fruitful source of economic wealth. I love this man, this average French-Canadian. Trust him for he is true to his language, true to his creed, true to his traditions, true to his institutions and last but not least true to his King.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): The hon. member (Mr. Béland) who has just taken his seat did what practically every opponent of the Government has done when confronted with the impossibility of successfully criticizing its actions—he complimented the members of the Cabinet upon the success that has attended their efforts. In his opening remarks the hon. gentleman complimented the representatives of the Government upon the attitude which they took upon international questions at the Geneva Conference. Let me say that if this Government had done nothing else than to appoint representatives who would so ably represent Canada at that Conference they are entitled to the gratitude of the people of this country. It was a question with a great many of us as to whether or not Canada—a nation which had never taken part in international affairs until quite recently and had been most domestic in all its politics—had representatives who could go and meet in council the great men of the world and hold their own in the deliberations which were to take place. A great many of us watched—as I am sure all intelligent and patriotic Canadians did — the proceedings of the Conference and when we saw, as my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) admits, that Canada's representative not only held their own, but that they led in some of the debates and thereby established for their native land a position throughout the world which has reflected, and continues to reflect, credit upon this country, we were exceedingly satisfied with what had been done. Personally I am glad that our representatives so ably acquitted themselves, I am glad that they showed themselves to be equal to the task that confronted them, and I am sure the result will be that Canada will, more heartily than ever, uphold that great institution which has been created, the League of Nations, and which will, in time, save the world from any such conflicts in future as we witnessed a few years ago.

The tenor of my hon. friend's remarks was as I have indicated. Towards the close of his speech he changed his attitude and said: The present Government is a war government, elected under war conditions, and we want a peace election. Would it be a peace election if there were conditions such as prevailed some time ago when the Winnipeg strike was in progress and a dangerous agitation was at its height? Had an election been ordered then would we have had a peace election throughout Canada? There was nothing that the cool-headed business men of Canada felt more anxious about than that we should not have an election at that time because they were afraid of it. We in Western Canada particularly knew what the situation was and what it meant and we realized what the result would be. To-day though that agitation has subsided it has not yet entirely disappeared. Hon. gentlemen opposite themselves still admit that there is a great deal of unrest in Canada, and that agitation still continues. While in our part of the Dominion demagoguery has practically been taken by the throat by the common sense of the common people and placed where it properly belongs, while the demagogues have been practically compelled to stop their agitation, yet that agitation in some measure is still going on in various sections, and until it is completely quelled I myself would not be desirous of holding an election. On that issue I am prepared to abide by the calm, cool judgment of the Canadian people rendered under perfectly tranquil conditions. We are very gradually but very perceptibly approaching that point, and when it comes I for one am quite prepared to abide by the consequences whatever they may be. Mr. Speaker, why should I be a party to disrupting the business of this country at this most critical period in its history, why should I subordinate my opinion to the political whims of the leader of the Opposition in order to assist him in his political aspirations? The amendment which he offers calls for an election but what would an election

mean at the present time? It could not be held for a considerable period, there is no question about that. Parliament would have to vote supplies before going to the country, and consequently there would be considerable delay. But what would an election mean when it did take place? What has an election always meant, not only to the business of Canada but the business of the United States where they have four-year election periods? In the United States that fourth year is always looked upon with dread by the commercial men because they know that it paralyzes business from one end of the country to the other. In Great Britain, in Canada, and in all the other British Dominions where the system of responsible government obtains, the idea has always been to disrupt business as little as possible by having the lowest minimum of time between the announcement of the election and the election itself. Admitting then that business will be disrupted by an election, is the present a good time for having it take place? In my opinion most undoubtedly, no.

What are the business conditions in Canada to-day, and what have they been for some little time back? As we all know business for the past two years has been carried on under most abnormal conditions. It is a matter of wonder to me that Canadian business men have succeeded in carrying on as well as they have done. They were faced with tremendous uncertainties because of the high prices, the conditions brought about by agitation, all the results that have followed the war. Because of all these factors they were faced by most abnormal conditions and yet they carried on splendidly. I think nearly every one of them during the period of uncertainty knew that a slump had to come. Many of them in conversation with me admitted that it must come, and quite a number were surprised that the date of its coming was delayed so long. But the slump did come last fall, and our business men are to be congratulated upon the fact that they buckled in as well as they did and have succeeded as well as they have in carrying this country through such a trying period. The conditions of the past winter have not been anything like as bad in this country as they were in 1917, or in 1913 and 1914. Still they have been bad enough. But times are improving. Every financial report that is being issued indicates that we are gradually and surely getting on to better ground, in fact that the worst has passed. Yet at this time when our business men have succeeded in carrying us through so well, when the amount of unemployment is small in comparison with other countries, the leader of the Opposition comes along with an amendment to the Address and says: Let us have an election in order that we may further disrupt business interests as much as we possibly can during the coming summer. For in reality thtat is what the proposition means. The result will be that the business men of the country, faced with the uncertainty which an election occasions, will not carry on as they have at present arranged and that next fall unemployment will be much greater in Canada than it is to-day—much greater indeed and there may be no remedy for it. If, however, we continue as at present until business is again on a thoroughly firm foundation, then let there be an election whenever you please, because nobody in this House, Mr. Speaker, loves an election better than I do. It is the only sport, if you can call it sport, I take pleasure in.

But why does the leader of the Opposition desire to have an election immediately? If his star was in the ascendant, if he was sure of his ground, if he knew that by an appeal to the country he would gain strength, and that he would by five or six months' or even a year's delay be stronger than he is to-day, do you think he would ask for an election now? Far from it. He knows very well, as do his followers, that he is weaker in the Dominion to-day than when he was chosen leader of his party. There is not any question about that at all in Western Canada.

The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) says that he went with his leader through the western provinces. I wish he could tell you, Sir, some of the things which we see as a result of their visit to our section of the country. The hon. the leader of the Opposition held meetings in the city of Regina, as he did in other places, and the result was very, very plain to any one who cared to study the situation—in fact, it was not necessary to study it to see the effect. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, speaking the other day, said, that the spirit was far more important than the letter of the law. I said to myself: Yes, and out in Western Canada, the tariff being the chief issue, our people expected to see some tariff spirit in the various addresses which you delivered. Did we find any?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. COWAN: I never noticed any, and I was present at one of his meetings in Regina. His whole attitude was an appeal to the farmers. He said: We Liberals are hopelessly and irretrievably lost. This Government has lost the confidence of the people, but we ourselves are so much weaker than they are that unless you come and unite your forces with ours it is absolutely impossible for us to succeed. That was the sum and substance of his whole address, and he spoke most appealingly to the farmers to unite their forces with his. As I sat in the gallery and looked down at him I could not but note that when he came to the tariff his voice dropped perceptibly, and the whole audience sat quiet and expectant: He said: I am in favour of free trade in implements, and he hastened away from the subject as though he had resurrected a ghost which would pursue him. That was the sum and substance of his tariff references there—free trade in the one thing that those people were wanting. There was neither soul, nor substance, nor spirit, nor body, to his tariff utterances in Western Canada, except that at local points he appealed in that way to the people, because he knew they wanted "free" implements.

What was the result of all this? I am rather a good "listening post"—I listen a good deal better than I talk—and I wanted to know what the people thought after he had left. I could not help but note some of the things that were being said, but I am going to quote one only. This is a portion of an editorial from the leading Agrarian organ published in the province of Saskatchewan. Two organs are run by the same party, one in Saskatoon and one in Regina, and between them they have double the circulation of any other newspaper in that province. I will not repeat the abusive terms directed against the hon. the leader of the Opposition after he left, because I do not believe in applying such terms to a political opponent; but if in this case he is the subject of abuse, I cannot sympathize with him, because we must all admit that hon. gentlemen opposite have been a culture bed for abusive terms applied for many years back to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We have been referred to as tools of the big interests, as puppets in the hands of the millionaires, as jumping-jacks that jump just as the manufacturers press the button, and so on and so forth; and even now we are called usurpers. I do not believe in such abuse, and therefore I am going to pass over those references and quote this opinion of the hon. leader of the Opposition as expressed by this paper after he had visited our part of the country. This is from an editorial in the Regina Post and the Saskatoon Star:

> Such a man excites no thrills of wonder veiled in terror; his conscience is full of scruples and returns; he stuns us neither by his inward freedom nor by his outward power.

Mr. MAHARG: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. COWAN: Certainly.

Mr. MAHARG: Did I understand him to say that there were two papers published or under the direction of the Agrarians in the province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. COWAN: No, I said that these two papers were the leading papers in the province of Saskatchewan supporting the Agrarian party. They do nothing else. The Government or the Opposition do not receive their support. This is the opinion they have formed of the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to find out the opinion of the business men of our city and district with regard to the fiscal announcements made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition while in the West, and I have yet to find a Liberal or a Conservative who is satisfied with those announcements. The question I heard on all sides was: What is his policy, what does he stand for? They have not yet been able to find out. I want to say that that kind of willy-wabbling is something that the people of Western Canada will not stand for. They admire at any time even an opponent who has the courage of his convictions and who expresses them, rather than a man who tries to play the oily game of promising this locality one thing and that locality another. The people of the West prefer courage and honour—and honour is really honestly in that case. We want men who will be honest and fair with the electors.

Then I went amongst a great many of the returned men, and I remember one of them said to a group of his comrades: "Oh yes, he wants us to come and save him. But why should we do that? Did he come and save us?" That is the attitude they take, and you will find that that is the attitude they are taking all over Western Canada towards the hon. the leader of the Opposition. So he knows full well from what he has heard from his supporters if they are at all

observant, that his star is waning and that he cannot possibly come into power under normal conditions. But he thinks he has a chance when agitation is at its height, when the discontent which he and his party have manufactured has not been entirely wiped out by the improved conditions which are now rapidly coming into existence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the very fact that the hon. the leader of the Opposition has entirely ignored the tariff in his amendment proves conclusively that he himself knows that his fiscal policy is a miserable failure. I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker, in your statement last week, that the proper time to discuss the tariff is when the Budget is before the House; but I am satisfied that had the hon. the leader of the Opposition moved an amendment dealing with the tariff issues referred to in the speech from the Throne, you would have found it very difficult indeed to rule any references thereto out of order. But instead of taking up that question, he has taken up another question altogether. If he knew that his fiscal policy was the strongest policy that he could possibly submit to this country, if he knew it was the winning card, do you think Sir, that he would have played the deuce? Not at all. He would have played the card which he knew would win, and the very fact that he has ignored it here is a confession that he knows his fiscal policy is a failure.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we had the leader of the Opposition out with us. We welcomed him; we were glad to welcome him because of his personal worth. We were glad to welcome him also because of the fact that he is the leader of a great party—we are always pleased to welcome a man into our country even if we disagree with him. Politically we welcomed him and we who are on the Government side, will welcome him again even more heartily than we did before. To him we say: Come again, if the result is going to be as it was before—come as soon as you can and as often as you may; hold as many meetings as you can—because it is quite evident that the more meetings the hon. gentleman held when he was last in our part of the country the weaker became his case and the less his strength.

It seems to me that it would be quite unfair to ask the Government to hold an election at the present time, and I for one am going to oppose the proposal of the leader of the Opposition. What has happened is this—and it has been stated so often in the House that it seems ridiculous to repeat it: for a period of two years,

while demobilization was going on, the Government were so busy carrying out their duty that they had no time to attend to the political side. But did hon. gentlemen opposite play the game fairly during that time? Did they assist the Government in their demobilization work? Instead of that, they and their press all over the country were carrying on an agitation against the Government in a most demagogic way. And now, when they have created as much discontent in the country as they can, they say: The time is ripe; we have chosen our weapons; we have chosen the time; we have chosen the ground; we are going to force the Government to a fight. Well, I do not think that the members of the Government are such political fools as to agree to any such terms as that. So far as I am concerned, I am going to have something to say about the time; something to say about what the weapons shall be; something to say about what the conditions shall be. These things are not to be left entirely to the Opposition; when the fight is fought it will be in a fair manner, and each party will be given an equal opportunity. The Government will be given time to explain its policy; to lay before the country its record, and to offset the demagogic agitation which for some little time has been so dangerously carried on by the Opposition.

I wish to make a brief reference to one or two matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I am not going to discuss tariff to-day, but I should like to make reference to the duty on fruit, a phase of the question which was referred to the other day by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie). It has been argued that we who in past times favoured a duty upon certain articles were, by reason of that fact, the sworn enemies of the farmers of our country. In my humble opinion the duty on fruit has been of the greatest possible benefit to the farmers in the Prairie Provinces. I think all will agree that it is to the general advantage of Canada to have our fruit lands cultivated. Fruit lands abound in British Columbia; it is the natural fruit producing district of the Prairie Provinces. Is it of advantage to the farmers of the Prairie Provinces that these fruit producing areas shall be cultivated; that the orchards shall increase and the production of fruit become greater? I unhesitatingly say, yes. The member for Yale told us the other day that during his lifetime the production of fruit in one little valley had increased from one car-load to five

thousand car loads, if I remember correctly. Is it an advantage to the people there to have these five thousand car-loads of fruit produced? Obviously, it means that they can get fresher fruit, because the fruit can be taken from the prairies to that district in a much shorter time than it can be brought from the states of Oregon and Washington. Besides, the fruit from our own fruit-growing districts arrives in much better condition; a much smaller amount of it is decayed and spoiled. Furthermore, the expansion of this industry creates a population tributary to the railways; the volume of traffic carried by the railways increases, and the lowering of the cost of transportation is, or will be in time, materially assisted. That is a very important consideration. The fruit does not ripen in British Columbia until a month or so later than it ripens in Washington and Oregon. That is a tremendous advantage to the foreign shipper and the foreign grower; he can and does come in and supply our market a month before our own growers can take advantage of it. If we are going to have these lands cultivated at all, is it fair to ask the fruit growers to do it under those conditions? I unhesitatingly say, no. What is the result of this condition? The result is that to-day the farmers are feeding their splendid apples to the cows—all because the Oregon and Washington producers were able to get into our market last fall and supply it before our fruit had ripened. In a letter which I received to-day, a fruit-grower in the Nelson District says: "I am feeding my apples to the cows." He says further that two things are necessary: one, that the duty on fruit should be maintained, and second, that the express rates to the prairies should be lowered. In that I absolutely agree.

I do not believe that the increase in express rates, recently put into force on our railways, is beneficial to our country. The effect is that the people cannot pay the rate; the railways do not get the traffic; the volume of business is not there; men are not required; unemployment results. It seems to me, therefore, that the proper policy to pursue is to establish the rate at such a figure as will ensure a maximum of traffic for our railways. If this is done the result will be more satisfactory. The question of transportation rates is of far greater moment to the farmers of Western Canada than any tariff question can possibly be.

I notice a reference in the Speech from the Throne to the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill with regard to scientific and industrial research. I am sure that the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) must feel very much pleased. I have been associated with him on the special committee which has been studying this question for the last couple of years. I hope that in the Bill to be brought down the Government will make most generous provision along these lines. It has been my pleasure during the recess to address some twelve to twenty meetings of business men, clubs and so on, on the subject of the establishment of a scientific and industrial research bureau in Canada. Without exception these men have unanimously passed resolutions, many of which I have with me, favouring the establishment of such a bureau. They do not believe in the agitation which has been carried on for so many years and which has led the people in Eastern Canada to believe that the prairies are a purely agricultural country. We do believe that agriculture is our basic industry, but we further believe that a great deal of manufacturing can be done in Western Canada. The agitation to which I have referred has caused our eastern people to believe that there is no opportunity for the investment of capital in our western country. We know otherwise, and we want this bureau because we wish to have an industrial life in Western Canada. That is the attitude taken by hundreds, probably thousands of men to whom I have spoken, and they are all agreed, so that I hope the Government will make very generous provision in that regard.

I am not going to vote for the amendment. Before I left the city of Regina, it was rumoured through the press that this amendment was to be moved, and I took it upon myself to consult as many as I could of the business men, Liberals as well as Conservatives, of my city. There was not one—and I did not pick them out—but said: "No, we do not want business conditions upset any more this summer; we want an opportunity to get back to solid foundation, normal times, and until then we do not want any such upheaval as an election would precipitate. For that reason, because I think the business interests of Canada are to be greatly considered in these matters, I am going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle), (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to have in this important debate on

the Address, an opportunity to offer a few considerations in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I avail myself of the occasion to offer him the tribute of my admiration for his energetic and patriotic attitude before this House and before the country.

The main argument, the essential argument put forward by the leader of the Opposition, under whose flag I am proud to serve, in his contention that the Government's duty is immediately to order general elections, is that the Government does not command the confidence of the people. If the Government does not hold the confidence of the people and governs the Dominion in spite of the people which denies them its confidence, this Administration is unconstitutional; for the constitution provides for the government of the people by the people. If this Administration is unconstitutional inasmuch as it takes no account of the national will, then this is nothing but tyranny, nothing but manifest despotism. And it seems to me that the Government cannot but be convinced that the people of Canada have withdrawn from them their confidence.

There are public facts which undeniably show that the will of the people are for a change of government. In the western provinces, for instance, it is plain that the Agrarian movement is very popular and consequently very powerful; and it is evident that this Agrarian movement wants to do away with the present Government. Indeed, the place occupied in this House by the political leader of the farmers (Hon. Mr. Crerar) clearly shows that the sentiment of the farmers is that the Unionist government should go.

Another fact, one of yesterday only, the election of West Peterborough, is a signal evidence that the Unionist block of the old province of Ontario is disintegrating, and consequently it seems evident, in view of the election of our friend Mr. Gordon, that Ontario, a prey to many opinions, is however manifestly inclined to give its confidence to the leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King. The victory won in Peterborough West is a kind of popular ovation which bids fair for the hopes of our leader, and is, for the right hon. Prime Minister, pregnant with painful anxieties.

Finally, another fact which is not of yesterday, and is but a persistent reprobation of the present Government, is the attitude of the old province of Quebec. Indeed old Quebec remains manifestly so antagonistic, so unanimously antagonistic to the Government that the hon. Prime Minister is powerless to add to the Cabinet a single French-Canadian from the people's Chamber, understanding as he does that the man of his choice could not be elected in any county of the province of Quebec. To characterize this attitude of old Quebec the friends of the present Government speak of the "Isolation of Quebec". The phrase is a false one. Quebec is not isolated; Quebec has its place here. Its place is not by itself, its representatives are part of the powerful group made up from all the English provinces. The Quebecers are to be found in the powerful mass of citizens who are the enemies of all despotism, enemies of all tyranny, and faithful servants of the nation's will, all those who, at this time, long for a general election to overthrow a Government which are keeping themselves in power by means of an infamous campaign of fanaticism, who obstinately cling to office through an infamous tyranny, and who stand before us crowned with power but tramping under foot the groaning nation.

Thus this Government offers to our astonished eyes the lamentable spectacle of its powerlessness to represent upon the floor of this House the oldest, the most Canadian ethnic group. Does this party represent the nation? It does not. Not a single French-Canadian member of my province is to be found in the ministerial camp to represent the race of the discoverers, of the pioneers, of Canada, whose sons by the next census will show to be nearly one half of the total population of this country.

Since the disappearance of Unionism, could the new National Liberal Conservative party be acceptable to the people? Its very name is nothing but a camouflage. This party is the very reverse of what its assumed name implies—What! National, these hybrid remnants of uncompromising and persecuting Unionism? National, in its true sense, means belonging to the whole nation, suitable to the whole nation, to its ideals. Anti-national is the term which best fits this party and this Government.

Nothing therefore should interfere with a prompt election. On the contrary, circumstances imperiously require one. Have we forgotten that we are in 1921, and that since 1911, we have had but one election? The election of 1917 was not so much on a programme of local politics as on one of foreign relations. Practically we have had no election in view of Canadian affairs

since 1911. This is ten years ago, the limit of duration of two parliaments under the constitution of the country. Had our would-be masters any respect for the constitution, any care for the people's interests, any anxiety for the prerogatives of the nation, they would have already appealed to the people and would not cling to office until the last day of the last month of the last possible year of the life of this Parliament.

But, the partisans of the Government will say, to have elections in 1921 is to have them on the present electoral map, when the next census might justify a new arrangement of constituencies which might entitle the western provinces to a larger representation. I will answer that it is not by changing the limits of the constituencies that you will change the sentiment of the people. The cunning of these territorial delimitations in view of elections, succeeds. I admit, in displacing majorities in many cases. Thus, by clever manipulations of boundaries, the majority in a county can be drowned by the majority to be found in a neighbouring constituency, The consequence of the census is to change the vote majorities in some constituencies, and espcially to modify the number of the members of the House, by making them, for instance, two hundred and forty instead of two hundred and thirty. But what will not be changed is public opinion, the popular sentiment of the country. This popular will, this popular sentiment will be made known quite as well by 230 members as by 240. It therfore seems to me that if the Government had no other object but to find out public opinion by a general election, they could do so just as well by appealing to the present constituencies as by waiting to consult newly redistributed electoral divisions. I therefore say: to give as a reason for justifying the putting off of a general election, the propriety of waiting for a new redistribution, is but a pure pretence, a mere put-off, under the circumstances a putting off of the coming demise of their moribund Government.

If, in compliance with the wishes of the western people, which the Prime Minister seems to want to fall in with, the general election is retarded, I am willing to concede that the West will have secured a local advantage, an increase of its prestige, but on the other hand the general good shall have been sacrificed. This general good is of constitutional import. It is a thing which makes for the happiness of the whole population of the Dominion to be governed by men enjoying its confidence, to be saved from unconstitutionality, from tyranny and manifest despotism, a crime the result of which is to put the government of the people in the hands of a party leader who does not possess the confidence of the people. Is it not criminal for a government to sacrifice the general good, that is the government of the people by the people, to the individual good of the citizens of the West? I wish my voice could compete with the powerful organ of the Prime Minister and reach the citizens of the West; I would say to them: "Gentlemen of the West, this individual good which you covet, that of coming back to the Federal Parliament with two or three more representatives, do you want, in order to obtain it, to sacrifice the general good I have mentioned, in order to obtain what is after all but a paltry increase of your prestige in Ottawa?" I would add: "Gentlemen of the West, we are living in the same country; should your wish prevail, it would mean the sacrifice of the individual good of the old provinces, the province of Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, which, contrary to your good fortune, would see their representation and prestige at Ottawa decrease by the loss of a few members in Parliament." And I would conclude: "My good friends of the West, let us first save our dear country, so proud in the enjoyment of her young liberties; let us save our dear country from the great evil of despotism, of the great evil of tyranny, of which I spoke a moment ago, by having general elections immediately."

For all these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I join my voice to that of my leader (the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King) and say: "Let us go to the polls."

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HERBERT MACDONALD MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I had almost hoped that this debate on the Address would have been confined to the chief leaders on both sides of the House, so that by shortening it we could the sooner get down to practical business, but as this seems to be a free-for-all, I avail myself of the opportunity to make a few observations on current events.

In the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite I notice references to the continued presence on this side of the House of the class to which I belong, called

Liberal Unionists, and it is interesting to note the different attitudes of our friends who differed from us in 1917, and how they have varied from time to time. To go back to 1917, when we found it was absolutely impossible for us to reconcile the policy of the party at that time with what we thought was necessary for the honour of Canada, we were looked upon with great commiseration. It looked to our friends (and to ourselves) as if we were committing political suicide suddenly to leave the party with which we had been brought up and with which we had become allied. The political skies certainly to us looked black. The statement was made that our friends opposite were bound to win, that "The Old Man," which was our affectionate way of addressing our leader at that time, was sure to get into power, because he would bring a solid block from Quebec, and because conscription was so unpopular in Ontario—I am speaking now only for Ontario—that there would be sufficient to turn the then Government out.

Well, of course, we were grateful for the commiseration, and I must say we sincerely appreciated it because it was friendly, but at the same time we could not do otherwise than stick as we did, and while it did not turn out that we were defeated, but, on the contrary, somewhat triumphantly returned, while that was very gratifying to us, yet it did look at the time we made this resolution to separate from the party that our political future was very black indeed. Later on, another pleasant overture was made to us, somewhat of the coaxing or pleading kind, that we should return, that the light was in the window, but we found that we had better stay where we were.

Then, a day or so ago, there was a change, and instead of being treated with commiseration or pity, or being coaxed with that pleading to which we had become somewhat accustomed, we were treated almost with malediction. One hon. gentleman likened us to two of those who had gone out from the Liberal party in 1864, much to the disparagement of those two, and predicted that theirs would be our fate. He compared us unfavourably with the Hon. George Brown, who went back to his party after accomplishing the work for which he joined the coalition government of that day.

As a matter of fact, the cases are completely different. In the days of 1864, there were Liberal principles, well-defined. As I understand it, and as I was brought up to believe, Liberal principles were the principles which made a party sympathize with the people of little importance, as opposed to the men of power, the nobility, rich oppressors, and persons of great importance, and our sympathies were with those we usually call the "under-dogs" in the life of the community. George Brown was of that kind. George Brown had definite ideas on certain public questions, and he felt he would be happier to go back to his party because those questions, if not then solved, had left such an indelible mark upon the party that his sympathies yet remained there. George Brown was in favour of Representation by Population. He was in favour of the ousting of privilege. He was the successor of those who had fought what was in Ontario called "The Family Compact," the people who had power to themselves. George Brown had another favourite theme on which his heavy blows were delivered, and that was his opposition to the Roman Catholic separate schools.

These were some of the things that left a mark on George Brown, so that he would feel happier with his old friends. There was also a very important element in George Brown's career—that he had a personal difference of a very distinct and vivid nature with his principal colleague in the Coalition Government. But as times have changed, it greatly perplexes us now to know what the principles of the two parties are. I know what are said to be the principles of the two parties for hustings purposes and for newspaper articles, but when you get down to practical affairs there really is little difference now between them. The principles that had to be fought for in those days, such as the ones I have mentioned and the principle of provincial rights separated the parties and made very sharp differences between them.

But we found, when we came over here and allied ourselves with our friends in these benches, that there was absolutely no difference that we could discern between us on all these points I have mentioned. As I say, times change and we change with them; and I venture to say that there is not a single person on this side of the House —at any rate, if there is such a one I have failed to discover him in conversation, and I must say that I have held very friendly converse with hon. gentlemen on this side—there is not, I repeat, a single man over here that would now support the Family Compact, or privileges to the few or anything that would interfere with the rights

and the happiness of the many. If that is so, what is left in the way of principle?

Now, we have other reasons for thinking that there is not this distinction in principle which our friends proclaim even since we came into this House. Those of us who came in in 1917 have found most extraordinary events, which negative, it seems to me, the idea of principle. We on this side of the House, old Conservatives, as well as the Liberals, found ourselves on several occasions fighting for ideas and principles which were opposed by our friends on the other side. I am not disposed to speak harshly on that score, because I know that in ordinary political affairs the moment one party advocates a thing the other party as a rule opposes it. But there are some principles to which that rule cannot properly apply. It is well within the memory of us all that the majority on this side, at least, the majority for the time being, came out strongly for municipal and common rights as against the supposed rights of corporations. That would seem to me to be a fairly Liberal idea and one on which Liberals would have rallied years ago. But we had to fight for ideas such as that, and with the exception of one or two notable speeches on the other side—those of my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou), my hon. friend from Waterloo North (Mr. Euler), my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), and one or two others—we were opposed in this idea and we had the greatest difficulty in stopping the passage of legislation that would have militated against the rights of the many in favour of the rights of the few.

Temperance legislation has generally been a favourite with the Liberal party; but what did we find when that question came up? There were very few friends on the other side for the measure proposed. And so with other things. On women's suffrage, too, we were opposed, although that is usually supposed to be one of the tenets of the Liberal party, and a principle which they have advocated for years. And so we became impressed with the fact that really the place for Liberals was not on that side of the House but on this. If we are found here, therefore, we are found here without apology, but claiming our right not to desert those with whom we joined in fighting a great issue; and as they have played absolutely fair by us, we—I am speaking for myself and, I think, for the others on this side—will play absolutely fair by them.

We also felt when we came here the idea that we were supporting a Government which showed most extraordinary abilities in avoiding partisan or political issues. This Government commended itself to us, because it did not matter how unpopular a measure might be or how many interests it might provoke into antagonism against the Government, it went through with everything without regard to consequences. One Liberal measure after another we found put through, and that legislation was generally opposed by our opponents, although they were nominally Liberals. We put through an electoral franchise for women, a Prevention of Fire Act, the Income War Tax, the Medicine Act, the Board of Commerce Act, the Highways Aid Act, and the Purchasing Commission we tried to get through against the opposition of the other side; besides these, we put through the Naturalization Act, and last, but not least, the agreement for the nationalization of our railway systems.

The nationalization of railways has always been a plank of Liberal platforms and has found a place in any Liberal propaganda or convention resolutions that ever I heard of, and yet while we were striving with all our might to get this through, we were strenuously opposed. Fortunately we succeeded, despite almost the unanimous opposition of our friends the Liberals; and we began to think once more that to be a Liberal was not inconsistent with sitting on the right of the Speaker for the time being. Of course, I know that people who engage in politics generally look upon it as a sort of glorified game. You don the uniform of your side and are supposed to play with that side throughout your lifetime. But is it not the experience of all of us that we can draw an analogy from the national games of the country and say that one does not always play on one side throughout his entire sporting career? I advance no argument; I simply point out that when a good man in a lacrosse or football or hockey team plays for his town he is made a hero and is regarded as the greatest man in the town during the particular season; and we know also that if this same fellow got another position in a neighbouring town he would not give up his games. He would join a team in that town and if he came back to play against his home town he would be boohed and hissed at by his own people. And so it is in politics; there is a tendency to say unpleasant things of those who have severed connections with any party. Ungracious remarks are made with regard to the Lib-

eral-Unionists on this side by our friends opposite, although I do not assert that those remarks are prompted by bad feeling. The situation is analogous to the illustration I have given of the hockey team. But everyone knows that a man who plays hockey on one team can play just as well on another, and while he played for all he was worth for his home team he will play with equal vigour and zeal for the team he has lately joined. If he fails to play as well for the one as for the other, then he is no sportsman at all.

I now desire to make an observation or two upon the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. It is a surprising thing to us to find that instead of the main issue which agitates and will agitate the country he should have chosen nothing but the mere resolution which he presented in the form of an amendment to go before the country at this time. What is it? He simply submits the issue to an intelligent people like the Canadians that an election must take place at one part of the year instead of later in the year or even next year, that a few months between an election is to be the whole issue between the people of Canada as to whether this Government shall remain in power or not. Is there anything more in it? It is an expression of want of confidence and, if carried, the Government would be expected to go out. There is nothing but that one issue —no substance, no principle, no facts, nothing to argue before the people, but there is the hope that a vote will take place which will turn the present Government out of power and bring my hon. friends opposite into office. Is that enough to present to the country in view of the issues which have previously been raised by my hon. friends opposite? The real issue is contained in the resolution of the Liberal convention, and in the Speech from the Throne, and the clause in the speech is worth repeating:

> It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained; but that the customs duties imposed to that end should be no higher than is essential to ensure good standards of living among our working population, and to retain and make possible the normal expansion of the industries in which they find employment.

Now, one would suppose that that issue would have been taken up at once because that is the essential policy of one party as against a contrary policy of another; and yet the Address will leave the House without assertion by my hon. friends of the policy which they proclaim as their own. When the Address carries it will therefore carry without one dissenting voice on the really vital issue between the two parties. Nevertheless we are asked to blindly vote on simply the one question of power or no power, without regard to the principle it is maintained upon or the reason advanced for making the change.

Now what is the result of this, what seems to be behind it? My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition wants power too quickly. Is it likely that when he won that very notable victory in the convention of the Liberal party in 1919 they had any idea that they were boosting him at once to the position of Prime Minister of Canada? Neither in this country nor in any other has it been the practice to take a person not in public life at the time being and suddenly make him Prime Minister. That was not done in the case of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. For ten years Sir Wilfrid patiently laboured to build up his party until he got it into a position of solidity. It was only after ten years of effort of that kind that he found himself at the head of a party which was possibly stronger than had ever before been seen in Canada.

My hon. friend should take note of the examples because there are many in the world's history, of sudden ambitions coming to naught. Let me point him and his followers to one only. My hon. friend should look at Mr. Longfellow's notable poem of "Robert of Sicily, brother of Pope Urbane and Valmond Emperor of Allemaine who was divested of his magnificent attire" and placed in a humble position. He could not acclimatise himself to the surroundings and demanded that he be restored. But it was not until after three years service in a humble position that he was acclaimed again and then only after making an admission of humility which would very much become my hon. friend. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in Longfellow's poem the angel addressing this poor fellow, going about clothed in the garb of servitude instead of being dressed in regal robes said to Robert of Sicily: "Art thou the King?" And he replied:

> I am the King and come to take my own
> From an imposter who usurps my throne.

Well that was the position but it took many years to put the King of Sicily in a position where he admitted that his former conduct had been unwise and that he must humble himself before he could attempt to attain power.

My hon. friend asks for a vote of want of confidence without any reasons of policy at all, not even contradicting by resolution the policy which is opposed to him in the speech from the Throne, and he asks that those whom he is pleased to call usurpers be put out and he be put in. There is a great moral lesson to be obtained from the poem "King Robert of Sicily" that I commend to my hon. friend's attention.

With regard to the tariff it is quite true that this is not the time to discuss it, and I do not propose to do so, but there are certain political considerations connected with the tariff question which may well be considered here because there is a paragraph in the speech from the Throne at present before the House which deals with that subject. I point out that the tariff question has always been an unhappy, not to say a disastrous one, for the Liberal party. For years we had the idea that there was a large body of free traders in the country, men brought up on the old doctrines from England—where the circumstances are quite different—who had to be appeased in the matter of the tariff; and throughout the history of the Liberal party in the last forty years there have been sharp differences of opinion and well-discussed policies brought in with regard to it. It is quite true that we as Liberals never hit the right note with regard to the tariff in the whole course of our history. I was reading the other day,—the remarks made in 1882 by Mr. Collins who wrote the "Administration of Lord Lorne." At page 246 of that work he says this:

> The demon of discord—

He is now speaking of 1882 when Mr. Blake was leader and Mr. MacKenzie was still his second in command in the House of Commons:

> . . . the demon of discord had entered into the Grit party family. There were the modified free-trade Reformers and those who admired the political rectitude of Mr. Blake. . . Mr. Blake went out to Durham and told the people that "free trade is for us impossible." Mr. Mackenzie raised his voice in East York and assured the electors that any doctrine but that of free-trade was pernicious, retrogressive and a relic of commercial barbarism, and so an era of Reform speech collisions began all over the country and the enemy made the most of the clashing declarations. Thus it came to pass that the leader of the Opposition could scarcely make utterance on any question that a counter statement made somewhere else by Mr. MacKenzie, by Mr. Mills or the Toronto "Globe" did not rise like the ghost of Banquo to confront him, and vice versa.

That was the situation in 1882. For some time we Liberals were perfectly satisfied, I think with very few exceptions,—those being the theoretical free-traders,—with the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the tariff. For some time matters were settled and quiet, but there were claims made by the theoretical free-traders—chiefly, I think I may say, the editor of the Toronto Globe and others—for a greater reduction; and the heart of the old Grit Free-trader was at last satisfied, apparently beyond measure, by the declaration of the Liberal party in convention in August, 1919. Then the promised land seemed to be in sight because there was no question and no compromise there as to what should be the policy of the party on the tariff. The proceedings of the convention are contained in a very handsomely gotten up book, which, unlike the manna from heaven, which was free, can be had at any time for the price of one dollar from the organization committee of the Liberal party. I notice that this was the resolution on the tariff; I shall not read it all but merely the part that is important. It is to be found at page 204:

> That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of Customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance.'
>
> That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

And this is important because it gives to the old free trader who has been waiting for it for so many years a pledge that this policy will be put into legislation. The last clause of the resolution reads:

> And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

In addition to that, in an admirable speech of appreciation on his appointment as leader of the Liberal party, my hon. friend from Prince, P.E.I.—he apparently having been a party to these resolutions—said:

> That platform, ladies and gentlemen, is the chart on which is plotted the course desired by the people of the country, as expressed through the voice of the Liberals assembled here. So with this chart and this compass, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, let us press on from this moment, a great, a united, a mighty force, making ever for new liberty, for wider freedom, for greater righteousness in the public affairs of this nation; press on, evermore zealous and united, till we have reached the goal where

the principles and policies laid down on this historic occasion will have become, through legislation, part of the law of our land.

Yet despite that pledge to the old free trader, when the matter comes up squarely for decision in the House of Commons, my hon. friend, instead of moving a counter resolution defining the terms under which his party are decided to go definitely before the country, and so making those terms part of the proceedings of the House of Commons, brings in this bare, scarecrow resolution charging usurpation against those who are in power.

But there is one satisfaction—that this resolution which I have read was a deliberate resolution emanating from the Committee on Resolutions, and is contained in this book of the National Liberal Convention of August, 1919. This is a very nice little book and is apparently got out by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy). There may have been others besides the hon. member for Russell who were important figures at that convention; one would have thought that perhaps the hon. members for Gaspé and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) would have had some influence there, or Mr. W. T. R. Preston, or some other persons who are supposed to be great in the Liberal party; but apparently this is the product of my hon. friend from Russell, because in the front of the book there is a very fine photograph of him — which hardly does him justice, although it is a very handsome one—and under his name, Hon. Charles Murphy, M.P., are these pregnant words: "Who planned, organized and directed the Convention."

It is strange that while this Convention took place on August 5th, 6th and 7th in 1919, it was not until the month of January, 1921, or a year and five months afterwards, that this book was given to the public at the price of a dollar. One wonders why this delay. It was impossible during that time to know what was the policy of the Liberal party. I asked several persons if they could give me the resolutions, as having lost my newspaper published at the time of the convention, I was in the dark as to the definite pronouncement of the Liberal party upon the tariff question. Now there is no more doubt on the point, for here is the book with these photographs and speeches and resolutions, and we all know what the policy of the Liberal party is. So it is no use for my hon. friend from Ste. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) to repeat that somebody had said that the tariff policy of the Liberal party was only "theoretical." It is a perfectly definite policy set down in black and white, and the Liberal party must stand or fall by it.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOWAT: There is one "Hear, hear" from the other side, and I am glad to hear him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOWAT: More of them! Come on, we will have a few more. The point is, we cannot distinguish which gentleman is saying "hear, hear"; if we could, I am afraid we would not hear so many.

While there is no amendment to the tariff policy so frankly declared by the Government, still we have a definite declaration in this book. The first resolution says that the Liberal party when returned to power will substantially reduce the tariff. That leads one to ask: What is the meaning of the word "substantial." As I passed the Library I went in and, as many of us lawyers sometimes have to do, I looked into the dictionary to get a definition of the term. In the last edition of Webster's International Dictionary I found the meaning of the word. I am quite sure that the framers of the resolution which I have read about a "substantial" reduction of the tariff, being educated and scholarly men, must have known the meaning of the words they were using, especially of this word "substantial," because they put it in their speeches and in their resolutions.

Well, I looked up in Webster's Dictionary —an authority my hon. friends will probably admit to be as good as any—the meaning of the word "substantially". I find that it means, first, " in a substantial manner"— no shading down, as we had it in West Peterborough, but an actual, substantial reduction. Further, it means " really, actually, solidly, essentially, materially,"—in a substantial manner. It means that and nothing else. So that if hon. gentlemen opposite introduce petty resolutions calling for reductions of ten fifteen twenty-five or even forty per cent in the tariff, we shall know that they have undergone a change of heart since August, 1919. To effect a reduction which would be something material, something in line with the definition I have given, my hon. friends would have to advocate at least a seventy-five per cent reduction. On that policy my hon. friends must go to the country, and I think that the issue would be met with the greatest alacrity and pleasure by gentlemen on

this side, and by supporters of the Government generally.

For the reasons which I have given, therefore—having regard to the uncertainty which exists on the other side as to what principles we would adopt and what leader we would follow if we went to the other side—all this doubt makes it perfectly clear to those who were formerly Liberals and who have now joined in an honourable compact known as the National Liberal and Conservative party—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOWAT: that they should stay where they are. I think I heard an observation by an hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt with regard to the name "National Liberal and Conservative party". Well, is it not true? Is this not a national party? Does it not stand for the nation as against groups, as against small interests here or small racial conflicts there or anything that is brought up to oppose this Government? Does it not mean that the party in power has really put Canada in the way of being a nation, although yet in her tottering steps?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOWAT: I accept with readiness the laughter, the forced merriment which I hear. I do not believe that my hon. friend who laughs that way and sneers about Canada being a nation can really be the good Canadian that I would have taken him to be. If there is one thing that has engendered pride of race, pride of country and a true spirit of patriotism in Canada, it is the idea that in view of Canada's contribution to the great conflict she is recognized as beginning to be a real nation. True, she is a member of the galaxy of British nations, but that does not alter the situation. We shall go on henceforth trying to make Canada great and good; trying to get rid of racial troubles which we have had. Hon. members know that I made a strong plea during the last session in this regard, and I repeat it: we can never be a nation unless we eradicate difficulties of that nature; unless a strong effort is made and the best of good feeling is exerted with the view of bringing them to an end. We are of many races, and unless we have the spirit that will get us together we shall never have the future which we all desire. So that regardless of what comment may be made on the name chosen, nothing could be better, nothing more true. We are a national party; it is a union of two parties who respect each other, and who do not in any way try to interfere with each other's former ideas. It is Liberal and it is Conservative. My friends the Conservatives have had the grace to allow the word "Liberal" to come first because we are the fewest in numbers, but the three names, "Conservative", "National", "Liberal", do seem to me to combine not only the elements of the party, but the ideals for which they will continue to strive.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve-Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, when listening to the able address delivered by my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), and particularly to the biting remarks which he made with regard to his former associates, I was reminded that the hon. gentleman, with his Liberal antecedents, was made a candidate in the county of Parkdale in 1917 and was elected under very special circumstances. I remember very well that at the time of his election the Tories of that eminently Tory division of Parkdale made a covenant with the party organizer that for one Parliament only would that circumscription be loaned to the hon. gentleman; they did not expect that Parliament would last five years, either. Sir, I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman's presidency of the Liberal Association in the province of Ontario should have occurred at a time when the Reform party in that province was at its lowest ebb.

My hon. friend says that it has been impossible for him, after reading the report of the Liberal convention held in 1919, to find therein a policy to guide, first, the destinies of the Liberal party, and then the destinies of the Canadian people. My hon. friend is so blind as not to be able to read the admirable platform laid down by the Liberal party in convention assembled in 1919 as set forth in that report. May I not refer him to another authority? He says that on the tariff the Liberal party has no policy. Let me bring forward the latest authority in the Tory party—pardon me, in the Tory-Liberal-National party—and I hope that my hon. friend will be satisfied with it. It was stated in the House that this was our battle-ground:

> Reduce the tariff and you will help to reduce the cost of living. The policy followed by this Administration has had the result of creating unrest which continues to grow every day and every week, and this policy is proved by its results to be wrong, change it; reduce the tariff, and you will reduce the cost of living.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, was laid down by the eminent member who represents the

county of St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)—the new John the Baptist prophesying the advent of a saviour for Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, that speech was delivered in this very Chamber less than a year ago.

When my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat) opened his remarks this evening he stated that he would speak on current events. I would have forgiven him had he spoken only on current events. But when he went as far back as the Middle Ages and the geography of Sicily—perhaps he meant the Scilly Islands, because I thought his speech very silly—he lost all right to be answered this evening; therefore he will pardon me if I leave him at that and if I only speak on the amendment which is before the Chair.

Before I do so, I wish to say a few words about the very degrading incident which took place the other day in the House of Commons. It is an axiom in politics as in war that it is good tactics not to do what the enemy wants you to do. For that reason, we, on this side of the House, after the spectacle presented by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) in his speech of last week, decline to gratify our hon. friends opposite by entering into an unseemly brawl such as the hon. gentleman's new-found allies hoped he would be able to provoke in this chamber. At the same time I owe it to myself and to my native province that I should emphasize the political solidity as well as the personal respectability of the people of Quebec by drawing attention to the contrast presented in regard to both by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville and his performance of a few days ago.

Appropriately enough from the hon. gentleman's point of view, he selected the second anniversary of the death of our great leader whose memory he professed to honour as the date upon which to confess his own shame, and to give to the House a long list of personal and political lapses of conduct of which neither the House nor the country, outside of the province of Quebec, would have had any knowledge, and in which credence would not have been placed by the majority of the people, were the admissions not made by the hon. gentleman himself. Where the hon. gentleman stands in public estimation after his extraordinary revelation of his own chequered and tortuous career, I need not specify; but I may observe that after his attacks on all his former comrades and political associates, Conservative, Nationalist and Liberal, because he was all that, and after his further attacks on labour and the farmers, it goes without saying that he placed himself outside the pale of all political parties, and now there is "none so poor to do him reverence."

After having made it plain to the House and to the country that he occupies a position such as no other man belonging to any party in the province of Quebec would occupy, the hon. gentleman asks the House and the country to believe him when he says that he is no Judas. Mr. Speaker, that was an unhappy phrase for the hon. gentleman to use. I will not apply it to him. I might remind him however that, after receiving his forty thousand pieces of silver, Judas, at least, had the grace to go out and hang himself. The performance of a similar act is not, however, necessary in the case of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville. The black flag is already at the top of the mast in St. Hyacinthe, and the sheriff with his posse is waiting his political execution. This performance degrading as it was, made it certain that no matter what member of the Government may have stood sponsor for him, not even his shadow will ever be cast over the place that he and his sponsor planned that he should occupy. That is all that I have to say on the subject, and I leave the hon. gentleman, his new associates and his sponsor to contemplate together and separately the mess they have made of things and the contempt in which they are held by all who esteem fair dealing, fairplay and upright conduct in the public and the private life of this country. Further than this, about this incident I shall say nought. I do not care, I never cared to play bridge with a corpse.

9 p.m.

I now intend to address you, Sir, on the question which has been debated since the beginning of last week, and I beg to state at first that I will support the amendment moved by my honoured leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) because I believe in British Parliamentary institutions. No government is possible unless it has the consent of the governed. This is a basic principle in the British Parliamentary system, and we in Canada have accepted that system of government. My young friend, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), in his admirable address the other evening, gave a case in point which I will cite once more. I happened to be in England in 1905 and 1906 when the general elections were fought. Everyone will remember that

the Balfour Government came into office in 1900 during the South African war, that government being returned by an immense majority. It was a "win the war Government" such as this Government was on the morrow of the 1917 election. They called the elections of 1900 the "khaki" election. But soon after the treaty was signed in South Africa and the people of England returned to their respective political affiliations.

Constitutionally speaking, the government was entitled to seven years' existence, and Mr. Chamberlain, who was one of the leading ministers in that government, started at once to agitate the question of Imperial preference and that of protection. There were many changes in the Cabinet at that moment, several of the ministers left the government and there was a series of by-elections. In Canada, several ministers have left the Government since 1917 for divers considerations and a series of by-elections has taken place. To continue the parallel, from 1900 to 1905 in England Mr. Balfour lost in most of the constituencies, so much so that long before the constitutional end of his government, he decided to dissolve the House. I remember his address delivered, I believe, in the city of Birmingham—he was the member for Birmingham or Manchester. He positively stated that he had dissolved Parliament because he saw that public opinion was agitated; that new questions had arisen; that the Government had been defeated in several constituencies, and that the people had a right to select a new government. His government was defeated and, mark this, Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the Government of England—here again the parallel is applicable—were at that moment of different persuasions, politically speaking. You had then the Irish Parliamentary party; you had the Radical party; you had the Labour party, and you had the old Liberal party, composed of men like the present Earl Grey, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Haldane, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, Lord Rosebery, and others. All the opponents of the Balfour administration, although divided amongst themselves on non-essentials, united their efforts against the government of the day, and victory for one was considered a victory for all. Whenever a Labour man was put up in a constituency, he was supported by the Liberals and the Radicals, and wherever a Liberal ran, he was supported by the Radicals and by Labour. The most important question at that time, as it is to-day, was whether or not the government had the confidence of the people. It seems to me it was exactly parellel to the present situation here. Whether we call ourselves Liberals or Farmers or Labour, when the majority opinion of the country as expressed in the various constituencies is against the government, as it has been consistently against the Government since 1917, I claim that an amendment of this nature is in order and the Government should take notice of it.

There is, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, a paramount reason why the present Parliament should dissolve. I say, Sir, in all seriousness that there has been no general election in this country since 1911—ten years ago. The last general election in Canada was held in that year, but it has not had the opportunity to do so since. That explains the unrest which exists throughout the country; it explains the revolt, the rumbles of which we hear in the various constituencies.

Let me review very briefly the circumstances under which the Canadian Parliament was dissolved in 1911. The question before the people at that time was the reciprocity pact with the United States. Reciprocity was not a new question. It was a very familiar issue to the people of Canada. It was familiar to our predecessors in 1854, in 1866 the year of the abrogation of the first treaty, in 1872, in 1875, in 1879, and in 1891, because in 1891 a general election was fought in Canada on the question of reciprocity. The Liberal party at that time advocated a full measure of reciprocity and the Conservative party a restricted offer of reciprocity with the United States. The Liberal party was practically victorious at the polls. At all events the majority of the government was not very large, and the Conservative administration could claim that they had received the support of the Canadian electorate in favor of a restricted offer of reciprocity. But be that as it may, in 1911 the question was by no means a new one.

Yet, when my hon. friend the present member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and that old friend of ours, the late Mr. William Patterson, returned from Washington and presented the reciprocity pact to Parliament immediately—no, not immediately, because at first the Conservative party in the House of Commons gave a genuine support to the measure—but afterwards, there developed opposition to the measure and the Conservative party through its official mouthpiece, the leader of the Opposition, stated that an appeal should be had to the people

of Canada before the measure was voted on by Parliament. I remember that a motion was introduced in amendment by my friend the late Mr. Monk, then member for Jacques Cartier. His motion read that the question of reciprocity should not be voted on by the Canadian Parliament until the people had had a chance to pronounce upon it. His motion was supported by my hon. friend the present leader of the Government, and we know that later on there developed obstruction to the passage of that measure. It is interesting to remind the House of the frantic appeals which were made in respect to that measure brought in by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. Perfervid appeals were made to the province of Ontario in particular, by the general manager of the Conservative political campaigns of the day. Sir John Willison said:

> The future is a sealed book which only the Gods may read, but at least the country should have time and opportunity to express it self. At least the constituencies may demand the right to pronounce the final judgment. It is intolerable that two party politicians, however able and trustworthy they may be, should settle the political destiny of Canada by a secret negotiation with a foreign country. Surely no Government has the right to impose upon the country, without consultation with the people a policy which involves such momentous consequences, and surely if it persists every means of delay and obstructions should be employed to force dissolution of Parliament and to secure for Canadians the simple and incontestable right to determine their own commercial policy and their own political destiny.

So, Mr. Speaker, in order that the people might determine our policy at that time on a question which was not a new one, but dated back as far as 1854, the Conservative party, and some gentlemen who belonged to that House of 1911 are still in the House, obstructed the passage of the measure and forced the government to appeal to the country. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been returned by a considerable majority of the votes in the election of 1908. However, he dissolved Parliament in 1911—mark the contrast between him and the present Prime Minister—Sir Wilfrid Laurier dissolved Parliament and was defeated on the 21st of September of that year, on two different issues; he was defeated on the issue of reciprocity, and defeated on the naval issue, and defeated above all by the whispering campaign. Here is the contrast between the Conservative party and the Liberal party. Here we have a Government elected for war purposes, and war purposes only. In 1908 you had a Government possessing the full confidence of the electorate of Canada, presenting a measure to Parliament on a question which was not new, but was as old as the oldest amongst us could remember.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, because this measure was, in the minds of the Tory party, a measure destined to fix the commercial future of Canada, they forced the issue; they obstructed the measure and brought about a dissolution. Mark the contrast. In the elections of 1917 we had an appeal that was epitomized in a very concrete slogan: "Win the War." The only object of the elections of 1917 was that of winning the war, and from the Prime Minister down to the humblest member in the Unionist party, that slogan was heralded throughout the country. It was said that the Government should be allowed to manage the public affairs of the country until the war had been won, and then the people could pronounce on the policies of both political parties.

After the defeat of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party in 1911, the right hon. gentleman who now represents King's County, Nova Scotia (Sir Robert Borden) took office. With his Cabinet, he administered the public affairs of Canada until the year 1914, when we were suddenly awakened by news of the most stupendous war in history. That was the time, Mr. Speaker, to form a Union Government. Thus understood British statesmen; thus understood French statesmen; and so did the Premiers in Australia, in New Zealand, and in Newfoundland. Not so the Tory party in Canada.

The other day the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Hon. Mr. Meighen), taunting my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), said: "I do not understand why the leader of the Opposition is anxious to have an election to-day. In 1914 his party was most anxious that there should not be held any general election." How generous on the part of the Government not to have held an election in 1914! Sir, when the history of war events in Canada is written it will be surprising to know that at one moment the Tory Government, in the month of November, 1914, was ready to dissolve Parliament and to launch the country into a political contest, when already thousands and thousands of lives were being mowed down in Flanders' fields in Belgium.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, it was wise and patriotic on the part of the Liberal party to oppose any dissolution of Parliament. One might say that from that moment until 1917—and this is the point I wish to emphasize—from 1914 until 1917—Parliamentary, yes responsible Government was suspended in Canada. We had the War Measures Act; we had the extension of the Parliamentary term; we had the suspension of Habeas Corpus, one of the most sacred of all the liberties enjoyed by British subjects, if not, indeed, the most sacred of them. And finally we had the War Time Elections Act, the most iniquitous measure ever passed by any Parliament in any country. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that in 1917, after the War Time Elections Act was passed by closure we had only the semblance of an election.

The election of 1917 was but a sham, and all over Canada, in at least eight of the nine provinces, it was an official debauchery. It has been stated by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Copp)—and he brought affidavits to prove his assertions—that there are at least fourteen or fifteen members sitting in this House who were not regularly elected. Mr. Speaker, we know what took place. I was present at the Liberal Convention two years ago, and I heard an acquaintance of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, Mr. Adamson of Winnipeg, whose father and father-in-law both sat in this House of Commons, state to the Convention assembled, on his word of honour, that two telegrams which I shall read to you had been sent during the campaign. He had the code and the key thereto, and he decoded the telegram to the Convention. On the 30th November, 1917, the following telegram was sent from the present Prime Minister to the late Prime Minister:

> Would like one thousand soldier votes at large for Manitoba, of which 300 for Selkirk, balance divided between Provencher, Macdonald and Springfield or same proportion of division, no matter what our allotment may be.

He read another telegram sent from Senator Sharpe to Senator Tanner, dated Winnipeg, December 4, 1917:

> W. J. TUPPER,
> Halifax, N. S.
>
> W. J. Tupper received a telegram from your assistant secretary and in reply would say: please allot all unattached votes equally among the following constituencies; Provencher, Springfield, and Selkirk, for the province of Manitoba, and in Saskatchewan, Saltcoats, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Swift Current and Humboldt. This will assist us greatly.
>
> W. H. SHARPE.

I know—I want to be fair—that the Prime Minister has mildly denied the paternity of his telegram addressed to Sir Robert Borden, the ex-Premier, but Senator Sharp never denied the authorship of the telegram which was addressed to Senator Tanner. All of us of the Liberal party who hail from the province of Quebec do not know what took place in the other provinces except from what slips through the press or through the quarrels which occur to-day between the officials who were identified with that election, but we know what happened in our province. We know that for the county of Chambly-Verchères 700 soldiers voted at St. John's. We know that Colonel Melville who was commanding at St. John's declared that he did not know where his domicile was, and for that reason voted himself in Chambly-Verchères. You have only to present facts such as these and you have completely proven your case. Yes, Mr. Speaker, having sat in this House for a quarter of a century, having passed through several general elections, knowing the rough and tumble of a political contest, having read the history of the British Parliament and of British institutions, I have no hesitation in saying there were no elections really held in 1917, but that the elections of that year were nothing short of an official debauchery.

The salient fact through all the elections of 1917, or, if I may so speak, the raison d'être of the Union Government, was the objective which I mentioned a moment ago—that is to say, winning the war was the only purpose. Is it necessary to prove that? Why, we have the evidence from the lips of one of the most astute members of the present Government. We have the evidence from the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). On June 11, 1919, he said:

> The present Government as originally constituted was not created for the purpose of making a general revision of the tariff. This Government was formed for war purposes and to carry out a war policy.

I find exactly the contrary in the speech from the Throne. There I read:

> My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs Tariff. In order to secure the most complete information a committee has conducted an extensive and thorough inquiry, and has secured the views of all parties and interests in every province.

Yet the Minister of Immigration stated two years ago:

> The present Government as originally constituted was not created for the purpose of making a general revision of the Tariff. This Government was formed for war purposes and to carry out a war policy.

Shall we believe the minister who uttered those words in 1919 or must we believe the minister who drafted the speech from the Throne? But my hon. friend said this further:

> When the Government was constituted it was composed of Liberals and Conservatives and the members composing the Government held strongly divergent views on the tariff question. What is true of members of the Government is equally true of members of the House on both sides. The members of this House were not elected because of their tariff leanings. I do not wish to be personal but let me take one or two illustrations.

Then he takes the case of our esteemed friend the member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders):

> The hon. member for Macdonald was supported by all sections of the people in his constituency regardless of any opinions he held on the tariff because, I say again, the tariff was not an issue when he was elected a member of the House.

Then speaking of my genial friend the member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) he said:

> Will any person say that the people of that constituency were at that time thinking of the tariff or of a general revision of the Tariff? They were not. At that time the people were thinking of and voting on the issue that was before the country.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this evidence coming from a member of the Government and knowing the circumstances that surrounded the last election, is sufficient to justify any fair-minded member in this House in voting in favour of the amendment, and to ask that in all sincerity, in all justice, the people of the country be called upon to pronounce between the Opposition and the Government.

I will admit, as I stated a moment ago that a union of both parties was a logical sequence of the declaration of the war; but what was logical during the war, and immediately after the war, is illogical to-day, and we must strip of its disguises the Government which continues under a war agreement when we have reached peace. The master of the English language in the British Parliament is Mr. Asquith. It has been my privilege to listen to that great statesman on many occasions and I do not know in the English world a Parliamentarian who can marshal his phrases

in such beautiful order as the present leader of the Liberal party in England, Mr. Asquith. He made such an apt description of the coalition in England that I feel inclined to apply his burning sentences to the existing coalition in Canada. Here is what he said in the month of January last:

> Now, let us turn for a very few moments nearer home. We see the same necessity for cleancut ideas and policies. The native atmosphere of the coalition is fog—fog which blears outlines and destroys perspectives. A combination of this kind, no longer justified by the supreme necessities of war, is driven to the task which, as the government of this country, is imposed upon it, or which it has imposed itself—it is driven, by the necessities of its being, to cater for at least two sets of opinions at the same time, and the inevitable result is a policy, if policy it can be properly called, of aviguities and compromises, or, of I may say so, of zigzag and see-saw.

That is an apt description of the present coalition of interests and appetites in this country, Mr. Speaker. It makes for ambiguities and compromises with two sets of opinions, as you saw last week. It makes also for a policy of zigzag and see-saw.

The supreme issue of the war has come to an end. The Government, of course, did not win the war, although they claim to have done so; the boys in the trenches won the war. There have been radical changes in the Cabinet; the Prime Minister selected by the people of Canada in 1911 has resigned; the Cabinet has been re-cast three or four times at least since 1911; the name of the party has been changed—and public opinion has also changed. Are we to be told Mr. Speaker, that a caucus which selects a Prime Minister, a leader of the party, shall be substituted for the will of the people and of Parliament? Are we to be told that bureaucracy shall take the place of free government in this young democracy?

Ah, I say to my hon. friends, the Progressives, the Farmers who sit alongside of me; This is the old, old issue between reaction and progress, between Liberalism and Toryism, because whatever be their name—Liberal, Conservative, National, we know that it is the same old Tory party. And this brings me to the distinction made by a famous English writer as between the Tory and the Liberal. Commenting on Gladstone's definition of the Liberal as the man who trusts the people, this writer said:

> The Tory looks down from the institution to the man; the Liberal up from the man to the institution. The Liberal says, "The state is made for man, and not man for the

state"; the Tory reverses the dogma. Democratic government to the Liberal is an essential condition of the free growth of the individual soul; to the Tory, if he believes in it at all, it is a piece of efficient political machinery. The Tory theory, in other words, is expessed in terms of duties, the Liberal in terms of rights.

And, Sir, it is a right that we are asserting to-day in moving this amendment. We assume the right of calling upon the Government to dissolve Parliament in order to give the people of Canada an opportunity of pronouncing as between the two political doctrines—an opportunity which has been denied since 1911.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is not only this question involved in the present amendment; there is, in my judgment, another paramount issue which justifies an appeal to the people. We are informed from all quarters that an Imperial Conference is to be convened for the month of June, that ministers from the various Dominions are to gather in London, and that they will be called upon to pronounce on the question of sharing the naval defence of the Empire. That is the declaration made by the Prime Minister of England. And we have also a declaration made, it is said, by Lord Milner, that the question of Home Rule for Egypt should also bring the Dominions together in order that they may be consulted on that most important policy. I leave aside this last question, because I cannot believe that we shall be involved in it, as we have nothing to do with Egypt. But the other declaration made by the Prime Minister of England, that the burden of naval defence had become too heavy for Great Britain, and that the Dominions should be called upon to share in that defence, creates at once, a most important issue.

On many occasions the ex-Prime Minister, the right hon. gentleman from King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden) has declared, in England and in Canada, that our country should have a voice in the affairs of the Empire—that Canada should be consulted on the policy of the foreign office. It is true that, at the Imperial Conference, in 1911, Mr. Asquith, who was then Prime Minister of England, said that all this was a sham, that the Dominions could not share in framing the foreign policy of Great Britain.

Sir, if we should have a voice, if Canada should be called upon with British statesmen to decide the foreign policy of the Empire, you could see at once in what old world troubles we might be embroiled. As my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) stated so eloquently this afternoon, if Canada was called upon to pronounce on such a foreign policy, it would mean that there would be some sort of central authority in London where the Dominions would be represented according to population. Well, although I belong to the minority, and although I know that quite often we are denied the right and the privilege to speak on Imperial affairs because forsooth, we are supposed to be born rebels, yet I know, and I have enough regard for public opinion in Canada, for public opinion in English-speaking Canada, to say that never, never, never shall Canada surrender her rights as a free self-governing commonwealth.

Canada is a self-governing dominion, will take part in the defence of the Empire or in the defence of Great Britain whenever Great Britain is on her trial; but Canada will do so of her own free will; there will never be any central authority in London to dictate a policy to Ottawa in that regard. If it is true that an Imperial Conference is to convene in the month of June to discuss the problem of the part Canada shall take in the naval defence of the Empire, I say that the question transcends all other issues and that the Government clearly has no mandate—to even discuss it! They have no mandate even to approach the issue; to take it up with Imperial statesmen and commit this House to a policy. I say that the Government should dissolve Parliament and ask the people by way of a referendum what is their will with regard to this grave question.

Any organic change in our constitution would be a serious departure, which should be specifically authorized by the people. This is a most vital issue, yet we are kept in the dark with regard to it. I suppose we shall be told in a few moments by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that, as he said the other day in Montreal, "Canada is a nation." True, Mr. Speaker, we have a territory and we have a population, but as I understand the elements of international law there lacks an essential attribute: Canada has no sovereignty. But we are told by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) that Canada is "a nation within the Empire" yet our status is not the same as that of Scotland, Wales, or Britain. I am eliminating poor old Ireland, but I hope that the day is not far distant when Ireland shall have her share in the Government of Great Britain. Is our status equal to that of Britain, Scotland, Wales, even the Isle of

Man? Mr. Speaker, if we are a nation within the Empire, what about the requisition of our ships during the war? Our ships were commandeered, I understand, owing to the emergency of the occasion, but what about the returning of those ships to Canada when the shipping interests of this country were clamouring after the armistice: "Give us back our ships. Do not send them from Liverpool to the extreme sections of the British Empire to help the merchants of Liverpool and of Glasgow. Return them to Canada."

We are "a nation within the Empire", and we pride ourselves upon that distinction; yet there is an embargo on our Canadian cattle, an embargo which rests on what Sir Charles Tupper stated was a lie. It is not true that Canadian cattle suffer from pleuro-pneumonia, but it is true that free-trade England wishes to protect the cattlemen and breeders of Scotland and the North of Ireland. We are "a nation within the Empire," but I remember that in 1911 when the Rainbow and the Niobe came to Halifax the Canadian Government received word from the British Admiralty that Canadian ships flying the King's colours and the Canadian ensign might not go beyond the three-mile limit lest they should create complications with some other power. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) is not in his seat, but some time during the session I should like to know from him how it is that the present so-called Canadian navy is going round the world flying the British flag and the Canadian ensign at the same time. By what process, through what channels, did we obtain in this year of Our Lord 1921 the privilege which was denied to the late Government in 1911?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce waxed eloquent the other day when he said that before Confederation Canada was bound first to the provinces, then to the other Dominions; and, as things progressed, as events emerged, Canada became bound to the Empire, and in a glorious peroration the Minister added: "Now, Canada is bound to the world." Noble words, Mr. Speaker; yet I read in the Gazette of February 4 that Canada was denied the right to conclude a commercial pact even with Nigeria and the Gold Coast. Here is what I read in the London correspondence of the Montreal Gazette of that date:

> On inquiry at the Colonial Office by your correspondent, the information was vouchsafed that negotiations had taken place directly between Canada and the Governments of the Gold Coast and Nigeria for preferential agreements somewhat similar to that now existing between Canada and the West Indies. It was soon discovered, however, that the granting of such a preference was forbidden, in the case of the two African Governments, by the Anglo-French Convention referred to, and there the matter ended.
>
> It appears that not only West Africa, but also East Africa, is thus bound, the bar in the latter case being the Berlin Convention, which prevented a proposed arrangement between a British colony there and Australia.
>
> The statement of the Colonial Office, when asked whether the Anglo-French Convention could not be terminated, was that it would take about five years, in the event of the British Government being willing to make the effort, which would doubtless require a considerable amount of persuation. Canada and the other Dominions have outgrown entanglements of this kind, but other parts of the Empire still find themselves in the leading strings in which Britain's foreign policy of former days has placed them.

I hope that if this matter is followed up by the Department of Trade and Commerce the right hon. gentleman who presides with such distinction over the affairs of that department will take a leaf out of the late Government's book so far as its trade policy is concerned. When British preference was voted by this Parliament in 1897, there were obstacles in the way, there were the German and Belgian treaties with Great Britain; but the Prime Minister of Canada went to England, where he pleaded the cause of Canada and the cause of the Mother Country, and the two treaties were denounced forthwith. To-day we are attempting to trade with Nigeria and the Gold Coast, and I hope the precedent of Belgium and of Germany will help the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Canada is a nation; but will the right Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) at least give us a hint as to when we shall have a right to appoint consular agents, or consuls, in the various countries of the world?

Mr. DOHERTY: When we shall need them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My right hon. friend has travelled of late. He went to Geneva; he went to Paris; and I have no doubt that he went to the various capitals of western Europe. He knows that, in every city of importance, the smallest country in the world, is represented by at least a consular agent who looks after the trade interests of that country. Where are the consular agents of Canada? And yet my right hon. friend will say: "Canada is a

nation." My right hon. friend says that we shall appoint consular agents when we shall need them. He will pardon me if I follow that expression. A few months ago the present Government was nearly defeated on the vote taken on the question of representation at Washington, the Government escaping defeat by five of a majority. The question was whether or not Canada should be represented at Washington by an ambassador or a semi-ambassador who, jointly with the British ambassador, would look after the interests of Canada, and in the case of the absence of the British ambassador would look after the affairs of the embassy at large. I make bold to say that the ink which signed the approval of Parliament was not dry when loud protests were made by the British ambassador at Washington and when louder protests were made by the colonial office and the foreign office in London, because a nation we may be, but still under the ægis of Downing Street. The Canadian ambassador has not yet been appointed, and I dare say that he will not be appointed. Will my right hon. friend state to-night if that ambassador will be appointed? He will not be appointed.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will state this, that it is no loud protest from anybody outside of Canada that has anything to do with the question whether he will be appointed or not. My hon. friend said that he would make bold to make the statement. He certainly carried the boldness to the extreme of making a statement entirely devoid of foundation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My right hon. friend evades the issue. He will not say if the ambassador will be named, and I make bold to say once more that he will not be appointed.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will also say, as I am accused of evasion, that he will be named just as soon as Canada decides who is to be named.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This question was mooted, not last year, but three years ago, and I think this is the third time we have voted the money necessary to maintain a Canadian ambassador at Washington. It is very easy for my right hon. friend, in answer to my question, to say that he will be appointed just as soon as we decide who shall be appointed; but if you never decide, no one will ever be appointed. I have no warrant to say that, but my knowledge of British traditions and my common sense dictate the answer I gave a moment ago to my right hon. friend. I say that Great Britain, through the foreign office in London, will never allow the Canadian Government to appoint a dual ambassador at Washington, and why should the foreign office give Canada, which has no sovereignty, the right to discuss with the United States the interests of Great Britain at large? Aye, if you were to appoint a High Commissioner like the one you have in London or the one you have in Paris, the case would be quite different, and I have already stated in the House and several others on this side also stated that they would see with pleasure, indeed, the appointment of a Canadian, of a man of substance who knows Canada, who is familiar with her trade interests and Canadian affairs generally, to Washington, where we have so many problems to discuss and to settle. That, I would approve most heartily but again I repeat to my right hon. friend that it is no more necessary to have two ambassadors in the British Embassy at Washington than it is necessary to have two ministers sitting in the Department of Justice. What would my right hon. friend say if, for instance, the province of Quebec or the province of Manitoba were to insist on the Government having alongside my right hon. friend in the department over which he presides, I must say, with grace and ability, a jurist, a lawyer from either of their respective provinces to assist him in his task? My right hon. friend would protest. Would he resign? I think he would.

10 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The case is as absurd as that. More than that, it would be a very strange position for Canada to be in. When the British Ambassador was in Washington discussing highly confidential questions with the American Secretary of State, how would he like to have a third party intervene? It would lead to endless embroilments and endless quarrels between Canada and the Mother Country. I say that in the best interests of Canada and the Mother Country the appointment of a Canadian ambassador to Washington is not to be desired. But, really, we need waste no time in discussing the desirability of having one, for he will never be appointed.

The object of Mr. Amery's visit last summer was very easy to divine, and there has appeared enough in the press of Great Britain and enough has been hinted on the floor of the House at Westminster to dispose of the question forever. But I say

again, it is about time Canada should have a High Commissioner in Washington, not attached to the British Embassy, but speaking for himself, and surveying always Canadian conditions there. Mr. Speaker, there are obvious reasons why we should have such an official in Washington.

I am glad to see my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) in his seat. He has heard, no doubt, from the shipping interests about the Chicago drainage canal. The trustees of the Chicago Sanitary District years ago were authorized to divert from lake Michigan 4,167 cubic feet of water per second. They actually divert, I am told, 9,000 feet, under the pretence of feeding what was to be a sewage canal in Chicago, but really, as a matter of fact, it is the beginning of a canal to unite the waters of the Great Lakes with the Mississippi river with a view to diverting western trade to the south. Now, Sir, these same trustees who have exceeded their permit to divert 4,000 cubic feet of water per second by 5,000 feet, are applying to Congress for permission to divert 10,000 feet, instead of 4,000 feet. There are fears expressed—I do not know what is the information of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries— that Congress may grant this permit, and if it does, what will be the consequences? They will be most serious for Canada, for this diversion of the waters of lake Michigan into the Mississippi will lower the level of the St. Lawrence river. My hon. friend knows that during the summer months especially, in the harbour of Montreal, and below, the water level is low and has been getting lower every year for the last ten or fifteen years in spite of all the work that has been done on the St. Lawrence. A very able engineer, Mr. Shenehan, in the last issue of the Canadian Engineer, writes as follows:

> The diversion of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second at Chicago will lessen the cargo-carrying capacity of each of the big vessels about 400 tons on each trip. This is a substantial damage. The loss in water-power at Niagara approximates 300,000 electric horse-power; and on the St. Lawrence, perhaps 200,000 electric horse-power. Very little of this loss is made up, as the water goes towards the Mississippi river. This power loss means not so much at the present time as it will 25 or 50 years from now.

It is true there is not as much glamour for a Canadian ambassador in dealing with a question of this kind as there would be if he were invited to sit alongside the British ambassador at the opening of Congress, let us say, or if he were admitted to the secrets of British-American diplomacy, but it is far more important for Canada that she should have a gentleman at Washington to watch over the legislation of Congress, to safe-guard the interests, for instance, of the St. Lawrence navigation, of Niagara's electric power, and those of the great harbour of Montreal. There is less glamour in dealing with these questions, but the results are more practical and more vital to Canada.

Canada has taken part in the first deliberations of the League of Nations. Our part, no doubt, has been interesting and has developed in Canada a national pride. Yet, Mr. Speaker, let us come to solid facts; let us come down from dreamland to realities. Our interests in world affairs are such that we are much more concerned as a people, as a nation, if you please, with America than with the old world. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that legislation, or let us say, an event like the adoption of the Fordney Bill by the United States Congress is of much more importance to Canada than any delegation to discuss the affairs of Mesopotamia, or even Egypt? I was painfully surprised the other day to read the speech which my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) delivered in the city of New York. Addressing his audience he used the following language:

> We are pretty good neighbours to you. We came over from Canada in 1920 and bought $921,000,000 worth of stuff from you in the United States. This means that every man, woman and child in Canada spent on an average $115 in purchasing from the United States last year. United States, by the same statistics, came into Canada and bought $560,000,000 worth only, exactly five dollars for every man, woman and child in the United States.
>
> Let us be neighbours, buy as much from us as we have done from you, and when we come down here with our good-will security, Canadian dollars, be above offering us 88 cents.

And my hon. friend added the following words:

> Well, there are but two things for us to do, one is not to buy the extra $400,000,000 worth from the people of the United States. That is my appeal to the commercial portion of the United States; it may be a good thing to think of these things before we legislate too far.

Mr. Speaker, I was painfully surprised, not to say shocked, when I read that report of the speech delivered by my hon. friend to the American guests who were present on that occasion. Why! I recall a certain campaign that took place in the year of Our Lord 1911, and I recall at the same

time that the chief speaker of that campaign on behalf of the Anti-Reciprocity League was the right hon. gentleman himself. I recall the fact that he addressed vast meetings in Toronto and throughout Ontario, always speaking under the aegis of a banner whereon was inscribed the slogan of the day: "No truck nor trade with the Yankees." This was the same gentleman who, as a pilgrim, went back to the United States and, hat in hand before Uncle Sam, begged him in the name of Canada, in the name of the Canadian Government, to truck and to trade with Canada. Painful spectacle! Shocking view of the right hon. gentleman!

The League of Nations, at whose deliberations Canada was represented by my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice, by my friend the hon. member for Durham (Hon. Mr. Rowell), and by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, is a noble institution. It will make, as it was intended to make, for the peace of the world. No doubt the peace of the world may be promoted by a league of nations, but the expansion of trade between nation and nation, the opening of markets between two neighbourly peoples, and the disappearance of high tariffs, which only breed armaments first and war afterwards—all that, Mr. Speaker, will make for better feeling between our great neighbour the United States and Canada. Yes; expansion of trade, wide markets, and still wider markets, will make for peace and good government in Canada; and, as well, a return to constitutional methods and the development of a more brotherly spirit between races and creeds will help to promote the peace of Canada and that of the world. A full and overflowing measure of justice to minorities will also make for the peace of Canada and the peace of the world. But, Mr. Speaker, before assuming too much in the society of nations, let us begin by agreeing on a society of Canadians.

Before I close I wish to address to my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) my sincere congratulations for his very eloquent speech, and I wish especially to thank him for his kindly reference to the French-Canadian minority. It is evident that there is growing more and more in Canada amongst the English-speaking, as amongst the French-speaking Canadians, a desire for a restoration of national unity. Let me say this to my hon. friends opposite. As Quebec was adament to abuse two or three years ago, so to-day she is also adament to too much flattery; and above all, I serve notice to the sponsor for the member for Ste. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) that Quebec is particularly adamant to corruption. Both races, Mr. Speaker, have their qualities as well as their failings: they are only human. To govern them without any trouble you have only to apply the golden rule, or rather the old British rule; trust them! Trust the minority as you trust the majority; make them feel that they are your equals before the law, and there will be then no French-Canadian question in Canada. I say that the question of national unity is one of supreme importance; and the Government, whatever it may be, can solve it only by respecting the qualities and even the prejudices of both the English and the French. It is futile to attempt to ignore the national characteristics of a people; you cannot eradicate them from the heart. As a great Irish orator once said, all the belfrys of London cannot peel as sweet to the Celts as the bells of Shandon,—

> Whose sounds so wild would in days of childhood
> Fling round his cradle their magic spell.

The art of government consists in producing harmony and unity out of our Canadian diversities. That was the objective of Sir John A. Macdonald; that was the objective of the forbears of my hon. friend from Parkdale; that was the objective of Sir Oliver Mowat; that was above all the objective in life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Yes. That was above all the guiding star of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. From the beginning of his career to the very last he unceasingly preached unity, harmony and amity between the various elements composing this Confederation of ours. I have still ringing in my ears those words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in a very eventful debate which took place at the time of the South African war, and which find their application to-day as they did in those distant days:

> If there is anything to which I have devoted my political life, it is to try to promote unity, harmony and amity between the diverse elements of this country. My friends can desert me, they can remove their confidence from me, they can withdraw the trust they have placed in my hands, but never shall I deviate from that line of policy. Whatever may be the consequences, whether loss of power, I feel that I am in the right, and I know that a time will come when every man will render me full justice on that score.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that these noble words represent in a concrete form

the policy of every true Canadian statesman, and I hope they will be adopted by the leader of the Government. At all events I know that they will ever be the watchwords of the Liberal party.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker at this hour of the evening I hardly feel that I can fairly undertake to follow the hon. gentleman over the vast extent of territory that he has covered in treating the numerous questions with which he has dealt. I very much regret that I shall not be able to take the matter up at this moment, and I must necessarily, in consequence, leave him to be haunted through this night by those terrible nightmares in which he sees with terrible dread, a centralized authority grasping Canada and also sees this country standing out as a nation. The hon. gentleman has a most awful dread of Canada being a nation. I am sorry for that, but I feel I will be able to do something, at all events, to carry conviction to him that that is the fact, and perhaps something to modify the terrors that, in his mind, surround that position. I hope to be able to do that, but I fear that at this hour I shall have to postpone the task until to-morrow, and so I can only wish him the pleasantest dreams a man so obsessed may have, and beg to move, Mr. Speaker, the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

On the Motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Before the House adjourns I have a suggestion or a request to make to the Minister of Justice. In view of the several important speeches that have been made, and the immediate prospect of the making of others, touching the League of Nations, I think it is most desirable that the House should be in possession of further information with regard to the appointment of the delegates who attended the Geneva Conference. My suggestion, therefore, is that without waiting for a formal motion, which could only come at a later stage, my right hon. friend should bring down immediately the Orders in Council and instructions respecting the appointment of the delegates. We would then have a clear conception of the matter. I think it would be better that my right hon. friend should do that now and not wait until a motion for these papers is placed on the Order Paper. I hope that my rt. hon. friend will be able to do as I suggest.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. DOHERTY: At the present moment I see no objection to its being done, and I will bear the request in mind.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 10.30. p.m.

Tuesday, February 22, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Copy Orders in Council Nos. 1722 and 1860 approving two tariffs of fees of elections' officers under section 76 of the Dominion Elections Act.—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

Report on the Agricultural Instruction Act 1919-1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder for Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

Regulations under the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.—Hon. Mr. Calder for Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

Order in Council appointing the representatives of Canada to attend the first meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations.—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency, the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Monday February 21.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who entertained us last evening with an address that, no doubt, from many points of view was very interesting—although I think it must be confessed that it was in many respects hardly relevant to the motion and the amendment before the House—covered, as I took occasion to say, when moving the adjournment of the debate last night, a very considerable extent of ground. It is not my purpose or intention to take up in detail all the different matters, more or less relevant, which he introduced into that discourse. I shall content myself with dealing with what seemed, in the mind of the hon. gentleman at all events, to be the outstanding points which he sought to make, limiting myself, if I may use the expression, to "touching the high spots". That will necessarily reduce the length of my observations, because so far as I was able to appreciate his discourse the high spots were rather conspicuous by their absence.

The hon. gentleman, I suppose in view of what had preceded in this debate, by way of finding something that might perhaps constitute a reason why this motion should be made, and a reason that might at least call for some discussion as to why we should have an election, suggested that we should have an election because there is going to be an Imperial Conference, as he described it, in the month of June. And when he mentioned "Imperial Conference", there immediately crept into his discourse a subject that he seems as incapable of keeping out of his speeches as was the famous Mr. Dick, of Dickens' creation, incapable of keeping out of his literary productions the head of King Charles.

He gave us a dissertation upon his conception of Canada's national position, and in that he gave us another evidence of his settled determination to thwart every endeavour that may be made to assure to Canada the national status to which she has so long aspired, and to create the impression that her achievement in the direction of that full national status amounted practically to nothing. He clings—with all the determination which the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) attributes to us in what he calls our clinging to office—to the colonial garments with which he sees Canada still robed.

Mr. BELAND: I did that.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) says that he was the gentleman who did that. I missed the pleasure of hearing his address—

Mr. BELAND: You missed a lot.

Mr. DOHERTY: —and I quite realize the loss was entirely mine. The hon. gentleman in his speech did refer to the hon. member for Rouville as having taken the position which he took himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not call me the hon. member for Rouville, please.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I appreciate his modesty which seeks so promptly to repudiate the honours unconsciously attached to him. However that may be from the point of view of the hon. gentleman, perhaps I should apologize for the error; it is always proper to apologize in such a case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And sin no more.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman, in his frantic endeavour to establish that Canada is, after all, nothing but a mere colony, carries us back to 1911. Incidentally, I may suggest that in seeking to establish that position he is seeking to establish that a large part of the life-work of his late distinguished leader, for whom he professes so great admiration, went absolutely for naught. But the hon. gentleman is still living in 1911. May I say to him that since 1911 a great deal of water has passed under the bridges? And may I add that a great deal of blood has been spilled on the battlefields of a ravaged and devastated Europe? And may I further add—but it is not needful to remind the hon. gentleman of that—that much of that blood was the blood of Canada's youthful sons who, if nothing else had proved it, proved to the world that Canada had bought, at a price that is beyond all prices, the right to recognition of that nationhood to which she had grown? The hon. gentleman, going back to 1911, cites a declaration of the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Right Hon. Mr. Asquith, that it was impossible that the dominion nations of this Empire should ever have any share in the control of the Empire's foreign affairs. Having cited this, the hon. gentleman says: The case is ended; that is conclusive; there is nothing more to be said. I would ask the hon. gentleman: Since when have the people of Canada decided that their destinies are to be settled by the ipse dixit of any British Prime Minister, no matter how distinguished he may be? Time out of mind and times without number there has been hurled across the floor from the other side—we have heard it from the hon. gentleman himself—the imputation that upon this side of the House there was some desire to be governed from Downing Street. What more absolute evidence of the readiness to be governed from Downing Street can be found than the abject submission of the hon. gentleman and his friends to a declaration, which he attributes to one Prime Minister, as settling forever the national status of Canada? In that day what that Prime Minister said was unsound and untrue. He slammed the door in the face of Sir Joseph Ward, who had made the suggestion—which, I am sure, found a response in the hearts of the people of all these dominions—that the time had come when as sister nations we were entitled to have our say as to what the Empire of which we are an essential part should do in connection with her foreign affairs as well as in connection with

other affairs of general interest. We have to admit that the then representative of this Dominion stood silently by, and so far as silence could give acquiescence he gave his acquiescence. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) is not satisfied with that silent acquiescence; he comes to us now, ten years afterwards, to proclaim that the question was then and there settled once for all. May I remind him that there were people in Canada at that time who were not prepared to give that silent acquiescence? May I remind him that within one year after that incident other representatives of Canada were in England speaking the real voice of Canada? May I remind him that among those gentleman was the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden)? May I recall to his mind also the fact that that right hon. gentleman went from gathering to gathering in England proclaiming in terms that permitted of no misunderstanding that Canada did not accept the dictum that she never could and never would have a voice in the control and direction of those important affairs touching so closely her vital interests? Has he forgotten—or, perchance, did he never know—that that same Mr. Asquith (who in the presence of the acquiescing representatives of Canada had slammed the door in Sir Joseph Ward's face) after these pronouncements of the right hon. member for King's and after the response that he saw they evoked in the British hearers of that right hon. gentleman, reopened that door? What Mr. Asquith said in 1911 he abandoned in 1912, the hon. member clings to it still. Let me read to him what the hon. Mr. Asquith said in 1912 after he had heard the real voice of Canada as spoken by the right hon. member for King's. It may be found in the British Hansard for the 22nd of July, 1912. In what he acknowledged there Mr. Asquith did not stand alone; there was a veritable chorus of leaders and leading statesmen on both sides of the British House declaring their recognition of the soundness of the doctrine that the right hon. gentleman was laying down, and Mr. Asquith's statement came as the crowning of what they had all said. And what did Mr. Asquith say? I quote from the British Hansard:

> I will add, although I will not make any detailed statement upon that point at this moment—that side by side with this growing participation in the active burdens of the Empire, on the part of our Dominions there rests with us undoubtedly the duty of making such response as we can to their obviously reasonable appeal that they should be entitled to be heard in the determination of the policy and in the direction of Imperial affairs. I do not say it would be wrong to state—of course Mr. Borden and his colleagues would be the first to disclaim any desire for any such declaration, but I do not say in what shape or by what machinery that great purpose is to be obtained. Arrangements like that cannot be made in a day. They must be the result of mature deliberation and thought; they will probably have to develop from time to time—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will show the hon. gentleman how they have developed from time to time. There was a period of time filled with great events between 1912 and 1921. Mr. Asquith continues:

> — but without committing ourselves in any degree to particular forms in the matter, we share with our great Dominions the feeling which has become more and more conscious and articulate as years have gone on throughout the Empire, that we have a common heritage and interests, and that in the enjoyment of that heritage, and in the discharge of the duties which those interests involve, we ought more and more to be conscious partners with one another.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear. Fine words.

Mr. DOHERTY: As the then Prime Minister of Great Britain foresaw, time has done its developing work. The hon. gentleman—I should say the hon. gentlemen, for the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) insists upon being included—seem to be singularly blind to what is going on around them. They have not seen this developing work of time in which their late leader had so implicit a faith. They do not seem to have the aspirations that he had. They want to see their Canada always, shall I say, in her swaddling clothes?—Perhaps that would be carrying things too far; but however she may grow, whatever years she may attain, whatever achievements may be to her credit, however perfectly she may have fitted herself for her role amongst her sister nations, they want to see her with her fingers grasping close her mother's apron strings and clamouring to be kept in the nursery. High ambition, lofty ideal, for Canadians to hold! Surely the hon. gentlemen, who after all, I know have good Canadian hearts, will some day wake up, will some day escape from their Egyptian darkness which seems to surround them and precludes their seeing their country's growth. I spoke of their being in Egyptian darkness. Is this blindness of theirs perhaps not more attributable to the very dazzling nature of the light that shines upon this country and shows her forth to the world's nations as a nation

standing on a footing of equality amongst the nations of the British Commonwealth? Is is not rather that, on account of their having accustomed themselves to live in the darkness of that colonial condition, the light appears to be too much for their unaccustomed eyes, and just because the evidence is too conclusive, because the light shines too brilliantly, they seem incapable of seeing?

I have said that through those years there have been developments. Certainly a great change operated from the day of the British Prime Minister's declaration cited by the hon. gentlemen in which he pooh-poohed the possibility of the Dominions standing recognized as sister nations, to the day when another Prime Minister of Great Britain, introducing the representatives of those sister nations into the society of nations, first at the Paris conference and in the League that was subsequently constituted, said, mincing no words: "Why, Sir, these are practically independent nations." There is a long gap between those two declarations, and evidently the moving hand of time of which Mr. Asquith spoke in 1912 had not stopped but had continued to move during that period. What is the evidence that has satisfied the world of Canada's national status and that has left unconvinced no one but a few—I sincerely believe they are becoming fewer—people in Canada who persist in turning their eyes away from the light? It is not my habit, nor my practice, to try to search out men's motives; I am satisfied to judge their actions, and as I have said, I believe that these hon. gentlemen have good Canadian hearts. I can only wish them a better intellectual eyesight.

What is the position to-day? Every statesman of the United Kingdom recognizes that this Empire is made up of different, distinct, self-governing nations, and that it takes all of them to make the great commonwealth which is called the Empire; that there belongs to no one of those nations the right of domination over the other; that there belongs not even to a majority of those nations the right to dominate over any one or more of them. We have found a better method for binding together those nations of the great British Commonwealth, because, bear in mind that I have made no suggestion that Canada or any one of the other Dominions is a nation outside of the British Empire. I have heard the hon. gentleman many and many a time in eloquent periods protest his devotion to the maintenance of that great commonwealth, and so far as those expressions go, I have no desire to differ with him. There is in what I am saying no suggestion of any separation from the great Empire which really would be dislocated if one of these members should abandon it, and I am not talking of that; but I am trying to bring to the mind of the hon. gentleman just what that Empire is, and it is that partnership to which the Hon. Mr. Asquith aspired in the words that I have quoted. Surely we stand to-day, by common acknowledgment of the statesmen not only of the other Dominions, but of the United Kingdom itself, nations each equal in status with every other.

I do not think I need labour that further. Why did His Majesty, when he was called upon to sign the peace treaty and wanted to bind his entire Empire, sign that Treaty distinctly on behalf of Canada, distinctly on behalf of Australia, distinctly on behalf of South Africa, distinctly on behalf of New Zealand? Why did he consider that he should not impose that signature until he had the advice of his ministers of those respective countries? Simply because what was needed was the Empire's signature, and you would not have the Empire's signature when you had the signature of but one of the nations if you had not the signatures of all the nations that went to make up that Empire. Can there be any more outstanding act that His Majesty is ever called upon to do on behalf of this Empire than the signing of a treaty of that import? Why, too, when the nations proceeded to form their Assembly of Nations, did they welcome Canada as one amongst them? Why, when they convened their Assembly of the League of Nations, did they summon Canada to be present? Why did they receive her delegates on a footing of equality with the delegates of the greatest States of this world? Why did they, whatever may have been the value of what those delegates had to say, listen with respect to the voice of Canada? The answer is obvious. Nothing of that kind could have happened if they at all events had not differed from my hon. friend as to Canada's status. And now the hon. gentleman finds a reason why we are not a nation. It is because we are not performing all the actions of nations. He says—just listen, because it is so conclusive and so convincing! Why, he says, you have not got any consular offices. A new addition to the essentials of national existence! Because Canada has not felt the need of consular offices, because, having this big

sister nation, which, by reason of its manifold interests, requires such offices all over the world and is willing to give Canada the service of those offices whenever she may have an interest calling for representation in those countries—because under those circumstances Canada does not seek to provide herself with consular offices, then, forsooth, Canada has gone back to her colonial status! Having given us this conclusive reason, what is the next thing the hon. gentleman proceeds to do? He directs an attack upon this Government for having sought to provide for diplomatic representation at Washington. Very consistent! We are not a nation because we have not got consular offices; the one thing he is able to point out as lacking to our national status is that we should have consular offices; but so determined is he that we should not complete the national status that he makes an onslaught upon us for having had the ambition to provide for a diplomatic representative at Washington, the country where we have the greatest occasion for representation, the country with whom our relationships are such that we may be said, without exaggeration, to be in constant communication with regard to matters of a kind that, where we have no diplomatic representative, have to be communicated through the office in Great Britain and communicated back through that office, and through the British Ambassador to us. The hon. gentleman waxes indignant because we sought to remedy that state of affairs. Is it that he is afraid that he may be deprived of the last shred of argument that he could invoke to deny the status of his own country, to humiliate her and keep her back among the growing children who have not yet reached the status of manhood or womanhood and are not yet qualified to take their place among their adult companions in the great body of the world's nations?

Then, my hon. friend and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) raised the ghost that we thought had long since been laid, the ghost with which they seek to terrorize the people of Canada, the ghost of some central organization that must necessarily be brought into existence and have conferred upon it a power to dominate Canada if Canada ventures to assert her national status. Outside of the imagination of these hon. gentlemen, where can we find evidence of any such danger as that? Who is preaching to-day the creation of a central organization to dominate this Dominion?

[Mr. Doherty.]

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Lord Burnham and Lord Cave.

Mr. DOHERTY: If Lord Burnham and Lord Cave are preaching such a doctrine, let me again point out that we on this side of the House are not like my hon. friend. We do not say: Lord Burnham and Lord Cave have said so; therefore, Canada, bow down.

Mr. BELAND: We do not say that either.

Mr. DOHERTY: We have our say. Let me just read to the hon. gentleman what somebody who has more to say about the matter than Lord Burnham or Lord Cave, so far as Canada is concerned, had to say the other day in our good city of Montreal. Speaking on this question of Imperial relations, he said:

> Let us keep on the way we are going and let brotherly love continue. I have never been a believer in abrupt constitutional change. The elevation of our status as a British nation has through all the years been a matter of growth rather than of change, and so it will always be.
>
> There are those who are continually seeing trouble in our Imperial relations, and who pretend to be in terror lest we lose our autonomy. There is no more danger of the loss of our autonomy than there is of the loss of our atmosphere. Don't let us be frightened by ghosts, especially homemade ghosts, born and re-born, exhibited and re-exhibited wholly for political purposes. One political leader of the present time—he does not live in Montreal—puts a declamation into every speech against what he calls Imperial Centralization. I don't konw anyone with the slightest influence either here or anywhere else who wants Imperial Centralization.

He was apparently not as intimate with the noble lords as my two distinguished friends. He went on:

> It is a long, long time since, any such system was even seriously talked of, and no one has done more to make anything like centralized control forever impossible and to point a more excellent way to the British family of nations than has the man who led this country through the war, whose principle of full autonomy I adhered to then and sanction now. Perhaps the necessity of an issue is father to the thought, but there are some whose fear of centralization is the greater the farther we get from it.

Those are the words of the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country, speaking the unanimous opinion of the men who sit behind him. Will the hon. gentlemen now stop being afraid of ghosts?

They tell us they do not want Imperial centralization. Here is the declaration from the authorized voice which speaks for this side of the House. Why are gentlemen

so afraid? But perhaps before proceeding further I might remark that when one insists on remaining in the nursery one is likely to lack confidence in what oneself may do by way of protection from dangers real or apprehended. But those of us who have been proud to step out into the open field of Canada's nationhood trust to ourselves for our own protection from any threatened interference with our autonomy, if there be any such threat. And let me add that I am not aware of the statements of Lord Cave or Lord Burnham, but I have heard statesmen occupying,—with all respect to those particular gentlemen—much more prominent and much more influential positions in the Government of the British Empire, and I have heard them, not once but time and time again—and you may find their declarations in the newspapers — repudiating the idea of any such ambition. Let hon. gentlemen not be afraid; let them gather their courage together.

Mr. BELAND: We do not lack that.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then what is it that you lack?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The facts.

Mr. BELAND: Nothing else.

Mr. DOHERTY: The facts? We have not a Consular office at Washington; we did try to have a minister there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You won't have it; you cannot get it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that we cannot get it. (Let me say in parenthesis that that last statement I know to be unfounded; but let us suppose it to be true). The hon. gentleman will have no nationhood because we have not that thing which he denounces as something disastrous for Canada to have. The logic, of course, is absolutely conclusive.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Don't twist.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, if the hon. gentleman is not afraid, then we may take it that the ghost has disappeared and the central organization has no terrors for him; and there is nothing left now but the fact that we might have a representative at Washington. I am not sure whether he is afraid of our having one, or of the possibility that we might not; there is some doubt on that score.

Now, to pass from this matter, which I must apologize for having given so much time to; my excuse is that I have regard for the hon. gentleman and would be glad to see him come out from the ways of darkness and walk with us in the paths of light; I feel he could do a valuable service to this young nation if he only would have the faith to believe in it. The measure of Canada's nationhood is just the measure of the determination of her children to see that she has that nationhood; and if we fail in that respect it will be because the adversaries of Canada's nationhood, who are to be found only in Canada, will have succeeded, will have triumphed, will have overturned the facts by their misinterpretation of them. Canada's nationhood has no enemies outside of Canada; it is not questioned abroad; we have to come to Canada to find the thing put in question. Why, if I wanted to refer to past things, I might just mention that when in the United States Congress men were looking round for arguments against Canada's right to stand among the nations, and to have her vote cast in the assembly of those nations, having sought the world over, one of them at all events was able to find but one argument, and it was in the speech of an hon. member of this House. If hon. gentlemen are proud of that role I do not envy them their conception of what is a proper subject of pride.

And now, to come to this proposition upon which the hon. gentleman hung his observations about Canada's nationhood and of which he profited as an opportunity to add his further little effort to defeat Canada's nationhood, that is, the proposition that because there is to be what he terms an Imperial Conference in June of this year therefore we ought to have a general election. I appreciate the value of the argument in so far as it is evidence that the hon. gentleman recognizes that what had been, until he made his speech, put forward as an argument, was in fact so utterly insufficient that he must go out looking for an additional reason. But it will not take a great deal of time to show that this second argument that has been brought up as a reinforcement of the failing argument advanced in support of this motion is weaker even than the beaten reason to whose reinforcement it has been called. The hon. gentleman says that because there is going to be what he describes as an Imperial Conference we must have a general election. There have been Imperial Conferences in the past; they were attended not only by the leader of our most recent Government, the right hon. member for King's, (Sir Robert Bor-

den), but during a series of years in different sessions they were attended by the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the former leader of my hon. friends opposite, and a great Canadian whose memory we all of us respect. Did he go to the country every time he was going to attend an Imperial Conference? I do not think hon. gentlemen would be able to point to one instance in which he did. The last occasion I remember was during the sesion of 1911 when the House adjourned in order that the then Prime Minister might attend an Imperial Conference. Was any voice raised then to suggest that there was need of going to the country before the right hon. gentleman proceeded to the Imperial Conference? It is true—and I shall have something to say on this later on—that at that very time members of this House were arguing that there was reason to go to the country. But they stopped that very argument and suspended discussion of the matter in order to allow the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier to go and attend the Imperial Conference. And that was not the only Imperial Conference which the right hon. gentleman attended. If I remember rightly, he attended three; at all events he attended more than one, and he never went to the country before going to any Conference. The reason was obvious. In that, as in many other things, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right and the Parliament of that day was absolutely right. Why should his going to an Imperial Conference involve his having a general election first? In the first place, let me say to the hon. gentleman that what is going to take place in June is not an Imperial Conference, although I am quite willing, for the purpose of this argument, that he should regard it as such. As a matter of fact, it will be a meeting of Prime Ministers to talk over and discuss matters. It is not, nor would an Imperial Conference be, a body whose decisions would bind any country represented at it.

Everybody who knows what the Imperial Conference is—and this, as I have said, is not even an Imperial Conference—knows that no country was ever bound by anything that transpired at it; that if the parties attending that conference did, as between themselves, come to a mutual agreement that a certain course would be desirable, all that could follow from it could be that the representative of each country would go back home and report—submit his report first to the government of his country, and that government, if it approved, would submit to the national Parliament the suggested plans or projects that may have been considered and may have been agreed to at such conference. Why, we have an outstanding instance of that in the conference of 1912 where the Prime Minister of that day came back from the conference and laid before this House a project, and that project failed entirely of effect because the other Chamber of this Parliament declined to approve of it. Why then the need of going to the country before the Prime Minister can talk over with these other Prime Ministers things that may be proposed, not things that shall be done? I think the hon. gentleman himself will appreciate that if out of that conference there should grow anything that would call for a decision by the people of this country, the only proper time to go to the people upon questions of that sort would be when the Prime Minister had taken the responsibility of asking the Canadian Parliament to take some action with regard to it. I am not now going to discuss whether it would or would not, under those circumstances be necessary or desirable to go to the country. That would depend almost entirely—very largely at all events —upon what the nature of the proposition would be; but to suggest that, contrary to all precedent, this House should now declare that the Prime Minister cannot go to England to talk over and discuss with the other prime ministers of the different nations of this Empire what might be in their mutual interest and what would be a desirable course for each of them to adopt, without first dissolving this House and going to the country, is, I think, carrying the search for reasons to bolster up an unsustainable proposition to the extreme limit to which such a search can be carried. It seems to me it would not be unfair to speak of my hon. friend's position, in so far as he grasps at that contention, as the desperate grasping at a straw by the drowning man who finds that the plank to which he had entrusted himself has failed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will, I am sure, allow me to ask a question?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am sure that my hon. friend does not want to give a different interpretation from what I said about the next conference. I said that if the Prime Minister of Canada was going to a conference, where he is to discuss—according

to despatches which have been published of late—the share that Canada must take in the naval defence of the Empire, surely that was such an important question that he should get a mandate from the people. That is what I suggested.

4 p.m.

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. and learned friend when he does not rely upon his imagination for establishing the facts upon which he bases his conclusions falls back upon that substantial basis, "what the newspapers say about current events." As I have already stated, whatever the newspapers may say, this meeting of Prime Ministers is not going to decide anything which will bind any country. Whether they will talk about Imperial defence I am not in a position to say; but whatever may be talked about there, let the hon. gentleman possess his soul in calm—nothing will be done there that will bind Canada. From the very nature of things nothing can be done there that will bind Canada; the whole thing is purely consultative.

During the hon. gentleman's references to our providing for a minister at Washington—I do not know whether he fears we shall or shall not take that course—he went on to make some allusion to the question of water being taken from the Great Lakes for the Chicago ship canal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From Lake Michigan.

Mr. DOHERTY: Very well, from Lake Michigan for the Chicago Ship Canal. My hon. friend seemed to think that if we had a minister at Washington the water would be taken away, but that if it were not a minister but a commissioner, then the water would not be taken away. Let us be serious.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh yes, let us be serious.

Mr. DOHERTY: I can only pray in the interests of my own seriousness that I may not so often be led into temptation as I have been by the speech of the hon. gentleman, to turn the other way. If we had a minister it would be part of his duties to watch what was going on at Washington; and, just as, no doubt, the British ambassador in fulfilling his function watches in the general interest of the Empire what is going on in the United States, so our minister would watch those things in the general interest of Canada. Let the hon. gentleman possess his soul in patience. On a previous occasion when there was a question of the taking of part of the flow from international waters, the government that was then in power of which the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) was leader, saw to it that the interests of Canada were protected and defended; and since then those interests have been defended before the proper tribunal charged with dealing with the matter. If danger comes again whether we have a minister at Washington or whether we have not, we will find a method, of protecting the interests of Canada.

The hon. gentleman went on to refer—but the bearing was never quite clear to me—to the Geneva Assembly and to the League of Nations, and uttered something in the nature of a protest about Canada taking her part in that Assembly. He said that we should look after domestic interests and concern ourselves with our relations with the country that is immediately adjacent to us. Of course we should and of course we shall. Does the hon. gentleman think that because we perform one duty we are paralyzed from performing any other? Does the hon. gentleman suggest that we have not an idea of the relative importance of things? Who on this side of the House has ever suggested that we should abandon the interests of Canada in order, through the operation of the League of Nations, to look after the interests of the world? We believe that it is possible to carry out our first duties—duties that have to do with our own country at home—and also to attend to those duties which our relations to our immediate neighbour may impose upon us and which may be more important than our share in the work of the League and still to do that share. The Government of Canada—prides itself—no it does not pride itself; but it does believe that Canadians, and Canadian public men from whatever party they come who may be charged with the responsibility of the protection of Canada's interests, will be able to take care of those interests in their entirety, and at the same time fulfil every duty that may rightly be incumbent on her. Let not the hon. gentleman fear that we are going to sacrifice the interests of our nation because we are interested in the affairs of other nations; let him not suggest that we should fail to do our reasonable part to contribute to the preservation of the world's peace, and to make successfully workable this great instrument upon whose success so much depends for humanity in general and for ourselves as forming

a part of that humanity; let him not suggest we should abstain from doing our reasonable part to keep Canada in a position in which she may not suffer the reproach that she alone among the nations did not interest herself in that which makes for the common good of the world; let him not be afraid that because we are prepared to do our duty in that regard we are therefore going to expose the interests of this our own nation of which we are so proud.

Now, let me come to what the hon. gentleman attempted to say in support of the general proposition that this amendment was called for because the continued existence of this Parliament and of this Government was a violation of every constitutional principle. It is a very long time since I have had the pleasure—we will call it pleasure—of listening to so much variegated and strong language and so many rash assertions, made and repeated as though the makers and repeaters of them had an absolute conviction of the efficacy of the rule lately laid down by a distinguished American politician—that the one way to get a statement accepted is to make no effort to prove it, but to just throw it out and keep repeating it and getting it repeated, until finally you say: well, of course, nobody argues anything against that; it is obvious.

Our distinguished friends on the other side, starting with their leader, have told us that the war being over the remaining in office of this Government is a breach of the British constitution, and that if we do not hurry up and go to the people to-morrow that breach would hardly be reparable. They advanced reasons in support of this, citing the fact that one gentleman in Great Britain went to the country because the by-elections had been going against him; and that another gentleman who argued against the proposition at that time, had argued in favour of it when he happened to be in Opposition at another time. And, faithful to the colonial aspirations which distinguish my hon. friends on the other side, they threw at us those isolated facts as conclusive evidence that that was the spirit of the British constitution; some of them even waxed eloquent about a government " of the people, by the people, and for the people "; and, of course, as we all know, they were quoting Abraham Lincoln; and then they concluded that this House ought to dissolve to-morrow.

I wonder if the hon. gentlemen have forgotten that the very essence of the British constitution is parliamentary government. In the sense which the hon. gentlemen are clamouring for, the British constitution does not provide for government by the people; it provides for government by the people's representatives, and it determines, according to the laws of the different countries, for what period of time the mandate shall be conferred upon the members of Parliament. Because, mind you, we have heard a great deal of talk about the mandate of this Government and the mandate of that Government coming directly from the people. That is an expression used at different times, but people who understand know that it is purely figurative. The mandate that the elector gives is a mandate to the member of Parliament. And my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition seemed to think it necessary to carry us back to very ancient times for the purpose of telling us that there existed a legal remedy known as quo warranto—a remedy that exists to-day just as it has always existed —and he went on to say that by that great writ a man holding office was called upon to say by what warrant he held his office. My hon. friend then suggested that if a writ of quo warranto went to this Government it would be powerless to make a conclusive answer.

Why, if any such writ came demanding, just as the hon. gentleman with eloquent reiteration demands, by what right we are sitting here, we at once tell him: By the authority of those two bodies—if I may apply the expression to both of them—by whose authority alone any Government can hold power; we sit here by right of the fact that the Prime Minister of this country to-day, being called upon by the representative of the Sovereign to form a Government, that is to say, enjoying the confidence of the Sovereign, found that selection ratified by an expression of confidence of the majority of the Parliament of this country. There is no other warrant by which any man can hold the office of Prime Minister, there is no other warrant by which any man can be justified in occupying a position as a member of the Cabinet in any Government. All this elaboration and discussion about a mandate to the Government led by the right hon. member for Kings, (Sir Robert Borden), as distinguished from a mandate to the Government led by the right hon. gentleman who now leads it, is all built upon theories elaborated in the imaginations of the hon. gentlemen who set them forth.

I shall not go into any examination of authorities on a question of that kind. Anybody, I venture to say, who knows anything about—I do not say the letter, but the spirit of the British constitution, "the spirit that giveth life", as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition knows—is aware that the great distinctive feature of the British constitution which differentiates it from all those constitutions which have not directly and without distinction followed it, is the fact that its centre is the principle of parliamentary government, and that under it the great power is the Parliament of the country.

Now, there is no doubt that the parliament of the country takes its authority from the people, but it takes the authority that the people give it, and when the people vote for a member of parliament they vote for a man whom they are willing to charge with the function of governing during the period for which the law and the constitution provide; whom they are willing to trust in regard to what may arise during that period and charge with the responsibility of dealing with it. They give him a mandate—a mandate that has to run during a fixed period, unless in the interval a Government having the confidence of the majority of parliament comes to the conclusion that by reason of some great and new question that has arisen, or possibly, by reason of some crisis that the country is facing, it is desirable and necessary that there shall be a dissolution. But a Government that is to pronounce upon that is a Government that has the confidence of a majority of this Parliament. So long, therefore, as a majority of this Parliament stands in agreement to give its confidence to a Government the leader of which the Crown has reposed its confidence in by calling upon him to form a ministry, you have the government contemplated by the British constitution. And there are reasons for that which have no connection with a desire to cling to power and all the other sordid motives which the hon. gentleman attributed to us the other evening and poured out in the series of more or less meaningless invectives with which he closed his speech. One of the great benefits, one of the great advantages, of the British constitution, is the stability that it gives to the country. The British constitution never contemplated that the electors were going to select representatives so unfit to cope with the problems that might arise that as each particular question came up they would have to run back to the people to find out what the people wanted. The people elected men in whom they had confidence and charged them with the responsibility of dealing with the situations that might present themselves. We would afford a sorry spectacle if we should accept and act upon the doctrine of unconstitutionality which has been preached, with the result that we should have a series of powerless, spineless, irresponsible parliaments—parliaments composed of men who, though seeing before them clearly the course which their duty called upon them to follow, would not have had the courage to form their own decision and courageously follow that course, but would say "Oh, no, I had not thought of that at the last election and I did not talk about it; let me run back to the people and find out whether or not, perchance, there is at this moment some wave of public feeling that may run counter to that: to me the course is clear as to what is best for the country, but I do not care for that. I am the man who was charged with the duty of doing what I conscientiously believed to be best for the country, but that is nothing to me; perhaps there is some current of public opinion running counter; it may turn and run in the other direction to-morrow; let me hurry and get there before the current changes." That is not the British conception of government; that is not the British conception of parliament.

The hon. leader of the Opposition went over a whole list of countries that had had elections since the conclusion of the war and wanted to know whether the people of Canada were so inferior to the people of those countries that they should not be gratified with having an election. Well, in the first place, in the case of most of these countries the election was held because the parliamentary term had expired. In the case of the United States, the election was held because the constitution said that they should have an election at that particular time. Let me, in parenthesis, referring to this country where there is government "of the people, by the people and for the people." point to the fact that the people in November declared their absolute want of confidence in the existing government of the United States and that that government is carrying on still. That is according to their constitution; ours is a vast improvement on that, no doubt. I mention it only as showing how figurative all these words are.

I had said that I would not cite authorities. Let me make one exception. I shall not delve into the past; anyone who will study the works of the men who were the real authors of this Constitution may see for themselves. In that connection I would ask my hon. friend, who shares with me, if I may judge from the citations he so frequently makes from his writings and speeches, a high admiration for that eminent statesman who had much to do with the building up of the British Constitution, Edmund Burke — I would ask him to read his work and see what the constitutional system of government is under the British Constitution. Last session someone did say that Burke had gone out of fashion; that his ideas were, as John P. Robinson said, "exploded idees." I shall not go back to that, but I will read the statements of one gentleman, a statesman of our own country, who said, referring to this very question:

I take issue with my hon. friend from North Toronto and my hon. friend from Brandon when they tell us that the Parliament of Canada is debarred from dealing with any question which has not been discussed at the previous general election.

Just note the contention that is made here.

That is not in accord with the constitutional history of Great Britain or of Canada either, as I have read it. Let me ask my hon. friends what mandate had the Government of Lord Elgin in 1853, when it went to Washington to obtain Reciprocity? Had that question ever been put before the people? Had it been an issue the last time the people's representatives had gone before them? Not at all. Let me ask, further, what mandate had the Government in 1864 to put through Parliament the resolution which proposed Confederation? Had the question of Confederation ever been put before the people of United Canada? No, not a word about it had ever been heard. The only question then raised was that of representation by population.

Just as we are told now that the only question in the last election was the carrying on of the war.

Yet the Government of Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. George Brown—because the two were united on that occasion—brought in a resolution which was nothing more nor less than a complete transformation of our then condition. When Canada assented in 1871 to the Fishery stipulation in the Washington Treaty of that year, had that question ever been put before the people? No, it was unknown to them. It never had been debated before.

I am sorry that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not here; it might do him good to hear this.

In the face, therefore, of these precedents, it is childish for any man to challenge the

right of this Government to follow the course it is doing.

If my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were here he would sit back scandalized—scandalized as he is at this Government to-day. He would sit back, no doubt, and say to us: What office-holders; what men among those who love the loaves and the fishes, who make broad their phylacteries, who enlarge the borders of their garments, who love the uppermost rooms at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the marketplace, — who make clean the outside of the cup and platter and within are full of extortions and excess; — what man of this description is it that uttered the words I have just been listening to?—Tell me that I may pour out upon his devoted head the vials of my indignation, that I may search the Scriptures to find, if possible, even additional expressions of Scriptural vituperation with which I may forever confound the name and memory of that unworthy man, that officeholder, that clinger-on to office, that lover of the loaves and fishes and all the rest of it. And, of course, I would give him a little time so that he might, in some degree regain his calm, his selfcontrol, and be able to restrain himself, and then I would tell him that the man who pronounced those words, the man who followed that doctrine consistently throughout his life, was that great Canadian statesman, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. whose successor the leader of the Opposition of to-day is; the man of whom I fancy the proudest thing that the present Opposition leader has to say for himself is that he was this man's devoted follower through many years; the man with regard to whom we are all prepared to say that, whatever may have been our differences with him, we respected and admired him and we especially recognized in him a distinguished authority upon constitutional questions of this kind.

I do not think I need go further to make the justification from the constitutional point of view of the position of the present Prime Minister and of this Government in refusing to be stampeded into a general election. We have a duty to do. The public of this country gave us a mandate and imposed a duty upon us, and that mandate was and that duty was to protect the interests of Canada to the best of our judgment and our capacity, until the time should come when our mandate expired under the law or when in our honest con-

viction the interests of the country called for a change, not merely in the Government, but in the Parliament of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite have cast insult and slur upon this Government. Do they realise that they are casting insult and slur upon every member of this Parliament? This Government is not here of its own volition; it is here because it possesses the confidence of the majority of this Parliament, and because the majority of this Parliament is convinced that the moment has not come when they would be justified in surrendering the mandate that the people gave them, when they would be justified in departing from the performance of the duty that the people, when they gave their representatives the mandate, imposed upon them.

"But," we are told, "there have been by-elections, and the by-elections are going against you and they show that the public has no confidence in you." And we were referred to a list of by-elections as establishing conclusively a complete overturn in public opinion in this country. Just let us look at those by-elections for a moment. We were told that there were seventeen by-elections, in which five Liberals, and five supporters of this or the preceding Government, were re-elected. As regards those constituencies, surely we have conclusive evidence that there is absolutely no change of opinion in those constituencies from the opinion that prevailed in 1917. As regards them we are asked to say that we have lost the confidence of the public because the people who always voted against this Government are voting against it still. As regards those constituencies, the position is absolutely identical with what it was when this House was elected. What is left? With regard to constituencies in which there has been a change, let me in the first place point out that there has been no change in the direction of the party led by the leader of the Opposition, save in one case where he succeeded in getting a minority, a small minority comparatively, of the total vote of the constituency, placed in such a favourable position that it was able to say who should be the member. As regards the other constituencies they all went to gentlemen desirious of securing special representation for a special class in this Parliament. We have yet to have any evidence that the electors who elected them elected them because they wanted a dissolution of this Parliament. All that the election of those gentlemen established is that the electors of those constituencies thought it was desirable that there should be in this House greater representation of the particular class to which they belonged. I have not heard it said that in any of those elections—Certainly it has not been said that in all those elections, the dissolution of this House was made an issue.

So, what is the proposition? Because there are six constituencies in this country which have pronounced their adherence to a party that was not in existence in 1917, you have to asume that there is so violent and widespread a change in the opinions of the electorate of this country that this House, having barely completed its third year, should immediately dissolve. Can any proposition be more utterly without of foundation?

Then, there is the one constituency to which I have referred, which had not supported the Opposition party in 1917, a constituency which has returned, by a minority vote, an adherent of the Liberal party. I would just like to call attention to that election, in the first place from the point of view of its bearing upon this vote which we are about to take, and in the second place from the point of view of the light it throws upon the sincerity of those who are here professing to want an election. In the first place, what is the lesson of that election? The one clear lesson that results from that election is that the overwhelming majority of the people of Peterborough, whatever else they do or do not want, do not want an election. Let me explain why. Who precipitated that election and upon what issue? There was in this House a man to whom we must pay the tribute that he sincerely wanted an election, and he gave his proof,—he took his political life in his hands. He went out to the people of Peterborough and he asked them for an endorsement of the proposition that we ought to have an election now. How many votes did he get and how many people voted against that man who had made the issue, thus making it clear that they did not want an election? There were altogether something like 12,800 votes cast, and how many of them said they wanted an election? The figures show that: 2,595 electors in Peterborough wanted an election; 4,093 said: We do not want an election, we are out to fight the man who raised the standard of a new election, we want him defeated, what we want is a Liberal member in this existing House; 2,811 said we do not want an election, we want a member in this existing House to support the present Government; 2,319 said: We do

not want an election, get out and beat that man Burnham, we want a Farmer member in this existing house; 1,103 said the same thing, we do not want an election; we will not follow the standard of the man who made this election necessary; we want a Labour member in this House. The result was that you had 8,828 voters in Peterborough who upon the issue: Election or no election, said: We do not want an election; there is something else we want more. You had only 2,595 who said they wanted an election.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very strong.

Mr. DOHERTY: And then hon. gentlemen opposite come here and say: Here is the evidence that the people of Canada are clamouring for an election. Why, two-thirds of the people of Peterborough would rather have something else than an election.

Mr. BELAND: What about the supporters of Mr. Gordon?

Mr. DOOHERTY: They have been voiceless on the subject of whether they wanted an election. All I know is that they wanted elected, at the risk of defeating the man who raised the standard of an election or no election, a Liberal member to sit in this House.

Mr. BELAND: He will tell us when he comes.

Mr. DOHERTY: Probably he will. When he gets here, he will probably be anxious to forget the platform upon which he stood, and the speeches which he made. Probably he will be anxious to have us all forget how very far away he has got from the platform of 1919 which my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) showed us—with the book closed—last night; he was very careful to make no reference to that platform, which all hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have got so far away from and of which the hon. leader of the Opposition is so thoroughly ashamed that when he comes to meet this House, not being able to reconcile the speeches for and the speeches against that platform which he has made on his tour, swaying from one side to the other as he passed from one constituency to another, that he simply takes refuge behind his amendment as if he were saying to himself: Well, as a result of all these things I have said, I have got the cards so hopelessly muddled that I do not think there is anything for it but to call for a new deal.

[Mr. Doherty.]

The Peterborough election also throws a light on the sincerity of this present clamour among hon. gentlemen opposite for an election. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said: The one thing necessary to the salvation of this country to-day is an election; I am here to turn out the Government for the sake of getting an election to-day. But what did he do when he learned that somebody with that doctrine as his sole doctrine, somebody willing to put aside all questions of party differences had nailed to the mast the standard of an immediate election, and had gone out and asked the Peterborough electors to endorse his stand? Of course, this hon. gentleman, sincere believer in an immediate election as the one salvation of Canada, rallied to the support of that man. Of course he said: Shame on the man who talks party politics, shame on the man who would divide the people in the face of this supreme issue,—the one great object is to have an election to-day; gather your forces together, and let us, all who want a general election, vote together so that our votes may be effective. That is what you would expect if you did not know the leader of His Majesty's Opposition; but knowing the leader of His Majesty's Opposition, you were not disappointed when you saw him call for his horses and call for his men, and organize his party to go out and make war on the man who had ventured to say we ought to have an election. What a light that election throws on the sincerity of this clamour for an election! This House is asked to say that the great paramount issue is an election or no election, that on its decision the salvation of this country, nay, perhaps more than that, the integrity of the British constitution depends. We on this side of the House who may in the past have belonged to different parties are appealed to to sink every consideration other than that, and vote in order that the country may be saved by a new election; and we are so asked by men fresh from the fray, glorying in their success over the man who preached the doctrine of an immediate election. I ask you now, how much faith can you put in the sincerity of this amendment?

I should hardly perhaps go back to them, because they are so insignificant, but the hon. member for Maisonneuve gave some considerations about the requisitioning of our ships during the war, about the cattle embargo, about the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine carrying the

Canadian ensign, and about some difficulty with respect the the Gold Coast and Nigeria, all bearing upon our not being a nation.

As to the ships requisitioned in the war, the Canadian nation requisitioned her ships and put them at the service of the Allied nations, just as the Canadian nation sent her boys to fight for the common cause. I ask you in what respect that derogates from our national independence. As to the cattle embargo, I give that up. That you can find in the cattle embargo—that is, in one nation of this Empire, for its own protection, even as against other nations of the Empire putting on an embargo—any evidence that we are not distinct nations rather puzzles me. If anything, I should think it was evidence that we are distinct nations. Then we are asked, why do the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine now carry the Canadian ensign when the Niobe was not allowed to do so two years ago. I do not know it to be a fact, but I would say it is only a further evidence of the development to which I have pointed. We have privileges to-day that we did not have nine or ten years ago, and surely this only goes to show the development of our recognition as a nation. As to the Gold Coast and Nigeria, had the hon. gentleman paid attention he would have seen that in the item referring to the difficulty of our directly negotiating with them, it was pointed out that Canada had outgrown these limitations which rest on the other parts of the Empire, but that Nigeria and the Gold Coast find themselves tied up, so it was not for any want of right on the part of Canada that we could not have gone on. It was, unfortunately, because the Gold Coast and Nigeria, being still Crown colonies, had no right to act on their own behalf. And the very item which the hon. gentleman read pointed out that fact. I have read to the House what Sir Wilfrid Laurier thought on this doctrine of mandates and the power of Parliament to deal with matters that had not been discussed at the general election. I may say that he made these observations in the course of a debate upon Reciprocity during which it did appear to hon. gentlemen then sitting on the other side of the House that there was need for a new election, because there was the proposal of a great new project in which was bound up not only the commercial but the national future of this country. It is true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier ultimately gave an election, but he was careful to tell us in the speech he made, when the motion of closure was before the House, that he did not do so because our doctrine was right. He was very clear on that. He never flinched from the doctrine he laid down, but he told us that we should have the election because we had been naughty boys and had obstructed him. I do not want to express anything of a critical character on this point, but it did look a little like the case of the unjust judge of the Scriptures who yielded to the widow's insistence—not because she was right but because of her importunity. I merely wish to point this out in order that I may not be told that after all he did dissolve Parliament.

Now, in the course of his observations, the hon. member for Maisonneuve gave us several examples of what he considered to be deadly parallels, one of which was that of the Reciprocity debate and another, a parallel with some English election that occurred after the South African war. There, he pointed out, all of the contending parties opposed to the government came together—so differently from the way they did in Peterborough; if the parties here had taken the same course we might have begun to believe in the sincerity of those who are clamouring for a general election. In the meantime I only desire to call attention to the disparity between the two cases. We had another parallel, in which Mr. Asquith made a speech and talked about the policy of his adversaries as being one of zig-zag and—Oh, I have forgotten what else.

Mr. LEMIEUX: See-saw.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell me some of the others. Well, I listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks and then I thought of their application, and I could not help thinking of the clear-cut position taken in the speech from the Throne, and of the variegated policies of the leader of the Opposition and of the fact that, challenged to do it, he absolutely declines to tell us what definite policy, if any, he has. And then I wondered to whom the see-saw and the zig-zag applied. I am like the friend of Antonio in the play, who felt called upon to thank the Jew who had furnished him with the words which he wanted to use: "A very Daniel come to judgment" —a very see-saw and a very zig-zag! I wish the hon. gentleman would tell me the other adjectives, because they are so thor-

oughly applicable to the line of conduct of his own leader, a line of conduct in which the hon. gentleman apparently so complacently follows him. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should apologize for having devoted so much time in dealing with so small material. However, I have at last finished.

It is a gratification to me to be able, in my closing remarks, to join in one expression of opinion that fell from the lips of the hon. gentleman. He expressed the aspiration for unity among the people of this country. Let me say that in that hope I most heartily and most sincerely join; and I should be taking no risks in saying that all hon. members on this side of the House endorse my sentiments. While we have duties with regard to the peace of the world, duties which we shall be able to perform, and while we have the duty of looking after the material interests of the people of this country, which come before any interests connected with the outside world, I am prepared to agree that we, all of us on both sides of the House, have one first great duty, and that is the duty of each trying to do his part to bring about and increase and preserve a feeling of unity between the different peoples of Canada. In making the eloquent appeal on this subject which he did, the hon. member for Maisonneuve did little more than re-echo the words of the Prime Minister of this Country as he uttered them first at Portage-la-Prairie, then in our good city of Sherbrooke, and also in our better city of Montreal, and as he has tried to send them broadcast throughout this country, extending his voice and hand to greet every man, of whatever class, creed or political party, who is willing to join earnestly in the work of bringing about unity—observe, I do not say uniformity—among the people of this country I need not add anything to the eloquence of the hon. member for Maisonneuve further than to say that I join heartily in the hope he expressed in this respect. I might suggest to him, however, that he be good enough to have a heart to heart talk with some of the gentlemen who sit on the same side of the House with him. I say this in no spirit of criticism, but perhaps to those hon. members he might point out acceptably, if I cannot, that it is not the best way of reaching unity to maintain the determination not to forget things that have happened in the past which largely, through misapprehension on one part or the other, have conduced to destroy the spirit of unity. One hon. gentleman the other evening said he was prepared to forgive but not to forget. I would ask him to think over a little what is the practical value of forgiveness on the part of one who continues to treasure up the memory of what he believes to be a wrong, and who, treasuring up that memory, seeks to keep alive the determination to have satisfaction for the wrong which he believes to have been inflicted. I am not here to plead in condonation of things that may have been wrong from one direction or another and which may have contributed to separate our people. But I am here in all honestly and sincerity to plead for a spirit all round of readiness to forget, asking only to be convinced that there is sincerity to-day in the desire to heal old wounds and to close up the gaps that have been created and that divide our people into different camps.

I appeal to gentlemen on this side as well as to gentlemen opposite to give thought to the necessity of the performance of that great duty of gathering together the Canadian people, and to give thought to what each of one of them may do, even if it involves the forgetting of some things, to bring about that most desirable end. As I have already said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) in making an appeal for unity only re-echoed the words of the right hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) pronounced on different occasions and in different parts of this country. I have before me just a citation from his words on one occasion which I would like to give the House and with which I shall close these altogether too-prolonged observations. Speaking in the City of Montreal on the subjects to which the hon. gentleman referred, the Prime Minister said:

> All I want is a fair field to show, in the practical task of government, that my desire to do something useful in the work of reconciliation is an honest desire, and that what I have already said I mean. Once more I repeat that on this subject I am secure in one regard: In all the years of my public life I have uttered no words that now need to be recalled; nor have I ever been a party to a statute that in a single line was unfair to English or to French. All those who persist in attributing to me the language of prejudice or hostility have for seven months failed to produce a sentence from the record of twelve years to support the calumny and stand today as convicted perverters of the facts.
>
> I am anxious for a fair distribution of the duties of Government. There is not such a fair distribution today, and my great anxiety is to be certain from week to week that I am not in the smallest degree responsible for a continuance of the unfairness that now exists. I believe also in the fair distribution of public offices of every kind, and I think that both the

great races should recognize that a careful adherence to that principle is essential if we are ever going to get along. Such was the conviction and the practice of the best statesmen of the past, and we cannot forget their precepts now.

Here I leave the subject. Recalling the eloquent words of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and calling attention to the equally eloquent words of my leader, I conclude with this appeal: That these words, this seed which they were intending to sow, may not fall upon barren ground but may produce four-fold and four times four-fold.

Let me in conclusion say that there will be one advantage at all events in the defeat of this amendment which I have no doubt will be reached within a few days, that it will afford the right hon. gentleman who leads the House the opportunity of proving the irrefutable truth that the words that he uttered were sincerely and absolutely meant. Let me further appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to be fair, not to lend themselves to the keeping up of enmities and hostilities between our different races, our different peoples, and our different provinces, by attributing to the Prime Minister statements and sentiments which, at all events up to the present, nobody has been able to prove the existence of. I am confident that the people of the province of Quebec—whether they support him politically or are opposed to him—ere long will have the opportunity of realizing that in the present leader of this Government they have no enemy. I have known him since he first came into this House, and he has administered different offices always very closely under my eye. I remember with pride that he was my Solicitor-General and that for years—for some years at all events—I was his chief. I remember with pride now that he occupies to-day the position of my chief, and that I have the privilege and honour of following him. And let me pay him this testimony, as a mere measuring out of simple justice, that throughout my years of intimate relationship with him, I have never been able to discover any small feeling of bigotry, or prejudice, hostility or antipathy, to any class or creed within this Dominion; and above all I have never been able to discern the slightest indication of anything but the most friendly feeling and disposition to my old province of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I fancy, will be fair enough to recognize that while they constitute the majority of the representatives from Quebec and while they represent the majority of people of that province, that I too, and my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), have a claim upon the same province. In our hearts there beats as strong an affection for that old province as exists in the heart of any hon. gentleman sitting opposite, and let me say that imbued with that feeling I would be in the government of no man that was inspired in the slightest degree by any spirit of hostility to the people and the province that I love.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, you will be glad to know that it is not my intention to detain the House beyond a few minutes. The 5 p.m. speech from the Throne with which the session was opened is a beautiful negligible document. And that was to be expected. A Government which has outstayed its mandate and forfeited the confidence of the people, and which continues to cling to office in direct defiance of recognized public sentiment, is not likely to be one to originate or to initiate progressive and vigorous legislation. It is marking time; it is frightened to march forward, it is unwilling to make way. But, Sir, Canada is facing great questions of re-adjustment. There are big and pressing issues to be dealt with; yet if ever in the annals of government there has been an era of ineffective leadership it is at this present juncture. The speech from the Throne makes it abundantly clear that effective leadership cannot be expected from this disintegrated Unionist ministry. The Government has no policy to lay before the people in order to provide for the serious problem of increasing unemployment. The fulfilment of dismal prophecies made during the war has come with the icy blast of winter, and the problem of unemployment finds Canada unprepared. After the last two years of reconstruction the Government throws up its hands in despair, and appeals to the Provincial Governments and local municipalities to find a way out of the difficulty. What has become Mr. Speaker, of all these Commissions, of all these Boards of all sizes, complexions and descriptions that were so much in evidence? The Government has only been feeding parasites to make believe that they were taking steps and precautions in anticipation of the period of economic readjustment. Where are these gentlemen who personally conducted in this House excursions, unfolding to us the beautiful panorama of flaming fur-

naces, belching smoke-stacks, and happy men at work with full dinner pails? Instead we read the sad story that the dreaded spectre of the soup kitchen has made its appearance. Where is the distinguished gentleman whom we had the pleasure of seeing only twice in this House last session when he had been hurriedly despatched from Toronto headquarters to enrapture us with the delightful strain that, Liberalism meant panic and that Unionism meant prosperity? Why, Mr. Speaker, the last time that hon. gentleman was seen upon the floor of this House—and you remember the occasion?—he was trying to induce us to continue to remain bondsmen of Sir Joseph Flavelle and of Mackenzie and Mann. "Carry on! Carry on!" he said. those were his last words to the Government. That harp has since ceased its strain; and the Government has changed its name. Why, the truth is that—

The harp that once through Parliament's halls,
The soul of prosperity music shed,
Now hangs as mute on Parliament's walls
As if the nightingale from Leeds was dead.

But you have soup kitchens, and the burden is upon the hon. gentlemen opposite to explain the condition of thousands of men begging for work and of reduced wages to those fortunate enough to have employment. This is the melancholy of the acme of the "Carry on" administration.

This debate, Mr. Speaker, has been proceeding for a little time and charming things have been said. We have also witnessed the grotesque performance of a new self-constituted John the Baptist creeping into the National Liberal Conservative desert in search of grasshoppers to alleviate his treacherous hunger. Beautiful addresses also were delivered on the League of nations, or rather the League of Empires. To this subject, I desire to make a slight reference.

I understand very well that the League which we were forced to approve of in this House could not leap full-grown into life, and I became convinced, after reading the speeches of our Canadian representatives which they recently delivered at Geneva, that the League must revise the Treaty or the Treaty will destroy the League. After hearing the addresses of the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and of the hon. gentleman from Durham (Mr. Rowell), although they eloquently stated that the League is to be the greatest forward movement in the world's history, yet it is plain to me that it contains the germ of future wars; and after hearing this afternoon the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), with his habitually lucid explanation, allow me to say, Sir, that the whole subject is darker than ever. The world is offered only an ideal. No word has been so misapplied in recent years as idealism. There is something splendid I grant you, in aspiring to the remote and the unattainable, providing it does not make us contemptuous of the slow steps towards better things that are attainable. But there are many kinds of idealists. Some like Darius Green, make themselves wings and mount to the ridgepole in a glow of aspiration, and leap out quick in the pleasant sunshiny air. But there are other idealists also, and they are of the kind I should like to see at Geneva, idealists more practical, who fashion their wings with due regard for the law of strains and stresses, who have a wholesome respect for the law of gravitation, and who will not mix trading stamps with moral issues. What is the use of sending men to Gevena to talk disarmament when on their return in their own Parliament by their votes they cheer the hearts of munition makers? Just so long as the big Powers who control the Supreme Council of the League retain all the important offices within the constructive programme of the League, and just so long as they will not agree to disarmament, just so long as they will keep on mistrusting one another, just so long as they will refuse to forego national selfishness, the whole thing is—pardon me the expression, Mr. Speaker—"eye-wash." Our representatives will only be enjoying a delightful trip at the expense of the Canadian people, just to have the pleasure of signing their names for Canada on the dotted lines already prepared for them, and the privilege of making speeches, which after all, to my mind, amounts to nothing. Sixty thousand Canadians walked their way to Golgotha and are now sleeping their last sleep on the fields of Flanders, and their actions, Sir, speak louder than all the speeches that can be delivered at Geneva by our representatives. They gave up their lives to end all wars, and what I should like to see, Sir, would be our representatives going to Geneva with a message from the Canadian people to the Supreme Council, which is the mouthpiece of the Great Powers, that they must agree to disarmament in order that Canada may remain true to her pledge to those who fought to end all war. War-making has been the sport of kings and

of sporty statesmen, not of the people. It has cost the sportiest kings their jobs, and the world is sick of sporty statesmen.

Sir, we have heard hon. gentlemen opposite offer a defence for their remaining in power. It has been plainly stated from this side of the House that the Government are carrying on without a mandate, and British practices and precedents have been quoted pro and con. I have this to say, Mr. Speaker: This Tory Government and its recent converts profess to find great merit in the so-called Unionist party, comparing it with the British coalition. But let us not forget that in the Mother Country men of all parties formed a real union for the purposes of prosecuting the war. Here, where a different sense of political honour obtains, the combination has been made for the purpose of winning an election. In England no one party accused the other of disloyalty; they did not make a pretence of friendly overtures in order to unite one section of the country against the other. They did not pass a Franchise Act by which they could control the elections. After the armistice there was an election in England; in Canada some of our Unionist gentlemen refuse to go to the people, keeping only their own selfish ends in view. I cannot make references to all these hon. gentlemen one after the other, but you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to pay a little tribute to a gentleman from the prairies, that great Colossus of immigration. I well remember that on the first of May, 1917, the hon. gentleman gave an interview to a Saskatchewan paper with regard to the provision which has been made for free wheat. He said: "Yes, it is great news, and we have to see to it that in the next Parliament we have free everything." At that time everything looked dark and gloomy for the Allied cause. I am not questioning the hon. gentleman's entry into the Cabinet in 1917, but he is the same gentleman who denounced the financial ring of Toronto, denounced the Borden Government as incompetent and retroactive, and denounced in no measured terms the government of "big business." I have said that I shall not comment upon the hon. gentleman's entry into the Cabinet in 1917. But, Sir, in his address in the House on the 11th of June, 1919, he said: "I say if I wanted to make a hero of myself, the road is quite clear to me." But he preferred to remain where he was. You remember, Sir, how tears ran down the cheeks of hon. gentleman when he deliberately sentenced himself to bread crumbs and cold tea in the portfolio of Immigration. In his recent political tour of the West with the right hon. leader of the Government he said, as quoted from the prairies, that he had changed morally and mentally and that he had decided to spend eternity with the monopolists whom he had denounced all his life. Well, what idea can you have of the patriotism of a gentleman who can perform such a somersault? I will not be as severe to him as he was to himself, but allow me to say of him that he was like Hosea Biglow's politician:

A marciful Providence fashioned him holler
O' purpose that he might his principles smaller.

If that is a little too strong, Mr. Speaker, I can give a better one. He at least believes, as Hosea did:

A genuine statesman must be on his guard.
If he must have beliefs, not to believe 'em too hard.

Bismarck used to say that Salisbury was a lath painted to look like iron. The hon. member from Moosejaw (Mr. Calder) is a Tory painted to look like a Liberal—he never was a Liberal; he posed as one. Like the coalitionists under Sir John A. Macdonald who refused to follow George Brown when he withdrew from the coalition, these hon. gentlemen have become reactionaries —makers of franchise Acts and gerrymander Acts.

Some hon. gentlemen have talked of apples and of the tariff, but, Sir, the issue before the House is the preservation of our constitutional treasures, our national heritage, which the Government is unscrupulously pawning every day without authority and without mandate. The issue is the disrespect of our laws, such as is involved in the building of a mercantile marine at a cost of $75,000,000, in connection with which contracts were awarded without tenders. The issue is the vicious railway policy of the Government, which is not established on a business foundation, and which makes the country responsible for the interest on millions of dollars' worth of obligations and deficiency in earnings. The issue is the lavish expenditures for militia purposes, amounting to eighteen or twenty millions of dollars, and the miserable pittance for eighteen small experimental farms. The issue is that the Government has created a paradise for its bosom friends, the profiteers, so that readjustment on a sane basis is practically impossible. The issue is that conscienceless rascals were permitted to accumulate outrageous profits and slip away with the spoils, leaving the business man behind holding the bag. The most discouraging

feature of the situation is that a spineless Department of Justice has made it impossible for the irresponsible shoe-string worker to be placed in such a position that he could be made to disgorge. The issue is the Government's scheme to deprive the people of their right to make any gradual political readjustment with due regard to economic conditions between 1911 and such time as they may choose.

Sir, a general election now would bring into Parliament no more representatives than at present, but it would open the door to the election of representatives who more closely reflect the vision of men who love freedom and hate autocracy.

The Prime Minister's extremist policy is calculated to dam the gradual flow of Canadian opinion and to interfere with the gradual process of parliamentary government. The last redistribution followed the census of 1911, and there was only one election on this redistribution, the war-time election of 1917. Enough has been said of this election that we need talk no more about it. No coalition candidate can pretend that he was elected on domestic issues, so that, excepting the 1917 election, no general election was held on this redistribution. Therefore, anyone voting against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is only a party to the Prime Minister's scheme to thwart the will of the people, to carry parliament through 1911 to 1922, and such men should be known to their constituents as men who refuse to face an election because they know they have lost the confidence of the electorate. I am not afraid to go before my constituents, to meet my judges.

I heard the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) say, during his long address this afternoon, that the Government had a moral issue, Moral issue! Eternal issue! Give us an opportunity to meet the Knights of Morality. Speaking for my constituents and myself, we have had to endure many things during the last years. Dr. Crane used to say that, in this world one cannot get what he wants, without getting a whole lot of truck he does not want. Desires may be pure and unmixed, but the gratification thereof is spotted. We have thrown on the shores of time all the truck we do not want. We forgive everything; but we do not forget and will never forget the rampant super-loyalty, pathetically stupid, of the junkers of the last election, whose delight it was to pillory the French Canadians as a body, and who have committed the worst political crime in Canada's history. We will not put on the shelves of oblivion the malignity with which the loyalty and patriotism of that great Canadian and Empire builder, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the rank and file of the Liberal party, were openly and maliciously assailed in such terms as "traitor," "disloyal," "yellow-back," "quitter," "pro-German," —all that to win a party triumph. To us this crime and sin against the nation has struck deep and far, and every true patriot to-day, now that the storm of rancour and abuse is over, contemplates with dismay and horror the national wreckage wrought by fire-eaters and reactionaries. We will remember the mischief that those impudent junkers have done by their uncalled-for, and unreasoning and unreasonable "name-calling" of men and women whose character, citizenship, loyalty and patriotism ring as true as steel, and whose only offence was that of differing with those super-heated patriots in regard to the way in which Canada should have taken her part in the war. We hope now that when the junkers' temperature goes down to normal, they will have the saving grace and the redeeming quality of commonsense that will make plain to them the assinine exhibition that they have made of themselves and what a terrible wound they have inflicted on our national unity. Laurier's life-work of Canadian unification has been demolished, and to heal the wound, to mend the breach that has been produced by stupidity stampeded by bigotry and fanaticism, there is only one remedy—an immediate appeal to the people. This is the humble prayer of the electors of Bellechasse, which I, their humble representative, wish to lay at the foot of your Throne.

Mr. FREDERICK JOHN FULTON (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate my hon. friend, who has just spoken, on having had delegated to him the important task of informing this House what the issues are which the Opposition propose to lay before the people at the next general election, in the near future, if they succeed —as is very unlikely—in securing a favourable vote on this amendment? We have had a debate lasting now for one week, and this is the first time that the House has heard any of the issues which the Opposition party proposes to lay before the electors of the country. I have not hitherto obtruded myself to any great extent upon the time of this House; but I feel that the amendment now before you, with its result one way or the other, is so important that I shall depart from my usual custom of

registering a silent vote; and I am impelled to give some reasons why I oppose the amendment.

Before doing so, I should like to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address. It is generally conceded that the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the address in reply are of a very high order, and it will be admitted that the speeches made this session have not fallen below the standard which is usually expected on such occasions. More particularly would I like to congratulate, and I am pleased to be able to do so, the seconder, not because I would wish to make any comparison between the two speeches, but because he is a gentleman whom I have known for many years and because he represents a constituency adjoining mine, which he and I have seen develop from almost nothing to its present wonderful state of production. It was his maiden effort in this House, on the second day of his membership, and I think that the majority of the members will agree with me in concluding that his constituents have made no error of judgment in selecting him as their representative, and that he is one of whom they have reason to be proud.

Mr. Speaker, I have read over the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and I find that it contains three assertions. With these I should like to deal. His first assertion is that the present Government does not possess the confidence of this House. I do not think it is necessary for me to take up any time with regard to that assertion because it is one that can only be tested by the vote which will be taken at the close of this debate. The vote will show whether or not the present Government possesses the confidence of this House.

His second assertion is that the Government does not possess the confidence of the country, and his third assertion that the retention of office by the Government constitutes a usurpation of the powers of popular Government. Dealing with the second assertion, the leader of the Opposition tried to prove it by two arguments. His first point was that he made that statement on the strength of the results of the by-elections which have taken place since December 1917. That point has already been dealt with fully by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Justice, and I do not propose to add anything to what they have said, except this: Out of the six seats which the leader of the Opposition states the Government has lost, there is only one in which a candidate running as one of the Liberal Opposition party has been returned, and in his case it would appear that the platform on which he presented himself to the electors of his constituency was not the platform of the Liberal party, but one of his own. The second point which the leader of the Opposition endeavoured to make was that he made that assertion as a result of his personal observation. Now I have not had the opportunity which he has had of observing the feeling of the people or this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, for he has made a tour of the country, but I must say that I think I can better judge the feelings of the people of my own constituency than can the leader of the Opposition, and so far as my constituency is concerned, so far as my observation goes, I do not think his assertion is correct. If that is so, I think his assertion cannot be relied upon with respect to the whole country. I have yet to have a single Liberal who supported me in the general election of 1917, and there were many of them, come to me and intimate that he thought after the termination of the war I should resign my seat, or that he thought the Government should resign. Again, as in the case of the first assertion, the truth can only be tested by a general election itself. When we get that, we shall know whether or not the assertion is true and not until then.

The third assertion is that the Government has usurped the powers of popular government. That, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is the most important assertion of the three and probably the only one which contains any element of danger for the Government. I say it contains an element of danger for this reason. The people of any democratic country will resent most strongly anything of that kind, any attempt on the part of the Government of the country to usurp the powers of popular government. They will stand for almost anything rather than that. But, as the Minister of Justice has said, if a statement is made frequently enough, in the end it will probably come to be believed, not only by the person who makes it, but by some of those who hear it; and there is the danger. This is an assertion which has been made on every platform on which the leader of the Opposition has spoken during the last two months. It is an insidious statement because it is one which, if believed in, will

be most strongly resented by the electors of the country. What grounds has the leader of the Opposition or any hon. gentleman opposite for making any such assertion? What are the facts? What are the arguments which they bring forward in support of their fact?

Their premises are that the Union Government was elected solely for the purpose of dealing with the war, that that was the only issue in the election of 1917. I grant, Mr. Speaker, that it was the main issue, but I do not grant that it was the only issue. We have in every general election some main issue, some issue that is singled out and on which as a matter of fact the whole election is really fought. It is certainly true that in the election of 1917 the main issue, the one outstanding and overshadowing issue, was that of the prosecution of the war, and in comparison with that all other questions faded into insignificance. But when the statement is made that that was the only issue, I think I need only refer to the manifesto which was published, containing the line of policy which would be followed by the Union Government if returned to power. That manifesto contained twelve planks. I have a copy before me and I find that of those twelve not more than two or possibly three are confined to matters relating to the war. The others are all matters that apply equally to times of peace as to the period of the war. Many of them do not even refer to problems that arise out of the war. For example, take the second, Civil Service Reform. That has nothing to do with the war or the prosecution of the war; the third, the Extension of the Franchise to Women; the fifth, A Strong Progressive Policy of Immigration and Colonization; the seventh, Development of Transportation Facilities; eighth, Reduction of Public Expenditure; tenth, Encouragement of Co-operation among those engaged in Agricultural Production; eleventh, General Development of all the Varied Resources of Canada; and twelfth, Adequate Consideration of the Needs of the Industrial Population. The great majority of these planks are matters that have no reference to the war. I contend that when this platform was before the electors of Canada, every one of its planks was submitted to their consideration and approval; and while under the circumstances existing at that time every person's mind and attention was directed almost solely to the great issue of the war and these other planks may have been temporarily forgotten in the larger importance of the other, nevertheless they were all there as a part of the policy of the Union Government. And if any mandate was given to that Government it was, as the Minister of Justice has pointed out, given by the people of Canada to their representatives for the purpose of being acted upon; each representative elected in support of the Unionist Government was given a mandate to support the carrying out of every plank of that platform. The war has terminated successfully; I do not think many of us expected that it would end as quickly as it did when the election was in progress. But there are still problems arising out of the war, some of which were mentioned in that platform and which are still being dealt with. There are many other planks which, as I have said, have no reference to the war or to after-war problems and which are not yet fully dealt with. Therefore, I say that the mandate of the Government is not exhausted.

The point is made that the personnel of the Government is different; and the leader of the Opposition named twelve out of the original members of the Government who are no longer in that Government. I have looked over the list and find that of the twelve one was defeated in the general election, two are dead, two have been appointed to office, and seven are still in the House; and so far as ocular evidence goes, only two of those are on the other side of the House, the other five still giving strong support to this Government.

What about the constitutional right of the Government to carry on? I do not think that point need be laboured. The leader of the Opposition and the Opposition members must, I think, concede that as a matter of right this Government is entitled to carry on. But they say that they have no moral right to do so. As to the constitutional right, so far as I am aware, no question could be raised if, in the event of the Government being defeated and the leader of the Opposition being called upon, he should carry on in this House for the term of this Parliament, if he chose to do so and could find sufficient support in the House. That has been done in the British Parliament on several occasions, the last occasion, if I remember rightly, being in the year 1885 when the Government of Mr. Gladstone was defeated. Although he had a large majority in the House he was defeated on a chance vote, and Lord Salisbury took office after considerable hesitation and carried on for some months before asking for dissolution.

It was done in our own country in the province of British Columbia. In 1903 when the Prior Government was defeated and Mr. McBride was called upon to form a Government, he completed the work of the House and passed the Estimates before dissolving. Precedents have been quoted, and it is said that this is not the same Government. Well, was the Government in Great Britain the same in 1915 as the one which took office in 1911 or 1910? In that election, if my memory serves me rightly, Campbell-Bannerman was returned, succeeded by Mr. Asquith. At the outbreak of the war a Coalition Government was formed entirely different from that which was returned to power at the general election; but there was no special mandate from the people to that Government to continue. In 1915 Mr. Lloyd George succeeded Mr. Asquith and made further changes, and that Government which carried on there until 1918 was as different as it possibly could be from the Government returned to power in 1910.

I should like to state a supposititous case—one very difficult, indeed, to suppose. But let us assume for the purpose of argument that the election in 1917 had resulted differently and that the Union Government had been defeated and the Liberal party returned to power. Their argument is that the people in that election had only in contemplation the question of the war, and had only in contemplation that whatever Government was returned to power should only carry on until the termination of the war. In that supposititous case, had the Liberal party been returned, I wonder would they have admitted at the termination of the war that their mandate was exhausted, and that they should dissolve and go to the country.

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. FULTON: Can you, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of imagination conceive of the Liberal party admitting what they are now arguing against this Government? The argument surely cuts both ways, and if it holds good against the present Government it certainly ought to hold good in the case which I have just mentioned.

To my mind, an unfortunate allusion was made by both the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), the allusion to the conduct of the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1911, which was referred to by both these speakers but in a very different manner. The leader of the Opposition in dealing with the point would rather lead one to infer that in the session of 1911 no mention was made of the reciprocity question. He stated in his speech that Sir Wilfrid Laurier recognized the rights of the people as superior to those afforded his Government under the Constitution; he believed that governments should be carried on only with the consent of the governed. He dissolved Parliament and appealed to the people to pass upon an issue other than which was involved in the elections of 1908. My hon. friend made no reference whatever to the fact that the reciprocity resolution was introduced into the House in 1911? The member for Maisonneuve dealt with the matter in a different manner. He stated the facts. He stated that the resolutions were introduced, but that the Opposition strenuously opposed them, and as a result of that opposition the Government went to the country. I believe those are the facts. But the member for Maisonneuve, I submit, was wrong in his argument in this respect. He said that reciprocity was no new issue and that it had been before the country on previous occasions. So it had been. But what was the result when the issue was before the country on those occasions? Did the country accept the principle? The country had rejected on all previous occasions any attempt at reciprocity. Now it was no issue in 1908 at the general election, and yet the leader of the Government in 1911 introduced no new principle, as the member for Maisonneuve says, but brought in the reciprocity resolutions against all previous decisions of the electors of this country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FULTON (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was referring to the reciprocity resolutions introduced in the session of 1911. Perhaps I may be pardoned if, for the sake of picking up the thread of my argument, I am guilty of a little repetition. I stated that this question was referred to, both by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and I stated further that each dealt with it in an entirely different manner.

If we are to accept the argument of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, a Government has the right to introduce and to en-

deavour to pass any proposal that is not entirely new, whether it was an issue at the previous general election or not. If that is the case, that argument is in favour of the present Government, because they are not bringing in any new issue, they are simply carrying on with what was before the country in the general election of 1917. The hon. the leader of the Opposition deals with the matter in a very different way. As I stated, any one reading what he said would infer that the reciprocity question had not been brought before the House, but that it had been under consideration by the Government, and that not having been an issue in the general election of 1908, the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier took the constitutional course of submitting the question to the electorate,—an entirely different argument from that advanced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. If we are to accept the argument of the leader of the Opposition, then Sir Wilfrid Laurier had no right to introduce that subject before Parliament, because, according to my hon. friend, his late leader had no mandate from the people to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when a case is presented in this House or elsewhere, and a conclusion is endeavoured to be reached on it, we must have two requisites. In the first place, we must have correct premises on which to base our conclusion; and then the reasoning on those premises must be sound. To my mind, the premises submitted by the speakers on the Opposition side of the House in support of the amendment are not correct; and the argument which they hase upon those premises is not sound. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that they cannot logically sustain the amendment which they ask this House to accept.

To sum up briefly, as I said at the outset, the amendment contains three assertions. The first is, that this House has no longer any confidence in the present Government. That can be left to be decided by the vote which will be taken in a few days.

The second assertion is that the present Government has lost the confidence of the country. I should like to ask, by what warrant does the leader of the Opposition make such a statement? If he bases it on the result of the by-elections, does he do so because one election, and one only, was won by a so-called Liberal candidate, but who, as has been shown, stood, not on the official Liberal platform but on a platform of his own? It would be interesting to learn from that successful candidate whether he is now prepared to kick away that platform on which he stood in the West Peterborough election, and to accept the official Liberal platform. Or, does the leader of the Opposition claim the right so to speak with regard to the feelings of the people because of the result of the other six by-elections which were lost by the Government, five to the Farmers' party, and one to the Labour party? If he bases his contention on the fact that five of those by-elections went in favour of the Farmers' party, it seems to me the argument would come with much greater force from the leader of that party. If he claims that those gains support his contention, I should like to ask him, whether it is any indication of the truth of the idea which prevails very generally that there is in contemplation, an alliance, or that it evidences a desire for an alliance, between the Liberal party and the Farmers' party?

With regard to the third assertion, I have not yet heard any argument which convinces me that the present Administration has usurped the powers of popular government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, while there exists, and has existed, a great deal of unrest in the country, my own personal opinion is that the feeling among the thinking people is every day becoming far more strongly in favour of the present Government. Thoughtful people are coming to the conclusion that, to use a slang phrase, the present Government is "the best bet" for Canada.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull), (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I first wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne for the able manner in which they have accomplished their task. It needs indeed much talent and especially much imagination to extol a government administering the affairs of the country without a mandate. All in Canada had hoped, when Sir Robert Borden decided to give up his office of Prime Minister, that his successor would have the decency to appeal to the people and bring on general elections. It seemed that it was not possible that a government elected for war time only, consequently holding no longer a mandate, should cling to power and persist in governing the country despite the will of the people. However, it is the very thing that happened.

More than that, the Hon. Mr. Meighen, called to the office of the Prime Minister, and anxious to cover up all the scandals

and misdeeds of the Unionist party, for which he was mainly responsible, decided to change the name of that party, and that is why we have to-day the National-Liberal-Conservative party.

Is it not in order, Mr. Speaker, that a party with such a name should reach high destinies, provided its members were sincere men? But this is but a farce and a camouflage.

What! You assume for your party the name of Liberal, Mr. Prime Minister; but do you not know that the first article of the Liberal programme is government by the people and for the people? Why! you govern in spite of the people and for the big interests only. The policy of the Liberal party is to favour the farmer and the workman; your policy is to protect the manufacturers and the millionaires. No, the fact that you still have in your administration a few former Liberals who betrayed their party for a minister's portfolio or for any favour, that fact does not give you the right to call yourself a Liberal! Neither are you entitled to call your party National. A national policy is one, the object of which is primarily the interest of the country. But your political creed, Mr. Prime Minister, is Imperialism. You are the man who said during the election of 1917, that you were ready to spend the last dollar of the public treasury, and to have the last Canadian killed, to save the Empire.

Nor are you worthy to call yourself Conservative, for it is a long time since you gave up the Conservative principles, such as proclaimed by Sir John A. Macdonald and Cartier.

No sir, the Government may change its name and its Prime Minister as it pleases; this would not better its position. It is for the people to make those changes when election time comes.

Now, what is brought out in the Speech from the Throne? Nothing new, nothing definite. It speaks of a revision of the tariff. We already know what that revision is to be. For the last six months, the Government organs have been proclaiming the Prime Minister as the champion of protection, that is of a policy in the interest of the manufacturers of a privileged class, to the detriment of the consumer. Nothing for the agricultural class. And yet it is mainly from the cultivation of the soil that are derived our national riches. We are an essentially agricultural country; and as long as the Government continues to neglect the interest of the farmer, unrest and uncertainty will continue, the land will be deserted and the young men will rush to the cities.

The Government should establish experimental farms; they should improve the roads and render life more agreeable to the farmer. Why not at once remove the duty on agricultural implements? It is not fair to force the farmer to pay a duty of 30 or 35 per cent on the agricultural implements which he needs to cultivate his fields, for the sake of a score of manufacturers perhaps who in a few years will have become millionaires, while the farmer will have to work all his life to pay for his land and establish his family. It is not to be wondered that the farmers group themselves for their own protection, when they see themselves exploited by the Government in the interest of their political friends.

And what about the working class, which, for the last few years particularly, have had so much to suffer from the high cost of living? It is this class that was called upon to make the greatest sacrifice during the war, and it is the workman who still has to bear the heaviest burden of taxes. Indeed, Sir, do not believe that all the taxes imposed by the Government upon the manufacturers, the merchants, the professional men, are finally paid by them, for it is ultimately the workman who settles the bill. The manufacturer raises the cost of his product, the merchant raises the price of his goods, and ultimately it is the consumer, the workman who foots the bill. And now unfortunately wages are going down. In my constituency, in Hull, essentially a workingmen's community, the salaries have some down 25 and even 50 per cent, and yet the cost of living remains high. I say that the Government is not doing its duty towards the labouring class. If work were plentiful there would be something to fall back on. But one would think that all the industries have connived to reduce the output, and the number of the unemployed is steadily increasing.

Meanwhile, I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the Government doing to better the situation.

Nothing! or rather, they are investigating. One would think that they are seeking such means as may dispense them from reducing the cost of living. Ministers are travelling to and fro, so that they may find out whether the tariff should be lowered. But, Sir, there is no need for investigations, and that is as clear as day. All that needs to be done is to remove duties on all articles which are of first necessity, so that the labourer may pay less for his clothes, for

his food, and for all the necessities of life. Find work for them. Why not start immediately and build the Georgian Bay canal? This is a national undertaking, one which would be of advantage to the country, while workmen would earn fair wages. All important public bodies are clamouring for the building of this canal. The Boards of Trade of Montreal and of Hull have both passed resolutions requesting the Government to have this work carried out immediately, but they have only met with refusals, the Minister of Finance stating that he was without funds for such an undertaking, the public revenue having been absorbed in paying interest on the war debt.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that our national debt exceeds two billions; nevertheless, millions have been found for the purchase of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk; the operations of the first year have left a deficit of $60,000,000. The expenses of the militia have been increased by six millions yearly, though the war is over and we do not need a militia. The hon. Minister of Marine intends spending millions on a navy which is not necessary in peace time. This reply that there is no money is but an excuse, Mr. Speaker. Money can always be found to help large firms, or to enrich political friends; yet, there is none for an undertaking which would further the development of the country, while the farmer would be afforded greater facilities for the shipment of his products and the labourer would be supplied with work.

I also note, in the speech from the Throne, that the Government intends considering the opportunity of paying old age pensions and protect the labourer from unemployment. I would be tempted to rejoice, Mr. Speaker, because, at every session, since I have the honour of sitting in this House, I have requested that such legislation be passed in favour of the workmen. My only fear is that it is but a false hope, that the Government will content themselves with an investigation, without legislating on the matter. As I have said in previous years, when a man has spent all his life in enriching his master,—the man, very often having but insufficient wages to support his own family,—it is not fair that he should be compelled, when too old to work, either to go to the poorhouse, or be left a charge to his children. The Government should, I think, establish a pension fund for these old employees.

I would also mention, Mr. Speaker, the compliments and the loud praise given to the Province of Quebec by my hon. friend who seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I quite realize that this is a serious moment for the Government, that their only chance of remaining in power is by making friends in the province of Quebec. But, Sir, allow me to say that it requires more than mere words to make us forget all the abuse and the insults that were heaped on us during the war. I remember that, in 1917, the press and the Tories, headed by Mr. Meighen, endeavoured to rouse the English provinces against Quebec; now that Quebec may be of help, compliments are being bestowed upon her. In so far as I am concerned, and quite contrary to my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. L. J. Gauthier), I am as indifferent to their compliments as I am to their insults, and will have no faith in those fine words until our share of patronage has, in all justice, been given us, either in the Cabinet, or in the several commissions, or yet in the public appointments that may be made, and until the French language has been given the place of honour to which it is entitled in Parliament and throughout the country.

Before concluding these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am in favour of the amendment moved by the honourable leader of the Opposition, and I shall ask all the members of this House, especially those who are sitting on your right, Sir, to act independently; let them heed the voice of their conscience which tells them that the Government's mandate has expired, that they are only usurpers, that they should vote in favour of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, so that we may have elections immediately.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is customary on the occasion of the debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne for this House to pass in review the programme that the Government submits in that speech through the lips of His Excellency the Governor General and the record and activities of the Government during the preceding months or years. But in this case, Sir, it would appear that the ancient custom has been almost wholly departed from. Immediately following upon the two excellent speeches delivered by the mover (Mr. McIsaac) and the seconder (Mr. MacKelvie) of the Address, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) introduces an amendment which, I think, in the eyes of all thoughtful members of this

House can be construed as nothing less than a straight negative of the resolution.

This amendment, which has been characterized as a bald amendment—and I think it is properly so named—has been very largely the subject of debate. Were we called upon to deal with the amendment in itself we could very well afford to dismiss it with but a few observations. But my hon. friends opposite, more particularly the leader of the Opposition, have, during the course of their arguments, made a great many statements and assertions and offered certain condemnations in regard to the Government, which, I think, call for some attention on the part of members on this side. It is because of this that I propose to deal with the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite rather than specifically and solely with the subject matter contained in the resolution and in the amendment.

We find the Government faced with two oppositions, two groups of hon. gentlemen in this House representing certain policies. At least, these two groups have given to the public two distinct policies, though in one sense we find them apparently united. I have been waiting for a week to hear from the hon. gentleman sitting at the end of the Chamber and to obtain a lead as to their views, but judging from reports I think I am not mis-stating it when I say that they are apparently united in opposition to the Government in regard to this question.

Now, I wish to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to certain facts, and in doing so I desire also to appeal to them, because I am quite certain that the majority of them, while they may appear on the surface to be more or less blindly following their leaders, are most anxious to weigh matters carefully and to give due consideration to arguments that may be advanced. My hon. friends who represent the Liberal party in this House present a certain view. I do not see the leader of the Opposition in his seat; if he were here I would ask him to correct me if I mis-state the position they take. In his absence I will ask my hon. and genial friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to do so. Their position, I think, may be summed up in this way: they assert that the Government has lost the confidence of this House.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I am happy, Sir, to know that I have not mis-stated their position; I will come to that a little later. I will make a further statement now, in which I shall endeavour to interpret the arguments they have advanced and the position they have assumed. They assert in most violent language that the Government has lost the confidence of the country.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I am again most happy in having correctly stated their position. Indeed, Sir, I have before me the words of the leader of the Opposition in which he says that we should have an election at once. I do not wish to quote his remarks at any length, but this was his statement in support of his amendment a few days ago. I turn to my hon. friends, and I do not wish to characterize them as the North-East Party: I will characterize them in the term that they prefer, the Agrarian party, and I do that for the purpose of distinguishing them from my hon. friends immediately opposite. They have a slightly different position. So far as I have been able to gather from the published statements of their leaders, they assert that they do not want an election forthwith; but they say: "Inasmuch as last year or on a previous occasion we joined in a vote of want of confidence, we think it would be desirable for us to join in this vote of want of confidence, because we have no apprehension that the Government will be defeated or that an election will be brought on, but we shall be in this safe position of having said that we have no confidence in the Government." I hear no objection to that, and I once again assume that I am not misstating the fact or the case. I want to invite my hon. friends to consider this matter. In his most recent public utterances, utterances made under conditions under which we are warranted at least in assuming that he was expressing his innermost thoughts—and that was in the late by-election in Peterborough—the leader of the Opposition had this to say, and I invite most careful consideration to these words:

> From now until the day of a general election only one of two things can possibly happen. Either the Meighen Administration will continue to hold power or it will be defeated on a vote of want of confidence—

That is a plain statement. Then he added these significant words:

> in which event it would be the duty—

Mark you.

> —of His Excellency the Governor General to call upon the leader of the Opposition to form an administration.

In this House the leader of the Opposition has been thundering in the interest of the people. In his statement which I have quoted, he says this: "It is not a general election that I want; it is simply that the Meighen Government"—I am using his own words, and in doing so I am not violating the rules of the House—"shall be defeated, and I, as leader of the Opposition, shall be called upon to form a Government." In other words, he has let the cat out of the bag. The sole incentive, objective, on the part of the hon. gentleman leading the Opposition is accession to office. My hon. friends will have great difficulty in escaping from that position because, before I get through, I am going to offer them a way out which I am quite certain they will not accept. I turn to my hon. friends of the Agrarian party, composed very largely of hon. gentlemen from the three Prairie Provinces—

Mr. M. CLARK: From all over the place.

Mr. STEVENS: I said "very largely;" I will very willingly include hon. gentlemen from other parts of Canada. I say the group very largely composed of hon. gentlemen from the Prairie Provinces, and great credit to them. This is the position in which they will find themselves. In supporting this amendment and admitting that they are sincere in that support, if they succeed in defeating the Government, they can have no redistribution before a general election. I am a member from the province furthest west, and I claim in this House, on behalf of and in the name of my province, this right, that there should be a redistribution before a general election so that my province may have its proper representation in this House. That is a very important point in this matter.

Indeed, were it not for the fact of a redistribution coming on, or that a redistribution should occur before a general election, I would not have any very great objection to the demands of my hon. friends opposite for an election. I would welcome it; but as a representative of a British Columbia constituency which has grown very largely, and from a province which I believe will have a larger representation in the new House than in this, I claim that as a right, and I say that right is of very great importance. I say to my hon. friends from the three Prairie Provinces—and I invite their attention to this with all seriousness and earnestness, that there are peculiar to Western Canada problems apart from politics, apart from our party or their party, which will never be solved until the West has a very much larger representation than it has now, and it is our duty, if we are true to the interests of our particular section of the country, that that increase of representation in this House should be brought about at the earliest possible date.

I will give one illustration, and I will not labour the point, because this is not the time to do so. I will bring it to the remembrance of my hon. friends that for ten years I have on frequent occasions brought to the attention of the House, as it has been brought to the attention of the proper legal authorities, namely, the Railway Commission, the inequality in freight rates in this country. This is an important problem to which I have given exhaustive study. When I state that in my province and in some parts of the prairies we are paying a freight rate, in most cases, approximately three times the charge in Eastern Canada, it will be recognized that we have a grievance. That is a grievance that has no political aspect, that can be solved, as my hon. friends know, only by proper and weighty representation in this House, and there are many other problems of equal importance. What I wish to say to them is this—and I am not now talking for the sake of argument of a political character—British Columbia and the three Prairie Provinces are the only provinces in Canada that stand to gain by a Redistribution Bill, and I stand here to claim for British Columbia—and I hope my hon. friends from the Prairie Provinces will claim the same for their provinces— the fulfilment of that right of representation in this House.

I wish to deal with one other phase of that question before I leave it, because it will be advanced no doubt by those who seek excuses for a position opposite to the one I am suggesting. It has already been intimated in the press that hon. gentlemen will argue that any increased representation will accrue to the cities; that it will not accrue to the rural districts. Be that as it may, in the first place, I am not going to argue vainly that the Prime Minister and his Government and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will deal fairly and honestly with the Redistribution Bill, because if hon. gentlemen opposite have made up their minds to the contrary, nothing I say will convince them. But assuming for the sake of argument that the cities will gain, have not the

cities a right to gain if they have the necessary population?

Take my own city, for instance. We have heard throughout the length and breadth of this land as one of the basic cries backing up the Red interests in this country, that the labour interests have not got fair representation. Now, if you give increased representation to the cities, does not labour get a larger opportunity? Undoubtedly it does, because labour controls the vote in the cities, absolutely controls it. So I invite my hon. friends to the consideration of this point: If it does turn out that the cities will gain under the Redistribution Bill, is it not right that they should gain, providing they have the necessary population? I say to my hon. friends, that before they commit themselves irrevocably to this vote of want of confidence demanding, as it does, in the words of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, an immediate election, they must give it careful consideration and be prepared to face the western section of this country and explain why they voted against the proper representation of the West in this House.

Let me turn now to another phase of this question. Has there been any general demand in this country for a general election? Outside of the pilgrimage undertaken by the leader of the Opposition, who at every place he spoke dwelt on this subject of improper representation in this House, and sought to disseminate throughout the country mistrust of Parliament—not of the Government, but of Parliament—there has been no utterance on the subject by any outstanding citizen, or any groups of citizens, so far as I know, with the exception of one group.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as do all hon. gentlemen who have been in this House some years, that one of the readiest ways of presenting a demand to this House is by means of telegrams, letters, petitions, and so forth. How often, Sir, we have sat in this House and seen hon. gentlemen rise in their place when the Orders of the Day were called, and proceed to read telegrams about this, that and the other thing in condemnation of the Government. Do you think that if such a demand existed, if it had been expressed by any large body of citizens, we would not have heard of it? Have you seen anything of it in the press? Has there been a single board of trade from one end of Canada to the other that has made such a demand? Have we had any such demand from labour organizations? Have we had any such demand from municipal or civic governments in this country, or from Provincial Legislatures? You might ask why I cite them. I do so for this reason: We have been told here, not once, but scores of times, that we are usurping the people's rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends opposite say "hear, hear." I would ask them how can we usurp the people's rights without infringing upon the inherent and constitutional rights of municipal and provincial governments, and the activities of commercial bodies? Can we do so? And has there been a single representation from any of these bodies to this House or to the public? Absolutely none. Again I repeat, the only demand for a general election originates with and comes from my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, whose sole object is the attainment of office in this country.

Mr. DUFF: What about the War Veterans?

Mr. STEVENS: I forgot to mention them. I intended to say that I did hear of a demand from one quarter, and it was this. Mr. Harry Flynn, a gentleman whom I think nearly everybody in this House knows, and who requires no introductory remarks from me, held a meeting in Vancouver, a portion of which city I represent, and under the influence of his eloquence a resolution was passed demanding that this Government immediately go to the country. Outside of that, Sir, I have seen nothing, and I know of nothing, in the way of a demand for a general election.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the Peterborough by-election?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is going to hear something about the Peterborough by-election in a minute. What about the Peterborough by-election? We might as well talk about it now as later. The Peterborough by-election showed this that there was a Liberal candidate in the field, the first and only one in the five by-elections since the right hon. the leader of the Government took office. That Liberal Candidate got a minority vote of the electorate of Peterborough by virtue of the fact that the Government support was divided into two, although it polled a larger vote than was accorded the Liberal candidate. There was two other candidates in the field, one representing the Farmers, and one representing Labour. My hon. friend's

candidate will enter this House in a few days, and will no doubt be received with roars of applause by hon. gentlemen opposite, although representing but a very small minority of the people of Peterborough. I have no objection to that, because he is constitutionally elected and entitled to his seat. If my hon. friends opposite can get any comfort out of that, they are entitled to it, but there is mighty little comfort in it.

Why did they not run a candidate in Yale? Why did they not run a candidate in Colchester? What about St. John? They abandoned their poor candidate down there. What about the splendid run made by my hon. friend's candidate in Elgin? Why, not long ago the leader of the Opposition made a speech in Peterborough in which he pointed to the drubbing the Government's candidate got in Elgin. As a matter of fact, Sir, we lost by about 200 votes. My hon. friend did not say anything about the drubbing his candidate got. He lost by about 2,000 votes. My hon. friend asks me what about Peterborough? I ask him, what about these other four ridings? If he can get any consolation out of having a minority candidate squeezed in, out of five candidates, in Peterborough he is welcome to it.

I was proceeding to ask: have not all the reasons that have been advanced here in support of this amendment existed since the armistice was signed? There have been three sessions prior to this since the armistice was signed—the spring of 1919, the fall of 1919, and the 1920 session, and yet this is the first occasion since the armistice was signed that my hon. friends have raised the question of a direct want of confidence vote. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) and my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) did, it is true, introduce resolutions which I shall deal with a little later on in connection with another subject. They were resolutions dealing with a specific and stated reason why there should be a want of confidence—an amendment to the Budget—but there was not a word in them such as is contained in the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, there was.

Mr. STEVENS: Not a word, and I defy the hon. gentleman to produce it.

As a matter of fact, their attitude to-day vindicates the Government up to this time in their own eyes. By their attitude to-day they virtually give the Government a clean bill of health for the last three years. Now, I have another statement which I desire to make, and I am going to quote very briefly from the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King). He says that the will of the people has been ignored. I observe that my hon. friends are not applauding now. They applauded pretty vigorously a while ago, but it seems that they are becoming rather dubious of the wisdom of the stand taken by their leader. That hon. gentleman also said that the rights of the people were usurped.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: They got it this time. The rights of the people, says the hon. gentleman, have been usurped—by whom? By this parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, by the government.

Mr. STEVENS: Were hon. members opposite not elected on exactly the same franchise as hon. members on this side?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEVENS: No? Do I hear hon. members say "no"? My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) does not invite me, surely, to analyze the election in Lunenburg?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, certainly.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have already said, that hon. gentlemen opposite were elected to this parliament on the same basis as that on which hon. gentlemen on this side were returned. They were elected under the same franchise. Now, they tell us that the rights of the people have been usurped by parliament, for that is the logical inference.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I am glad to get confirmation from my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), an hon. member who, I think, understands constitutional law very well, and who can speak with authority on the subject. It has been stated here that the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen) has lost the confidence of this House; and that even if he has not lost the confidence of the House he has no right to hold office, because he has usurped the rights of the people.

An hon. MEMBER: Sure.

Mr. STEVENS: I think I am stating their argument fairly. Now, I say this to everyone of them, that if they are convinced that they are accurate and true in that

statement; if they are behind the leader of the Opposition in his various assertions, of which I shall give samples in a moment, then there is a very easy and simple way of remedying the trouble. What is it? A very short time ago—last session, I think, or the session before—through the initative of my hon. friend from Montreal—I have forgotten the exact riding—a Bill was passed in this House making it imperative that a by-election should be held within six months. Am I not right? I certainly am. My hon. friends last July, when the House prorogued, knew that it was improperly constituted, as they say; well, knowing now that the government has usurped the rights of the people; knowing that the franchise was, to use their own language, a piece of public debauchery; knowing all these things and being convinced, as they say they are, why do not they not resign their seats and appeal to the people?

Mr. CAHILL: Because the Government would rob the treasury.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends laugh but I challenge them to consider this point. Do they mean to say, believing that, that if hon. gentlemen vacated their seats the Government would dare to carry on? In any case, if they had taken this step before the House was called together we would have had a miniature general election even if the Government had continued to hold office, for we would have had to run a by-election in every seat. But in order to safeguard the treasury, which some hon. gentleman evidently fears might suffer, why could they not divide their forces, leaving one valiant band in this House to watch the Government, and allowing the other noble band of patriots to appeal to the country? Then we should have a pretty good test of public opinion. But my hon. friends know that if a large number of their members—not all, but a large number—thought for one moment that there was any danger of the Government being defeated and a general election being brought on immediately they would not support the amendment but would rather support the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Try it.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends cannot escape the position in which they have placed themselves. They have reiterated time and time again in this House that this Parliament is improperly constituted. If, however, it is properly constituted and the Government have the confidence of Parliament the constitutional argument of my hon. friends is gone to the winds; there is no argument. My hon. friends cannot escape the position in which they find themselves. By their own admission, and by the statements of their own leader, the case is proved against them.

But they do not rest there. They take care to go further and insinuate into the minds of the people that in some way or other Parliament is not properly constituted. I purpose for a moment to meet them frankly on one of their charges. My hon. friends have used the word "debauchery" pretty freely in this debate in referring to the War-time Elections Act and the election of hon. members to this House. It is a rather serious charge, and if it is made with any degree of sincerity it is one that challenges the attention of Parliament. Let me say to my hon. friends that so far as I am concerned I am prepared to discuss the War-time Elections Act as it was applied to the elections that I know anything about anywhere in the country. I know how it was applied in British Columbia and in the West. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman sitting in this House, either of the Agrarian party elected under that Act or any of my friends from the western provinces sitting on this side, who was elected in any way except with the clearest expression of public opinion which any parliamentarian has ever received since Confederation.

What were the iniquitious features of the Act? Here they are: We gave the soldiers overseas the vote; that was one. We enlarged the franchise by giving the vote to women who had relatives overseas. Why did we not go further? I am going to state frankly, on my own responsibility entirely, one of the reasons which appeal to me, and it is this: While we were in the throes of war it was not common sense, it was not wise, in deed it would have been exceedingly ill-advised had we given the franchise to persons of alien enemy origin in this country. There is no use closing our eyes to that fact. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in speeches he has made all over this country, says that a large section of the community were disfranchised. Now, whom did we disfranchise? We disfranchised only that section of the community to which I have just referred, and I say that were a similar condition to face us again to-day we could not do otherwise. And so I say to my hon. friends, when they use the word "de-

bauchery" in connection with the 1917 elections, I think they are exceeding the bounds of reason and ordinary consideration for the interests of the country.

Now let me proceed to another phase of this question. I want to say a few words in connection with the tariff. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the tariff should not be introduced in this discussion, that we should not obtrude upon this debate the question of the fiscal policy of the country. Sir, I was in the West Peterborough election. That constituency was my old home. I spent my boyhood years there, and I witnessed the recent campaign. I can quote the platform of the candidates —the candidate of my hon. friends opposite and the Agrarian candidate—and a very large portion of their platform was taken up with utterances on the tariff—a very large portion of it.

The leader of the Opposition, in his speeches there, made a very definite statement, and I invite the attention of the House not only to the statement he made in Peterborough, but to the statement he made in Kamloops on his western trip, and to the platform which he no doubt had a considerable part in drawing. Then I invite the House to the consideration of this: After viewing these various statements made by the leader of the Opposition it is easy to understand why he does not want the subject discussed in this House. The one thing my hon. friend wants to escape is the tariff, or a fiscal policy, as an issue in this country. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), who is not now in his seat, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and other hon. gentlemen from the great industrial provinces of Quebec and Ontario—imagine these hon. gentlemen forced to get in behind a platform such as we have here in The message from Liberalism in the records of the 1919 convention in this city. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) nods his head in approval when I mention it. I give him credit at least for being consistent. He stands by this policy. My hon. friend would move the adoption of this policy, if his colleagues would allow him to move it and if he had the opportunity, to-morrow. Before this session is over my hon. friend will tell the House that he stands by every item in that tariff platform. He certainly will. On the other hand, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, the hon. member for North Cape Breton, the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and a score of others, will advocate something that is absolutely contrary to the principle. I challenge them to make this question an issue in the next election. They will not do it, they dare not do it.

Mr. CAHILL: The record of the Government.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, the record of the Government will go along with it very nicely and we will welcome that as well. Let me, Mr. Speaker, briefly read some portion of the resolution on the tariff contained in "A message from Liberalism," including the resolution adopted at the National Liberal Convention in August, 1919, and carrying the imprimature of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Liberal leader; Andrew Haydon, National Organization General Secretary, and John Lewis, editor and publisher. Now this is what they say:

> First: diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; Second: reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.
>
> That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cement and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

9 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: That was a pretty faint "hear, hear," Mr. Speaker; they are not very enthusiastic about this. Let me continue with the quotation:

> That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: A very earnest "hear, hear," from the Agrarian party but a very sporadic expression from the Liberal Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, having read what I have I invite you to listen to this:

> And the Liberal Party hereby pledges itself—

You can just imagine the solemnity of the occasion when this was read and affirmed

by those at the convention with their hands raised to heaven.

> And the Liberal Party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: Why do not my hon. friends make a decent parliamentary, constitutional attempt to implement their pledges by moving that as an amendment? I challenge them, Mr. Speaker, as I did a moment ago on another subject, to do it either now or at any other time during the present session.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I now, Mr. Speaker, invite you to listen as you have, Sir, with great attention, to this latter clause.

> The Liberal Party hereby pledges itself—

Commits itself, pledges itself by its signs and seals! They are pledged to implement by legislation. Now here is what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had to say. After stating the constitutional position in which we now are, not under some conditions that might arise, he says it will be the duty of His Excellency to call upon him (Mr. King) to form a government. Then he said to the electors of West Peterborough, a protectionist riding:

> Nothing will be done in the way of altering or amending the tariff in the smallest particular.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Finish the quotation.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Brome by his expression questions the accuracy of the statement.

Mr. McMASTER: No, no; I say finish the quotation.

Mr. STEVENS: I will finish it. Let me read the first quotation again. There is a little danger of our getting away from the position I was trying to emphasize a minute ago:

> And the Liberal Party pledges itself—

No, I am wrong it should be "hereby pledges itself." What to do? To quit and go to the country? No. "Hereby pledges itself" to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution that I have read. When? When returned to power.

Mr. McMASTER: When returned to power.

Mr. STEVENS: Wait a moment, let me, Sir, read again what the leader of the Opposition said.

Mr. JACOBS: Read it in full.

Mr. STEVENS: If the Meighen Administration is defeated "it would be the duty of His Excellency"—no option in the matter at all—"the Governor General to call upon the leader of the Opposition to form an administration." In other words he is going to accede to office by the defeat of this Government no matter how he can accomplish that defeat. My hon. friend knew when he was speaking to the electors of Peterborough that that platform would defeat him. He knew he could not carry Peterborough with that. He knows, and other hon. gentlemen that I see before me know, that they dare not go to the country on that platform. How was he to get around that difficulty? Having shown that he was likely to get into office by defeating this Meighen Administration, which he said had not the confidence of the House — persuading them to that—how was he to still their fears about this tariff proposal to which the Liberals in a grave convention had committed themselves?

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in the same strain said:

> Do not worry about the tariff. Remember that in 1896 and 1911 we broke all our past pledges and kept the National Policy in force.

And the hon. the leader of the Opposition said:

> You are perfectly safe; nothing will be done in the way of altering or amending the tariff in the smallest particular.

Mr. DUFF: He said that nothing would be done before a general election. Finish the quotation; be fair.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has not seen the point yet. I do not like to so characterize him, Mr. Speaker, but I am forced to by his frequent interruptions—my hon. friend's mind is so constituted that he cannot keep in it two propositions at the same time.

Mr. DUFF: That is very smart.

Mr. STEVENS: We can easily understand, Mr. Speaker, how at Peterborough the hon. leader of the Opposition said he would take one course, and in his speech at Kamloops—which I am about to read to the House—he said he would take another course.

Mr. DUFF: Finish the first quotation; be fair.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I think it will become any hon. member to reiterate at the peril of tiring the House for the benefit of one hon. gentleman who does not understand the point. My hon. friend does not want me to read this platform again, does he?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I do.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, I am not going to do so. We have got that platform, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. member, except my hon. friend from Lunenburg, knows to what I refer. That platform contains this paragraph:

> And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: Now, the hon. the leader of the Opposition told the people in Peterborough in the same speech and in almost the same paragraph that the Meighen Administration would be defeated, and that His Excellency the Governor General would then call upon him to form an administration. Having got his hearers into a state of mind where presumably they accepted that probability, he proceeded:

> Nothing will be done in the way of altering or amending the tariff in the smallest particular.

Now, my point is this—

Mr. DUFF: Go on.

Mr. STEVENS: My point is quite clear, Mr. Speaker—

An Hon. MEMBER: Are you afraid of it?

Mr. STEVENS: My point is very clear.

Mr. DUFF: No, no.

Mr. STEVENS: It is so clear—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Hon. members will please bear in mind that the hon. member for Centre Vancouver has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS: My point is so clear, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman does not like the explanation nor the revelation of it. But in case it should be considered that I am making a play on words in connection with the various utterances of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, let me read a portion from a verbatim report of a speech made by him in the city of Kamloops in company with my hon. friend from Lunenburg. If he was not present that night I think he was ill.

Mr. DUFF: No, I was on the platform.

Mr. STEVENS: Then the hon. member will remember and be able to verify what I am about to say. In this speech the hon. the leader of the Opposition, speaking of the general policy of the Liberal party, went on to say that they wanted a party that represented all political opinions, and classes, and so forth, and then he described how in this great convention in Ottawa there were extremists, that there were free traders and high and low protectionists—the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), for example—and that there was a great body in between, neither high protectionists nor low, nor free traders, but he said they all got together and were able to form a platform in the interests of all the people. Then he proceeded in this strain:

> We say the time has come in Canada when the tariff should be reduced.

That is a straight statement.

Mr. DUFF: That is right.

Mr. STEVENS: Very good. Then take the following:

> We will start on it at once.

When is that? Is that after a general election? My hon. friends cannot escape this, because it is too serious a matter to play ducks and drakes with, and again, I invite them to consider these statements. The hon. the leader of the Opposition stated clearly the constitutional practice, that if this resolution or amendment of his carried he would go into office, and he told the people of Kamloops that it was the intention of his party to start on the revision of the tariff at once.

Mr. DUFF: At Kamloops he said he was going to reduce the tariff.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has at last shown to this House that either he is not sincere or not sensible in the remarks that he has made.

Mr. DUFF: I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that remark.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend asks me to withdraw my remark where I referred to him as being not sensible. Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he is sensible of what I am saying, but he refuses to admit

it. I do not know which is worse—to be ignorant of a thing, or to refuse to admit when he does understand it. The point I am seeking, and it is certainly as clear as type can make it, is that the hon. the leader of the Opposition—whom I am glad to see in his seat at the present moment, he having just arrived—makes a declaration before a protectionist constituency assuring the people that the protective principles of the tariff were perfectly safe, and that the bye-election had no bearing upon the tariff whatever; but in the West, in Kamloops, he makes the statement:

> Let me tell you what that policy is. We say the time has come in Canada when the tariff should be reduced. We will start on it at once.

Then I draw the attention of the House to this as well, that in the city of Peterborough the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and also his first lieutenant the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, assured that manufacturing centre that there was no danger of tariff revision, the latter using these words:

> Be not worried about the tariff. You can rest assured that there will be nothing done to disturb it.

Let me point out, Sir, that they were addressing the people of a city where they manufacture mining, flour milling, saw mill, electrical and other machinery. Listen to this. In the city of Kamloops the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, knowing there were men in his audience who were interested in mining, saw mill and other industries, held out this bait. I quote his exact words which were taken down verbatim:

> As to the reduction of duties on the necessaries of life-food, clothing, shelter, warmth, this can be done.

Then he goes on:

> It seems to me that you here in British Columbia need a reduction of the duties on the instruments of production more than any other part of the country.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in Peterborough they manufacture machinery, and there the people were assured there would be nothing done in the way of tariff reduction. At Kamloops, where they use this machinery and where they are handicapped by the long freight haul that I referred to a moment ago, which is one of our problems, and where a great deal of similar machinery is purchased in the United States, the hon. the leader of the Opposition told the people:

> You have your forests, you have your fisheries, you have your mines. You need machinery to develop them, and if this machinery can be procured at a lower cost, it will be followed by a lower cost of production.

Then he continues:

> You need a reduction of duties on the instruments of production.

Now, what I am driving at in my argument is simply this, that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition—and in his absence I challenged his followers, and I challenge him now that he is in his seat—dare not bring forward the Liberal platform of 1919 as an issue in this House or in the country. He went through British Columbia appealing to the people—to the selfish instincts of the people, if I may say so—with regard to certain things that they used. He went to the Prairie Provinces and met my friends opposite of the Agrarian party and told them that there was no difference between his policy and theirs; then he came down to Peterborough, a manufacturing town, and told the people that there was no danger; that the tariff would not be tampered with—that the bye-election then impending would not result in any interference with the tariff.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. gentleman left out the words "until after an election."

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is still worrying.

Mr. DUFF: Not nearly as much as the hon. members from Vancouver Centre.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to direct the attention of the House very briefly to another point. My hon. friends state that we have no right to bring the tariff into this discussion; that it is not of interest at the present time. I submit to you, Sir, that the matter is of vital interest. In the speech from the Throne His Excellency, on the advice of the Government, makes a clear statement of the position of the Government on the tariff. Now, I have here two motions, one moved on June 9, 1919, by the hon. member for Brome and the other on May 18, 1920, by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. I shall not weary the House by reading the resolutions, but I wish to point out that in 1919, two years ago, the member for Brome had been alotted the high position of financial critic of the Opposition. But he held that position only for a very short time; in fact, after he introduced this resolution he was relegated to the back benches, I might say, and replaced by another gentleman who had less

dangerous views on the tariff. In the 1919 resolution a substantial reduction was asked for, "as speedily as may be expedient," and so on; then the member for Brome added this:

> Also, the reciprocal offer of trade with the United States should be accepted.

If my hon. friends opposite are in earnest about their tariff position, all they have to do is to make a motion in the House setting forth exactly where they stand. Almost every public utterance of the leader of the Opposition has been a different utterance on the tariff question. If my hon. friends do not desire to stand by the platform of 1919, which has been sent all over this country as their official declaration; if they do not wish to stand by the resolution of the hon. member for Brome or that of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's to which I have referred, let them frame some platform or some resolution which they are prepared to stand by and introduce it into this House, and we shall be prepared to meet them.

Hon. members on this side will welcome a campaign in this country on the fiscal policy. The leader of the Opposition is seeking to hold the manufacturing interests of Eastern Canada behind him and at the same time to bewitch my hon. friends from the Prairie Provinces as well into supporting him. Why should that be? There is much more in it, perhaps, than would appear on the surface. One would think that the hon. member for Prince, the leader of the Opposition, would not take that somewhat questionable position unless there was really sound reason for his doing so. I shall now give to you, Sir, and to the House what I consider to be the exact reasons for that position. I do not expect my hon. friends immediately opposite to agree with me. but I invite the attention of every thinking member of this House to the argument that I shall make.

It is this: assuming that an election should be brought about, it is absolutely certain that the party whose destinies are now in the hands of the hon. member for Prince could not come into power. That is certain, for the simple reason that there is not a single Liberal in the Prairie Provinces; we have the Agrarian party replacing the Liberal party in that part of the country. If this Government, or the party represented by this side of the House, should not have a majority, the only possible solution would be the formation of a coalition by hon. gentlemen immediately opposite and the Agrarian party. That is the only possible hope for the accession to power of hon. gentlemen immediately opposite. The leader of the Opposition knows that; therefore, he is seeking to hold the allegiance of my hon. friends from the Prairie Provinces with a view to their supporting him in case such an emergency should arise.

Let me briefly, Mr. Speaker, sum up the points I wish to make. As the leader of the Opposition is in his seat, I invite him to consider the challenge that I threw out earlier in my remarks. If the statements of my hon. friend are true; if the "will of the people has been ignored"—I am quoting his own words; if the "rights of the people have been usurped" by this Parliament; if "hundreds of thousands of citizens were deprived of the franchise;" if the franchise of 1917 was the "worst betrayal of the rights of the people this country has ever known;" if "persons are taxed without representation;" if we are witnessing "open defiance"—still quoting my hon. friend's own words—"of the most fundamental of all principles of government;" if "these halls of Parliament"—again quoting—"are within a charnel house of disillusionment full of intrigue and deceptions" —if, Sir, all this is true; if this Parliament is properly and correctly described by the hon. gentleman in these terms, then I say he can remedy that very quickly by resigning his seat, in company with those who sit behind him. I say to him, with the utmost conviction of the accuracy of my statements, that this Government and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would not dare to remain in office if any such contingency arose. The leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that he cannot get the backing of his followers sufficiently to do that; he knows that a very large proportion of his followers would desert him if there was any possibility of the Government being defeated at this time. I cannot, Sir, come to any other conclusion than that my hon. friend lacks sincerity in moving this amendment.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: I am perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, there is every evidence in the words and actions of my hon. friend and in the resolution itself that he lacks sincerity in proposing it and that his sole object is to

secure office, thinking that, perchance, with a large number of hon. gentlemen on this side away ill, he should be able to secure the reigns of office with the assistance of my hon. friends from the prairies—whose interests, I may say, are diametrically opposed to his on this occasion.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman resumes his seat, I would like to inquire whether he is authorized to state on behalf of the Government that if the Opposition members will resign, the Government will resign and go to the country?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer.

Mr. STEVENS: Am I permitted to answer?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS: I will simply repeat what I have said—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer.

Mr. STEVENS: I will answer my hon. friends. I uttered the challenge to my hon. friends that if they felt the accuracy of the statements of their leader, then it was their duty to resign the seats so obtained; that in so far as this side of the House was concerned, I was convinced, speaking for myself—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: —and as far as I am concerned I will act as I speak. I was convinced that hon. gentlemen on this side would not dare to continue to hold office if hon. gentlemen opposite were to act as I have suggested.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my first remarks must be words of protest. I hold in my hand the invitation sent to the members of my family asking them to assist at the opening of Parliament as well as an attached memorandum. These documents are exclusively written out in English. To say the least, such a proceeding implies towards the members of this House belonging to the French race, a lack of courtesy which cannot be condoned and which for my part I strongly resent. Indeed, I hold, Mr. Speaker, that invitations of that kind should be couched in the two official languages recognized in this country and that the opposite practice cannot be tolerated. Consequently, I beg of the competent authorities to put an end to that wretched practice, tending to set aside the rights of the French language, in such matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: During the month of September 1920, I had some business to transact, on behalf of a French-Canadian, with the officials of the Canadian National Railways system. The negotiations involved the signing of a deed. We had requested that the deed should be written in French. But here is the answer that we received:

Lévis, 28th September, 1920.

Mr. Arthur Trahan, M.P.,
Nicolet.

Dear Sir,

In answer to yours of the 18th instant, I hereby send you a form of application re the laying through of telephone wires over our property at Lemieux.

I am sorry that I am unable to send you a form in French, but we have none printed in this language at this time.

And the form in question, Mr. Speaker, contains two printed pages bearing especially on the construction of sidings. We are always met by the same old excuse which indicates, as far as the Government and its officials are concerned, that they are intent on making difficulties when it is a question of respecting the rights of the French language in this country. I wish to say that we have refused to sign that deed written in English and we do not intend doing so as long as they will not supply us with a French form. These few cases, chosen among thousands of others, show clearly to what extent the rights of the French language are disregarded in governmental spheres. I most strongly protest against that scandalous policy, and I wish to proclaim before all, that Canada is a bilingual country and both official languages, in practice, and the constitution as well, must be respected. When I demand from the Government that they do not illegally restrict the use of the French language, not only I exercise a right which is inscribed in the constitution but I fulfil a sacred duty.

Indeed, there is something more, something better than the commercial and industrial wealth of a race: it is the thought and the language which expresses it. It is through the diffusion of its language that a nation shows its external vitality, it is through the radiation of its ideals that it preserves and expands its influence. Mr. Speaker, we all wish to see Canada a united country. Let us see that French and English have an equal share in this magnificient Parliament, let us treat both languages with the same respect and deference.

It is generally admitted to-day that a knowledge of French is necessary not only in this country but also with reference to foreign intercourse; even the hon. member for Durham (Hon Mr. Rowell) who is not friendly to our language, lately proclaimed the necessity of a bilingual education.

People praise the beauty of our mother tongue, and rightly so. May I quote on the subject a few beautiful thoughts uttered by Mr. Etienne Lamy at the sitting of the French Academy held on the 20th of December, 1917:

"When Cardinal de Richelieu founded our Academy, he had these words engraved upon the seal: To immortality. It was to the French language that Richelieu wished that future. It inherited that power of universality which the Greek and afterwards the Latin languages had obtained. But nowadays this supremacy of yore needs being upheld. Outside, it still commands the admiration of the high cultured, though these at times, are repelled by the works of some of our writers. We must admit that those delinquencies are diseases of but a few and of short duration; that the clearness, order, grace and harmony of the French language are the elements of its primitive, unalterable and unequalled character; that these attainments find their usefulness beyond its native land; that it is not only an idiom for the use of a particular people, but an instrument of preciseness at the service of the human mind and the purest crystal through which light filters without deviating."

I wish that every one of my colleagues would meditate over these great truths and they will understand why I protest against those who ignore the rights of the French language and that I intend to uphold, to safeguard and to spread it through Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: (Translation) The Government is not merely satisfied with putting obstacles in our way concerning the use of the Franch language; but it really seems firmly resolved to encroach as often as possible upon the legitimate right of the Catholic people to adhere to the practice of their religion. Probably for the first time since Confederation the Catholic public employees have been compelled to work on holy days, observed by them like Sundays, and this occurred not only in Ottawa, but also in the city of Quebec.

Yet, last session when we opposed the Senate's amendment to do away with several legal holidays, which coincided with Catholic holy days, the then Prime Minister the hon. member from King's, Nova Scotia (Sir Robert Borden), stated that the Catholic employees had no reason whatever to be alarmed, since leave of absence would be granted to them on those days. Notwithstanding that specific pledge, an official notice from the Postmaster General's Department, presided over by the amazing Mr. Blondin, ordered that the post office employees of the city of Quebec should work on All Saints' Day as on all other days; and if I am correctly informed, Catholic public servants in Ottawa were placed under the same obligation. The same thing occurred here on Conception Day and on Epiphany Day.

Why has not the present Prime Minister kept the pledge given by his predecessor and why has he permitted such spiteful measures to be enacted against the Catholics of this country? I hold him responsible for this outrage against our Catholic convictions and for this attack against our dignity and our religious liberty. We hope that such a thing will not occur again and we hope the Government will take such steps that Catholic holy days will be recognized both by this Government and this Parliament.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN (Translation): When the Government, as I have just mentioned fails to keep the promises made before this House, it is no longer worthy of the confidence of the people. Therefore, the leader of the Opposition is justified in moving his amendment and we, the representatives of the province of Quebec, have ample grounds to question the good faith of the Prime Minister who professes friendship for us. His deeds are fewer than his words and these vary according to his audience whether he addresses a French or an English audience.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister came to the Province of Quebec during the course of last summer; he spoke both at Sherbrooke and at Granby; there he told us that he always had a tender spot for the Province of Quebec, that never had he wished to do it the least injustice, nor had a thought of insinuation against the character of its people ever entered his head. It is well; we take note of it. However, later on, a partial election took place in British Columbia, which brought to this House the hon. member (Mr. MacKelvie) who seconded the address and who is deserving of our congratulations on the manner with which he has performed his delicate task. The Prime Minister took part in this contest of Yale-Cariboo, went around the country and more particularly spoke in such places as Penticton and Summerland. What views did he express at those meetings? I have

before me the account given to a number of newspapers by the associated press. The Vancouver *Sun* of November the 4th, 1920, tells us that the Prime Minister discussed before the electors of Penticton and Summerland the question of conscription and the Military Service Act, and took advantage of this occasion to accuse the Leader of the Opposition of having left this country at a critical moment to obtain a large prebend in a foreign country and in the employ of the world's most powerful organization. The Prime Minister knew that he was far from the truth when he brought forward this accusation, knowing fully well that at the last session, the Leader of the Opposition had explained his position clearly and explicitly, which allowed of no contradiction. Following up this attack he turned against the Leader of the Opposition's supporters whom you all know; three quarters hail from the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that in this modern world, military imperialism is but the mail fist of commerce and industry — the open field which remains to imperialism is its economical conquest of the world. These are the underlying reasons why industrial expansion is pressed to its utmost. The Government, faithful servant to the powerful financial interests, has been induced into this prodigious error: they wish to establish an "industrial Holy Empire" in Canada. While they give supremacy to industrial and military matters, they neglect the agricultural interests. Yet rural population is dwindling, the cities are overcrowded, the cost of living is high and the world is starving.

Is excessive industrialism a remedy for these evils? I will answer—No. I certainly do not wish to replace the factory by the farm nor the labourer by the farmer, but I maintain that a just equilibrium must be upheld between the agricultural and industrial interests. On the other hand I assert together with the best known economists that nothing durable, economically, socially and morally, can be built that has not agriculture as its base.

Furthermore, it is my humble opinion, that the systematic industrialization of Canada would entail the complete upheaval of this country's organization, a radical change in all our customs as well as in our ways of thinking; the future of Canada would thus be imperilled. It is pertinent to the general interest, to remain faithful to our traditions and uphold our natural inclination for agriculture. An immense territory capable of sustaining a population of tens of millions is ours; yet we are obliged to import agricultural products. Is this not a national calamity? In a great measure, is the reason not to be found in the Government's bad policy? This Government which today presides over the destinies of our country instead of creating amongst the people a love for agriculture, has tried to inculcate in these populations the germ of militarism. That is why instead of having experimental farms in large numbers, they established here and there over the whole country, one for each county, if I am not mistaken, military halls and armouries. I maintain that it is more important to change the trend of thought of our people than to increase our armaments. We have to resist plutocratic barbarity represented by the powerful financial concerns who wish to place before all their commercial and industrial interests, that is to say economical imperialism: we have to struggle against social barbarity represented by these bolshevick tendencies who aim at destroying the foundation of property owhership in our country; lastly we have to fight against this barbarity under the disguise of science and learning that wish by all means possible to do away with religious teachings in our schools. What are the means at our disposal to enable us to destroy these three plagues, if it is not to turn to our most steadfast population, that one which is most attached to its native soil, the most patriotic, that is the agricultural population, is it not also to encourage farming and return to mother earth.

Such is the right principle; oppose agricultural and economic nationalism to economic imperialism, and that is the reason why the Liberal party, in framing its programme, included the interests of the farming class, and advocated the proper means to improve their condition.

Sir, "the crisis of all crises is that of moral sense", said a French writer. The Government have done nothing to check it. On the contrary, they countenance it. That was lately demonstrated to us in a pitiful manner. We had a further proof of it when in the soldiers' pensions' Act they caused to be inserted a section by which for the first time in the history of Canada our legislators granted a premium to concubinage and adultery. When it was moved that a pension be given to the "unmarried wives and mothers" according to the expression coined by Mr. Nickle, the then representative for Kingston, we of the Liberal party protested against such a disgrace; not only

we protested, but we voted against such a motion.

My right hon. friend said that we were among those who would have others fight for them and that such is our conception of liberty. For the enlightenment of my English-speaking friends, I shall quote from the *Gazette*:

> "Again at Summerland he referred to the leader and opponents of the Government as those "whose idea of liberty was to let other people fight for them."

I need not repeat it, Sir, the large majority, 75 per cent of the followers of the leader of the Opposition came from the province of Quebec, and it is the Prime Minister himself who goes into an English speaking province and states that the followers of the leader of the Opposition are people who would have others fight for them, that is, people who are not brave enough to defend their liberty. That is tantamount to repeating in a different form the charges uttered against the province of Quebec, to wit, that the inhabitants of that province were cowards and defaulters. Our Prime Minister is still what he was in 1917, that is a downright imperialist always fighting vigourously those who do not sanction his policy of sacrificing our last man and our last dollar for the benefit of the Empire to the detriment of Canada.

Having discussed for some time with the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. C. C. Ballantyne) the setting forward of the hands of the clock in Quebec, the hon. member from St. Hyancinthe came to an understanding, so he says, with the Postmaster touching the questions of imperialism and protection. Well, so much the worse for the hon. member if he wishes to disown his past "to curse the spirit of his race" and to set up treason as a state of policy.

As for us, we shall forever assert as in the past that above financial and monetary matters, there is our honesty of conscience to be consulted and our national pride to be safeguarded. We shall show a persistent tenacity and united stubborness in demanding an apology from those who have abused and despised us in 1917 and who now deluge us with hypocritical compliments and adulations with the sole end of dividing us upon an economic question. We shall safely keep stored in our minds, the bottom of our hearts, the rememberance of the momentous days of 1917-1918 when, under the leadership of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we felt that we were banded together by our common trials and our anxiety for the public safety. We shall not graciously lower our prestige by joining the ranks of the moneyed interests but true to our motto, we shall still form an invincible alliance of true hearts, of upright thoughts and strong will power so as to maintain in their entirety our religious ideal and the purest of our national traditions.

We cannot trust those who, by the unfair war time elections Act have usurped power in 1917 and secured their ends by stirring hatred, awakening distrust and using false pretences. They have scandolously deceived the farmers of this country when after the election they set aside the exemptions they had solemnly promised to their sons by an Order in Council passed before the election. They deceived our clergy concerning the exemptions to clergymen and to-day they give us but the shadow of a responsible government. How? First of all, the government declines to hand over to the representatives of the people documents and information concerning the other nations.

When, in several instances, we asked for copies of the correspondence concerning the establishment of an embassy in Washington, he refused to bring down these papers, thus trampling upon the purogatives of Parliament—Moreover, at the time of the debate on the Peace Treaty, during the second session of 1919, he ignominously treated the members of this House and the people of this country. When I asked if our delegates to the conference had or had not opposed clause 10 of the covenant, it was not thought proper to answer and frankly admit the truth, the whole truth of the matter. Is this not, Mr. Speaker, a contempt of the rights of the people, this systematically hiding the truth from its representatives? We were treated in this unceremonious way because at that time, the treaty had to be ratified without reserve and above all without delay—England, it appears, wanted it so—whatever be the consequences for Canada, and the Government, slaves to Downing street, disregarded their partisans, parliamentary institutions and the popular rights, by rushing the hasty and ill considered ratification of a treaty in connection with which they now ask for the repeal of one most important clause.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Government involves the country's credit and sets up new administrative machinery without the consent of Parliament. I do not need to refer again to the instance

mentioned by the hon. member for Benuce (Mr. Béland) in the matter of the purchasing commission. The project of such a commission had been keenly opposed on the floor of this House by the members of both sides of the House, and the Borden government had thought best not to insist upon the adoption of such a project. But the hon. Prime Minister had no sooner taken hold of the reins of power than, without consulting Parliament, notwithstanding the clearly expressed will of the representatives of the people on both sides of the House, he created by a simple Order in Council, this purchasing commission which no one had consented to.

MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

Mr. TRAHAN (Translation): And there is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House: The Government involves the credit of the country without consulting Parliament.

One day the hon. Minister of Marine got it into his head that a navy was necessary for Canada, and thereupon he entered into negotiations with the Imperial authorities to obtain warships. We have asked for the correspondence on the subject. The hon. Minister of Marine never brought it down; and it is only when he needed money for the upkeep and equipment of these warships that he put the matter before Parliament. Is this the act of a responsible government? I respectfully claim that it is not. And in regard to this question of a navy, I mean to repeat what I said last year, that the time is exceedingly ill chosen in which to launch such a project, owing to the lamentable situation of our finances, the country being on the verge of bankruptcy. There are numberless reasons for which we should oppose this project, and I ask, why create a navy at the present hour? Is not the League of Nations a safeguard against the recurrence of wars? Is not the limitation of armaments throughout the world the main object of the league? Large amounts are expended by us to send delegates to the meetings of the League of Nations, and with what result? What country is expected to wage war on us? I shall here take the liberty of quoting from an article of the Farmers Sun dated December 31, 1920:

"What, then are we to prepare for? To take part in another European war for which the seeds have already been sown. If the nations of Europe cannot after the awful experiences that have occured since 1914, agree to live in peace with each other, then let European nations themselves pay the penalty. In fighting one war to end war Canada has done her share and more than her share in that sort of experiment to ensure world peace."

These sentiments I agree with, and I claim that the time is ill chosen for the establishment of a navy in this country, especially when in all the countries of the world is mooted the question of disarmament.

The newspapers tell us that an Imperial Conference is to take place in June next, and that the Prime Ministers of the different Dominions are to be requested to take part in that conference—evidently the questions to be taken up at that conference will be of capital importance, not only for the Empire, but also for Canada.

These questions may be of two kinds: Those bearing upon our constitutional relations with the Empire, with England, and others relating to the scheme for Imperial defence announced by the Prime Minister of Great Britain in an interview in which he declared that Great Britain cannot afford to meet alone the cost of Imperial defence, and that the different dominions and colonies must contribute their share of the expense. If it is a matter of determining the constitutional relations of Canada with England, I mean to reiterate the policy adopted by the Liberal party at the national conference of August, 1919, when they opposed all centralized Imperial control, and claimed that no change in our constitutional relations with Great Britain should come into force before having been submitted to the approbation of the Canadian Parliament and ratified by the people by means of a referendum.

I share entirely, on this point, the opinion expressed by a newspaper of Toronto, the World, which is edited, if I am not mistaken, by one of the hon. members of this House (Mr. W. F. McLean):

Canada must remain master of its own destinies, free to govern itself and to do her own wishes. The Canadian people will not tolerate to be led nor domineered by Downing Street.

We intend to preserve the supremacy we have acquired and we shall not permit any council or conference, or the imperial parliament, or any outside tribunal, to dictate to Canada. Our legislators must be of our own choice. They must not transfer their power to any one not designated by the people. They are not the masters but the servants of the State. This authority conferred upon them cannot be transferred to other delegates such as to any imperial government. Let the Knights of the Round Table understand once for all that the Prime Minister Meighen or any other prime minister cannot alter by an iota the absolute right the people of Canada possess to govern this country. This country belongs to Canadians and they intend—to govern it as they please.

When we shall need an advice from the Lords or their equals living outside of Canada, we shall ask for it. If in the past the Government of the Dominion has pledged its word in any way, let it render an account to Parliament and the people.

As to the question of Imperial defence, I ask: Why this military imperialism at a time when general disarmament is the main talk everywhere?

To-day much is said about divorce in our country. The newspapers are discussing the question, and there is talk of legalizing in Canada this social cancer which is eating the heart of other countries. According to the unanimous opinion of the most distinguished jurists, the indissolubility of marriage is the rule, at least as regards the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Those who obtain a divorce by means of a Private Bill have their marriage dissolved, but that does not change the general rule, which is the indissolubility of marriage. This principle conforms with the natural law, while the divorce, which dissolves marriage during the lifetime of the united parties is contrary to natural order.

I am not discussing this question from a religious point of view, I only look at it from a social and a national standpoint; and as such I may quote a few thoughts from a writer, which I submit to the serious consideration of the hon. members of this House:

"The indissolubility of marriage is not a religious superstition, an invention of adherents to a by-gone cult, an unreasonable enactment of wild troglodytes. Nature is at the bottom of this iron law."

And further on the author shows that divorce is not only against nature but anti-national and immoral:

"Divorce, encouraged, vulgarized by a regime which confounds cowardly sentimentality with courageous and sane humaneness, divorce at will is the greatest of our crimes and the most baneful of our errors.

If we do not apply the hot iron to this ulcer, our blood will continue to ooze from it in corruption.

But, it will be said, what of the rights of man and the rights of woman... the right to live...

What! what rights?... You have children, you belong to them! you made a mistake, so much the worse! You are already of the past. The child is the future, he is the race. Remain bound together by the child."

And farther on—

"It takes twenty years to make a human being capable of facing life. It is not the work of a day or of a month, it is a considerable labour which is the whole raison d'être of parents and shows the importance which Nature attaches to manhood and what responsibilities it entails. You aim at shunning these responsibilities, eschewing the family and its duties by the selfishness of celibacy or the shame of divorce. Flee! but in your flight you drag all with you to the abyss, and the country perishes through your desertion of the hearth."

Mr. BELAND: Who is the author?

Mr. TRAHAN: Henri de Noussanne. A little farther on he says:

"Marriage is worth what we are worth. From money calculations, vanities, lies, lewdness, can happiness be expected? The intoxication of pride once over, The veil once fallen from folly, one finds oneself in a hell. One then believes that the way out of it is divorce, and in this plight, pledges and children are forgotten. The coward and perjurer, imagines that it matters not; there will be no consequences, no morrow. Marriage is thought to be a transitory, an occasional adventure, dependent only upon one's calculations, one's mood.

"As well believe that birth and death are also dependent upon our whim, and renewable at our caprice. As well imagine that we can fool Nature, as we can fool men, and that God is not the name of the Spirit in Nature, and that justice is not the name of reason in the spirit."

And in another place the author again says:

"We can only expect our salvation from social peace made of family peace, which can only come from the purification and the consolidation of marriage restored by its essential function, which is the creation and education of the child."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we complain at present of unrest, in certain parts of Canada. This unrest can be attributed to the dire ravages caused by divorce and the reduction of the birth-rate. We hope that the Government will not propose so iniquitous a measure as one for the establishment of a divorce court. We hope that directly or indirectly they will not favour such a measure, and I for one, should it be brought, will hold it my duty to most vigourously oppose it.

Nowadays compliments are freely lavished upon the province of Quebec. It is called the pivot of Confederation. We hear that her people are sane, are stable and do not allow themselves to be blinded by socialistic or other passions; and it is true. Why is this the case in our province? It is because we have remained attached to the native soil, to peaceful country life, we have sought before all to develop our agricultural lands, to throw them open to colonization. Why have the people of Quebec acquired such a good reputation in the other provinces? Because in the humble school in which they are formed they are taught their duties towards God and towards their neighbours. On this point let me quote from a speech delivered by the new Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Taschereau), on November 4th, 1920, on the occasion of the

meeting of the deputy-ministers of education of the different provinces.

However behind the times, did he say, our primary schools may have seemed to you some twenty-five years ago, I can say this much to their credit. They taught the children their religious duties, and they taught them to remain on the land with their parents; they warded off that modern evil which draws the farmers' sons from their natural sphere; they did not seek to lead them towards a commercial or industrial life which has no right to claim them, nor to take them away from the pursuit of agriculture.

I have said enough and perhaps too much, Mr. Speaker, to show that the Government is undeserving of the confidence of this House and of the country, as the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition shows. The Government ignores, notwithstanding our constitution, the rights of the French language; they do violence to our Catholic conscience in forcing the civil employees to work on religious holidays; they continue their tactic of insulting the province of Quebec while seeming to court it; they give us a caricature of responsible government by refusing to furnish the people's representatives with the public documents to which they are entitled; they pledge the credit of the country without consulting Parliament; they work for the triumph of economic and military imperialism to the detriment of agricultural and economic nationalism; they, in a word, tend, by means of divers laws which they have passed and others of which they underhandedly favour the adoption, they tend, I say, towards the crisis of all crises, that of moral sense. We oppose such a policy. We of the province of Quebec wish to live in the tranquility of work and order, by which may be insured the harmonious development of our country under the moral aegis of a religion which connects Heaven overhead with Mother Earth.

On the motion of Mr. C. R. Harrison (Nipissing) the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Wednesday, February 23, 1921.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations during its first session, November 15 to December 18 last: Report by the Secretary-General to the first Assembly of the League on the work of the Council—Right Hon. Mr. Meighen.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 3, to incorporate The Canadian Bar Association—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 4, respecting The Dominion Life Assurance Company—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 5, to incorporate Fidelity Company of Canada—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 6, to incorporate The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 8, respecting The James MacLaren Company, Limited—Mr. Fontaine.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer notification of the election and return of George Newcombe Gordon, Esq., for the Electoral District of Peterborough, West Riding.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

On the Order, "Motions":

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to move at this, the correct time, the motion of which I gave notice on Monday last relative to the amendment to the Dominion Elections Act. I have, however, conferred with my friend the leader of the Opposition, who is unable to be present just at the moment, and it has been agreed that, provided the House concurs, the motion be not gone on with now but that it be taken up later in the afternoon when the leader of the Opposition is present. I hope this is acceptable to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and to the House generally.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I beg to move, seconded by Right Hon. Sir George Foster:

That the name of Mr. McDermand be added to the Select Standing Committees on Agriculture and Colonization, Miscellaneous Private Bills, and Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE MARK AND DESIGN ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved

for leave to introduce Bill No. 9, to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The object of this Bill is to make in the present Act a slight amendement which will make it possible for Canada to adhere to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property which was instituted in 1883 and which has so for been adopted by most of the nations of the world.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—MR. ARCHAMBAULT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to an inaccuracy in Hansard. On February 17, at page 89 I find in the report of the speech made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) these words:

> The accusation came, and I am glad to see my hon. friend the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) in his place, for he was the president of the convention when this matter was threshed out.

I was in the House when the speech was made, and I do not believe my hon. friend referred to me, because a little later on he refers to the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Gervais) in these words:

> During the special convention, which was presided over by my friend the member for Berthier (Mr. Gervais), we took congnizance of all these facts.

I rise simply to correct this statement and to state that I never was at any convention of the Artisans, especially at the convention that whitewashed my hon. friend.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Tuesday, February 22.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERT HARRISON (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up very much of the time of the House, for I do not feel that I can add anything that would be of material benefit to what has already been so ably said by hon. members on this side of the House in connection with the important matters that have been placed before us in the speech from the Throne.

First, I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address upon the very able manner in which they performed that duty. I would also like to say a few words in connection with the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). In listening to the speeches of hon. members opposite, and especially the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) when he spoke of the wonderful leadership of the leader of the Opposition, who is going to blaze the way to greater things, as I am a labour man and one who was very closely associated with the Grand Trunk railway employees who went out on strike in 1910, my mind naturally went back to that time, and also to the famous resolution which was presented to the House last year by the leader of the Opposition, which is almost the same as the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition at this session, and now before the House for discussion. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the leader of the Opposition was just as insincere last year when he moved that famous resolution as he is this year in moving the amendment, and as he was when he promised the Grand Trunk Railway employees their positions back in 1910. The leader of the Opposition was Minister of Labour when the Grand Trunk strike occurred and as Minister of Labour he attempted to arbitrate between the company and the men, and after the strike had lasted for several days, on the assurance of the then Minister of Labour that the men would receive their positions back, or in other words, be reinstated in good standing, the strike was called off. And what were the results? We all know too well. Many of the men were never taken back, and many that were taken back did not receive their seniority standing. Apparently the now leader of the Opposition either betrayed the men or he did not have the ability to negotiate a proper settlement. In any event, he did not live up to his promises that if the men called off the strike he would accept the responsibility of seeing that the men got their positions back, as was the basis of the negotiations and settlement. I am informed that one of his party has been heard to remark that when the Opposition defeats the Government and the now leader of the Opposition becomes the leader of the Government, the Grand Trunk men will receive their pensions. As a matter of fact, the

only Grand Trunk employees who are not now receiving their pensions are those who failed in obtaining reinstatement by reason of the breaking of the promise given by the present leader of the Opposition. Had he at that time kept faith the pension dispute would never have arisen.

It is to be observed that the present Administration has done everything to facilitate a prompt and proper adjustment of the claims of these ex-employees, by placing in the hands of their solicitor all the information available in the files of the Department of Labour, and it has agreed that they shall have the opportunity to present their case as a claim against the Grand Trunk before the Board of Arbitration now sitting, and I have every confidence that justice will be done and that the men will receive their pensions.

Mr. Speaker, how do the issues now standing before the country affect the working man? The present Government stands for just such a measure of protection in our tariff system as will enable Canadian industries—agriculture, mining, lumbering and manufacturing—to continue to carry on to the greatest possible degree. The tariff proposals of the Opposition to the Government are that the protective principle must be eliminated; that industries that cannot meet the competition of the surplus products from the industries of the United States and the cheap labour of foreign countries must be sacrificed without any regard to what happens to the thousands of men that these industries employ. That, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree, is a fair statement of the issue as it is presented to us.

Well, Sir, how is that going to affect the wage-earner? The industries of the province of Ontario employ around around four hundred thousand men. They use large quantities of raw material produced by other Canadian workingmen. They furnish traffic to our railways and employment to our railwaymen. They provide markets for our farmers and business for our business men. Every industry added to those we now have widens the opportunity and improves the conditions of our people. Every industry forced to close by unfair competition has just the opposite effect. How would it affect the workmen if in Ontario, for instance, the Westinghouse Company, the Ford Motor Company, the United Typewriter Company, the Simonds Saw Company, the Yates Machine Company, and scores of other American companies with branch factories in Canada, closed their doors and furnished the Canadian market from their American plants? Yet, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is keeping these industries in Canada is a moderate protective tariff. Every time the output from a Canadian industry is reduced or curtailed by the competition of imported goods, workingmen suffer. Every dollar's worth of goods imported into this country that could be legitimately produced here means taking the bread and butter from some Canadian working man's child. And yet we have public men going about this country preaching the doctrines of class warfare, with one object, and one object alone—the hope that they may enlist the support of workingmen in a movement destined to destroy their chances of earning a decent livlihood.

There is another question that has not been touched upon by many of the previous speakers, and it is one in which I am deeply interested. It is the investigation that is being conducted by the Department of Labour into a system of unemployment insurance and old age pensions. On account of being a labour man, I perhaps know a great deal more of the actual conditions of the workingman than the majority of the members of the House, and I also feel I am in a better position to know just about how much the labourer can save out of his earnings after he properly cares for his family. Unemployment may arise from other causes than the loss of position. A man may become unemployed through sickness, invalidity or old age. Very few labourers are able to make provision for these contingencies and the question of making some provision by a system of state social insurance for those who through no fault of their own are unable to work whether the inability arises from lack of opportunity, sickness, invalidity, or old age is of very great importance. Such insurance would remove the spectre of fear which now haunts the wage earner, and would make him a more contented and better citizen. I have in mind at this time, labouring men who were strong and robust when the war broke out. They were too old to go to the front, but I know for a fact that they contributed every dollar they could spare to help along the good work. Sickness has overtaken them, and they are to-day down and out, through no fault of their own. These men might have saved money had they not been so generous, but they felt

that as true Canadians they had a duty; not being able to fight themselves, they helped in every way possible the men who were fighting for them. I hope that the department's investigation will be carried on, and that we may be successful in having legislation placed upon the statute books at this session of Parliament, providing insurance of this character.

Mr. Speaker, what has made this possible, and what has this Government done for labour? The Minister of Labour, who himself was a labour man, was appointed by this Government, and he has shown to the people of Canada that he is worthy of the honourable position he now holds. In 1919 the Government of Canada established a Royal Commission presided over by Chief Justice Mathers of Winnipeg, whose duty it was to inquire into and take evidence respecting industrial conditions in Canada. Following their report, the Department of Labour invited to a conference a substantial number of representative employers and of organized labour throughout Canada, with representatives from each of the Provincial Governments. This body after going fully into the report of the Mathers Commission, appointed a committee composed of representatives of employers and of labour. This committee endorsed the recommendation of the Mathers Commission and suggested that a careful investigation of the whole subject should be undertaken. This was done, and I am informed that our Department of Labour has been making a careful investigation and has gathered a large amount of useful information from all countries in the world that have adopted, or contemplate adopting, legislation on unemployment insurance. I am further informed that the information so gathered is being submitted to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and to the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, which organizations are the principal representatives of employers and employees in this country. I therefore think the Government of Canada is to be complimented upon the sane, careful methods which it has adopted in co-operation with those most intimately concerned, and that this House, may without hesitation, give hearty approval and endorsement to that portion of the speech from the Throne which indicates the policy of the Government in connection with these two most important questions, which, if solved, will tend more to stabilize industry, promote peace, and make happy citizens than anything else that could be done.

[Mr. Harrison.]

Mr. MARIE JOSEPH DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville): Mr. Speaker, according to my judgment, the political atmosphere in which we live at present does not make very long speeches desirable, and I do not feel disposed to take up very much time in the remarks I have to make this afternoon. I intend to confine myself to one or two salient observations. Following an old and very appropriate custom, and emulating the example of these who have spoken before me, may I be permitted to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address on the able speches they delivered, which were in accordance with the best traditions of this House. It is hardly necessary, I fancy, to say that although I appreciate the oratorical ability of those two gentlemen I am very far from sharing in their appreciation of, and admiration for this Government.

If the newspapers are to be believed, the result of the election in Peterborough has thrown disorder, discomfort, and even confusion into the ranks of the Government to such an extent that we can expect anything at any time. This session may last three weeks, perhaps a month, perhaps longer; no one knows. Uncertainty is the state of mind of everybody at the present time, and I want to ask you this question, Mr. Speaker: Under present circumstances do you believe that the members of this House should have been summoned to meet here? Is this a proper time to begin session, and can we expect anything substantial as a result of our deliberations? This government apparently ignores the lessons of history. I am pretty sure that history will repeat itself, and it seems to me that it is unnecessary for one to have a very long political experience in order to foresee the general election which is inevitable in the near future. The Government say "No" to this, but to my mind their negative assertions have no signifance whatever. Laws of nature, if I may say so, are above the will and the desire of any government. There is, in the situation with which we are confronted, something that is unprecedented, and that is the unanimity of the newspapers friendly to the Government in admitting the weakness of this Administration and advising it to give up without further ado. I think that the attitude of the newspapers friendly to the Government, after the election in Peterborough, was something unique, and the weakness of this Government must be very apparent since it is freely admitted even by its best friends. Under such circumstances, there-

fore, I cannot believe that this Government will not understand at last that its duty is undoubtedly indicated. Everyone is looking for a general election, even its best friends. Let us, therefore, have an election. Let the government give up that old bluff which they have paraded on so many occasions and which certain newspapers are meanly repeating, to the effect that even the Liberal Opposition does not favour a general election at the present time.

I do not believe that there is another example in the history of this country of a government so much discredited and disliked as the present administration. But there is a reason for that. We should keep in mind the fact that this is the first time that we have had in this country a government of usurpers. This expression, I know, has frequently been used lately, but I think it is very appropriate. The Administration, so far as I can see, will go down with humiliation and it will deserve—to use the expressive popular phrase—" what is coming to it."

Let us remember under what circumstances the Unionist Government was formed. A certain group of Liberal members decided to sever their connections with their leader on account of the war because they differed with him as to the nature of the contribution that Canada should make to the conduct of the war. They joined the Government of the day. But although they retired from their party, they solemnly declared that their retirement was but temporary, and they asserted emphatically that Liberals they were and Liberals they would remain, and that as soon as the war was over they would return to their party and stand by its principles and ideals. Some of them were men of conviction and sincerity; they fulfilled their promise and came back to their party. But, Mr. Speaker, what can we say of those who concluded a permanent alliance with their new friends on the strength of nothing better or more plausible than the motto: "What we have we hold?" Are the attractions of power then so strong? The election of 1917 was held under exceptional circumstances and under abnormal conditions. It was a war-time election conducted under a war-time electoral law. The platform of the Unionist party contained only one plank, "Win the War," and that war-cry was intended to appeal to every one irrespective of political affiliations. Some special and most extraordinary laws were passed in order to give the right to vote even to foreigners and to deprive some citizens of this country of the same right. There was a special selection of electors, and the law was so framed as to permit the manipulation of ballots, and naturally that law was put into practice by means of cipher and other devices, with this result, that many of the hon. members sitting in this House are not the choice of the residents of the ridings they are supposed to represent. And I cannot give a better example, a more palpable and striking example, than the hon. gentleman who spoke before me. I have here the Canadian Parliamentary Guide and according to it these were the votes cast in the constituency of Nipissing at the last election: Harrison, 4,879 Lapierre, 6,218. About thirteen hundred votes for the hon. gentleman were found outside of the riding and he was declared elected by a majority of forty-four.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. DEMERS: Proceeding, Mr. Speaker, to consider the circumstances under which the election of 1917 was conducted, let me say that a large number of votes, especially in Ontario, were obtained under false pretences, and it seems to me that under such circumstances it is impossible for a man of ordinary intelligence not to perceive the exceptional character of such an election, its temporary character, and the necessity for another general election at the earliest possible date after the war. The Government have failed to appreciate that fact, and that is the principal reason for the unrest which exists in this country and which manifests itself at every opportunity. Mr. Speaker, there can be no relief from the situation until constitutional government is restored—that is to say as long as the people of Canada are not satisfied that they have a government which has their confidence and which is supported by a majority of regularly chosen representatives. This satisfaction the people naturally cannot obtain except through a general election.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, during his political journey throughout the country, was naturally very generous and very charitable. He described his opponents of all classes as Bolsheviki, disturbers, dangerous and disloyal elements, and indulged in other similar moderate epithets, but, Mr. Speaker, I am very sure that all those who are listening to the Prime Minister—

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. member will be kind enough to favour

the House with a quotation establishing what he has stated.

Mr. DEMERS: I have the quotation but I think the Prime Minister will admit that I have stated just about what he said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Quote from the record.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We will give the proof.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just a repetition of misrepresentation already made about a thousand times.

Mr. DEMERS: I think the Prime Minister should address his reproach to the newspapers. I am pretty sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the Prime Minister was speaking about Bolsheviki, disturbers, and all such elements, the great majority of his hearers thought he was trying to give an adequate description of the group over which he presides. Because all those who were listening to the Prime Minister knew that throughout its whole life his administration has evidenced a continued contempt for order and for constitutional rule. His administration has been, and still is, the reign of arbitrary authority. Why should we recapitulate what is well known? When I speak about the Government I am referring to the administrations from 1914 to date, without any distinction between them, because even if it is true that the visible head of the previous government has disappeared we feel that the spirit is still there and more formidable than ever since it is more intimately associated than ever with the visible head of the present Administration. Let me say in passing that nothing was less surprising to me than the appointment of the right hon. gentleman to the position of Prime Minister of Canada. It was only what we might have expected. This nomination is absolutely in accordance with the evidence of the last seven years. Nevertheless I must say that it is a nomination which is keenly resented by a large section of the people of the Dominion. Personally, when everybody is urging the necessity of unity and harmony in this country I think there could not be a worse move than the appointment to the office of Prime Minister of a man who will always be an element of division and dissension. Do not ask me why. The Prime Minister speaking about Quebec said somewhere that he had never uttered a word against that province. Would he swear to that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He would not dare to do it.

Mr. DEMERS: Let me tell the Prime Minister that in Quebec, as in other provinces, words have less importance than facts and doings; the first minister must deem us very credulous when he comes and asks the question "Who can say that I ever uttered a word against Quebec?" The Prime Minister says he never said a word against Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DEMERS: Sir, the right hon. gentleman knows that Quebec does not like him. He said so when in the province last year. How does he know that, since, according to his own conscience, there is no justification at all for the attitude of hostility towards him on the part of Quebec? Did anybody tell him that, or is it only an impression of his? Let me inform the Prime Minister that his psychological appreciation of the attitude of Quebec against him is correct, and he should be the last man to come and ask why? In my opinion such an attitude on his part is an aggravation of the offence. Let me tell him that in Quebec, while we can easily forgive and forget words, we forgive but never forget facts. At all events I am sure that I represent the sentiments of the people of that province when I say that we are waiting for an election and when the time comes the people of Quebec will do their share, in conjunction with the people of the other provinces of Canada, in overthrowing this Government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I should restrict myself to the question of the necessity of a general election, for that is the only question of interest to our people, and undoubtedly they all desire a general election.

Mr. McMASTER: Except the Government.

Mr. DEMERS: No one class of the population is satisfied with this Administration. Look at the farmers, the returned soldiers, the working men, the consumers—among one and all of them you will find the same dissatisfaction. On the restoration of peace there was necessity in this country, as in the other belligerent countries, for rigid economy and a ruthless cutting down of the expenses of administration. What happened. We entered into the policy of public ownership—proved to be disastrous

everywhere else; we became shipbuilders; we increased our military expenditure by two-thirds over what it had been under pre-war conditions; we organized a very expensive navy, without any occasion for it; and as far as the expenses of the

3 p.m. League of Nations are concerned, we are told to-day that Canada is considered one of the greatest powers of the world, and the Government is satisfied with its work. But, Mr. Speaker, what could we expect of a Government which has been acustomed to uncontrolled extravagance and waste during a period of four years and a half of warfare? This is one of the obvious reasons why the Government should have understood that it was its duty to limit its activity strictly to the purposes for which it had been chosen.

We are told that there will be an Imperial Conference in London this year. In that connection I want to ask this question: Who ever received a mandate from the people to go to that Conference and speak for Canada? And who will have the audacity to go there and speak for us?

To my mind, Sir, the Government by its continuance in office is assuming a terrible and dangerous responsibility, and I am pretty sure that when the time comes it will realize the extent of the anger of the people.

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, while listening to the hon. member who has just sat down, I could not help but feel that he was reiterating the arguments which have already been so often repeated in this debate, and if I do not follow him carefully through his speech and reply to his arguments seriatim, I hope he will excuse me, because I must content myself with dealing with them generally in answering the main arguments of the Opposition. There are a few remarks, however, made by the hon. member to which I may as well reply now. He claims that the Government should resign because the Opposition have asked them to do so. In 1918, shortly after the termination of the war, many members on the Government side of the House—and probably as many on the Opposition side—were asked by dissatisfied persons in their constituencies to resign, not because they had violated the mandate given to them by the people, but because those dissatisfied persons who had voted against them in their particular constituencies wanted them to resign. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would be recreant to the trust placed in them by the people if they should at this or any other time pay heed to such demands made by the Opposition. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) on a previous occasion, when he was taunted with leaving his party, made the statement that hon. gentlemen opposite were not the Liberal party but that the Liberal party had crossed the floor and were then supporting the Government; on account of the attitude of the Opposition during the war certain members of the Liberal party were unable to stay with them; they therefore crossed the floor and supported the Government, because the Government was pursuing a policy in relation to the war which appealed to them. And when the hon. member (Mr. Demers) says that the Liberal party is at the present time on his side of the House, he is decidedly mistaken, according to the views of the hon. gentleman who crossed over to this side in the early days of the war and supported the Government. The hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) also said that the Government was actuated by a war spirit. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition have never been actuated by that war spirit. All through the war the spirit which animated the people of this country and the people of the allied nations did not appeal to them. The motion under discussion gives a wide latitude to hon. members to express their views on many questions of great interest to the people, and I think it is desirable that they should take advantage of the opportunity. At a time when a definite political alignment is emerging from the disruption occasioned by the war. This debate is a sort of rough and tumble political scrap in which hon. members may discuss almost any question under the sun so long as it has not any connection with the speech from the Throne—that, at least, appears to be the attitude taken by hon. members opposite. The amendment introduced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is merely the negation of the motion and introduces no new issue. It is a blind alley down which hon. members of the Opposition may wander at their pleasure and forget all about the important questions mentioned in His Excellency's speech. Hon. members of the Opposition are expected to disport themselves with abandonment in the political sea, giving an occasional punch beneath the belt just for friendship's sake, and stirring up the mud from the slimy

depths in order to befog the issue as much as possible.

Before applying myself to the important questions mentioned in His Excellency's speech, I should like to offer my congratulations to the hon. gentleman who so acceptably moved the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I congratulate the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac) on the very eloquent literary contribution he made to the pages of Hansard. It does him credit, and it reflects honour upon his constituents who are responsible for his presence in this House. I trust that the hon. gentleman may survive the vicissitudes of the next election in order to come back here and tell hon. members more about the sounding sea and the thunder of its surf. I would also compliment the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) on the very excellent maiden speech which he delivered in seconding the motion. He well merits the very many complimentary remarks showered upon him by hon. members from both sides of the House. He has a clear, resonant voice and an ability to marshal his facts so that they carry conviction. He bears the impress of a polished speaker, and we welcome him here as a decided addition to the debating powers of this assembly.

I would be remiss in my duty as a member of Parliament and a Canadian did I not give some expression of my deep appreciation of the great services rendered to Canada and to the Empire by the illustrious gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who so recently relinquished the office of Prime Minister. I am one of those—and the number is large—who believe that men are raised up by Providence to guide the destinies of a people in the hour of their dire distress and danger. It was by no mere accident or blind chance that our ex-Prime Minister was returned as leader of the Government in the election of 1911. It was by no mere accident or through no blind chance that the ministry of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier appealed to the country in the mid-period of their parliamentary term in the expectation of getting a snatch victory at the polls. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not agree with me in seeing the hand of Providence in that event; they will probably say that it was an instance of the great statesmanlike powers and political foresight of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). But the ex-Prime Minister was the one man in Canada possessed of the intellectual attainments, the prophetic vision, the determination of purpose necessary to the guiding of this country through the intricacies of international diplomacy during the war. He was the one man in Canada possessed of the qualities of head and heart and body to enable him to withstand the great mental and physical strain during that conflict, to bear up under the tremendously increased burdens of state, and to stay in harness until the victory was won. I regret as much as any man can regret the disability which compelled him to retire. The Canadian people may not be willing to accord to him that measure of honour to which his great services justly entitle him, but I have confidence that the future historian, in summing up the achievements of the war, will accord to Sir Robert Borden a foremost place amongst the great statesmen of the British Empire.

Prime Ministers come and Prime Ministers go; long live our Prime Minister. I offer my heartiest congratulations to the present leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) on his elevation to the highest position in the gift of the Canadian people. He was selected on account of his personal charm and his commanding ability as a Parliamentarian. He is a real statesman and will give a good account of his stewardship to the people of this country. Since Confederation we have been blessed with good Prime Ministers. I am speaking now without regard to politics; a man's politics have nothing more to do with his attributes as a man than his religious creed has to do with his qualities as a Christian—the qualities are inherent in the man himself. The hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson and Sir Wilfrid Laurier were all men of high ideals, of great executive ability, and of unimpeachable charater. Our present Prime Minister will rank high when compared with these men; he will do honour to the Canadian people while receiving honour at their hands.

In considering the speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the many important issues mentioned there as the basis of proposed legislation at this session of Parliament. In that connection I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the speech made by the leader of the Opposition. I must say that I was disappointed in that speech; it was not worthy of the leader of a great party aspiring to the Premiership of this great country. He failed, in his two hours' fusillade delivered with the speed of

a quick-firing maxim gun, to touch upon one of the subjects mentioned in His Excellency's speech. He had no criticism to offer of the record of the Government and of the policy as laid down. Assuming that silence gives assent, we must say that the hon. leader of the Opposition is in accord with the policies and with the record of the Government.

On the first page of the speech from the Throne I find a reference to the prosperity of the Canadian people, the general unrest throughout the country and the world and the contraction of business, and also a reference to taxes. These questions are apparently of no importance to the leader of the Opposition; they sink into insignificance when compared with his own ambition to be leader of the Government. On the second page we find mention of the unemployment situation—that it is world-wide. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment at the present time—and I am speaking now with regard to my own section of the country—is no greater than it was in the winter of 1914 and in preceding winters. On account of the material prosperity which the people enjoyed during the war, most of the labour sections were able to take care of themselves out of the savings which they had laid by during that period. I am willing to admit that there are men who, through circumstances over which they had no control, have found it difficult to obtain the necessaries of life for themselves and for their families. There are others, however, who live up to all they can make, no matter how much it is; who have no idea of thrift, and who are always in want if they are not at work. A system has been instituted under which, through the assistance of local governments and municipalities, these people can get relief.

Reference is made in the speech from the Throne to the matter of unemployment insurance. I compliment the Government on its courage in bringing this question up. I look upon it as a rather dangerous question and one that must be carefully looked into. Any action taken in that regard must be surrounded by every possible safeguard. A system of unemployment insurance might be easily abused; if a good Act is not brought in, the result might be the discouragement of thrift and the encouragement of indolence. I would have thought that the leader of the Opposition, who has studied labour questions and who poses as an expert in these matters, would be able to give some useful and constructive suggestions to the Government with regard to this important question, particularly in view of the fact that he must have gained some useful information while in the United States during the period of the war, at a time when our Government was sweating blood, one might say, in an effort to save this country for future generations. But did the hon. gentleman even mention the subject? No. Mr. Speaker, it was of no importance; he brushed it aside as he would the dust from his desk. He has no interest whatever in the trials of the working people, in their efforts to gain a livelihood and to keep their wives and children in comfort during the time of unemployment.

The next question, which is a very important subject and one that must be handled with gloves, is that of Old Age Pensions, and I again compliment the Government on its courage in bringing this matter before Parliament. It must be handled carefully, as it is a subject that may be very easily abused if legislation should be enacted. There are many people who are not able to take care of themselves and who have not sufficient saved from their earnings to take care of them in their old age, so that such legislation is probably necessary, although there are other countries in which it is more necessary than in this great country of Canada where everyone has an equal chance and there is every opportunity for people to make a living and save. This question, however, is an important one; the Government is investigating it, and it will be brought before Parliament at this session.

Yet it also is brushed aside by the leader of the Opposition as a matter of no importance; it pales into insignificance when compared with his ambition to be Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada. In his speech, he said that the question of the mandate of the Government transcended in importance all other questions; that until it was settled, questions of lesser importance would need be delayed, and all the subjects mentioned in the Speech from the Throne are regarded by him as being of less importance than his personal interests. Was there ever such a statement made by a leader of the Opposition in any Parliament of the world, that he placed his personal interests above the interests of the people and the State?

Another question of great interest to the people of this country is in regard to the League of Nations. The representatives sent by Canada to the Assembly of the League have already spoken on that

question, and I wish to compliment those gentlemen upon the very excellent way in which they looked after the interests of Canada and, indeed, of the American continent. They deserve the praiseworthy remarks made of their actions by the people of the United States. They were, one might say, the spokesmen of the whole American continent; they held the name of Canada high in the councils of the world, and they gained for themselves a very enviable international reputation.

We come to the consideration of the tariff, the revision of the tariff, that question which was of so much importance last year, but which, according to my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King), is of no importance now. The leader of the Opposition, at a meeting held in Milton in August of last year, made an appeal to the people and particularly to the farmers. He mentioned on that occasion that his fiscal policy was a tariff for the producer and the consumer. I wonder if any gentleman on either side of the House can tell us what that really means. I am quite satisfied that the audience to which he was speaking in the county of Halton did not understand it. It was a statement made purposely to mislead. He had with him, in order to convey two impressions to the people, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), and everybody knows what the hon. member stands for with regard to a fiscal policy. The leader of the Opposition said:

> It is not a question of free trade or protection. It is a tariff for consumers and producers.

The leader of the Opposition intended to convey two ideas to the people of that county. Like Santa Claus at Christmas, he had something for everybody. The leader of the Opposition is the greatest political Santa Claus this country has ever had. To those people who were inclined to favour protection or low tariff, he said: "Here, you can have protection; you can have a moderate tariff; this is a tariff for consumers and producers." The hon. member for Brome could give the impression to the free traders that this meant free trade, and consequently everybody should be pleased and should vote for the hon. member for Brome and his leader. That did not quite satisfy the audience, because he was speaking to hard-headed Scotchmen, Englishmen and Irishmen by whom that county is settled, the descendants of men who came from the old land many generations ago. They were not easily carried away by the piffle which the leader of the Opposition gave them—it did not go down and it was not long afterwards that the hon. member for Brome was asked to return and explain the conditions and the position. He went to the town of Oakville, a short distance from Milton and made a speech there. That speech was not reported in the press so that I did not hear what he said; but I heard that the hon. member travelled something like 400 miles to address an audience of fifty people. My hon. friend can corroborate that, as he is in a better position than I to know whether it is true or not. I might say that the speech delivered at Milton by the leader of the Opposition was practically the same as the speeches he delivered at Newmarket and Toronto; he has it off by heart; he can stand up in this House and it will go off of its own volition. He said, speaking in Toronto on the 16th of August last:

> We have in Ottawa, as we had in this province, a Government which has undertaken to perpetuate itself in office without any reference whatever to the wishes of the people, or without permitting any expression of the popular will.

He means to say that the Government of Sir William Hearst was perpetuating itself in office without asking the will of the people. We know that he did stay a little longer in office on account of the conditions of the war, but that was by unanimous consent of both parties in the legislature. He was not using autocratic power any more than we are in Ottawa. But the leader of the Opposition continued:

> We have neither a representative Parliament nor a responsible Government. We have an autocratic executive usurping authority, exercising political control, regardless alike of constitutional procedure and the first principles of Government in a free and self-governing country.

I think few men in the Dominion of Canada will deny that Canada is a free and self-governing country, and there are in the Dominion not many men who will say to-day that the present Government is exercising autocratic power. That is something that exists only in the mind of the leader of the Opposition and his followers, and they have reiterated it so often that they have commenced to believe it. The leader of the Opposition, in stating his position with regard to the resignation of the Government, did so with such vehemence and show of indignation that I was almost persuaded that he meant what he said, but in listening to his followers afterwards I came to the conclusion that he was not sincere in his demand.

Why should he be? At Milton he made an appeal to the farmers and frankly stated: We, myself and the Liberal party, cannot possibly defeat this Government, and we ask an alliance with the farmers, the labour men and the returned soldiers to assist us in turning out this Government. Mr. Speaker, what would an alliance with the Agrarian party mean? The leader of the Opposition has a tariff for the producer and the consumer, and if he goes to the country he has no hope of returning here with a majority sufficient to enable him to carry on without the support of the Agrarian party to his left. What would that mean? Would it mean that if the leader of the Opposition became the leader of the Government we would have a tariff for the producer and the consumer? If he has the assistance of the Agrarian group in forming a government in order to carry on, it will mean free trade, nothing more or less. He would be compelled to accede to the wishes of the leader of the Agrarian party, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), who is frankly an out-and-out free trader.

I do not think the hon. gentleman will deny it. I do not see him in the House at this moment, but I have here a couple of clippings from speeches he made in the West, which I think will be quite conclusive that he is a free trader. Speaking at a convention of the United Farmers of Alberta on January 26, 1920, he is reported by the Grain Growers' Guide of February 11, 1920, to have said (pp. 56-59):

> Now the farmers of this country, by pronouncing upon the questions, have stated their belief that the principle of protection is not only economically unsound but morally indefensible, is it not time we were considering a change in regard to it?

Then in his speech of November 19, 1919, as reported in the issue of the Regina Leader of November 20, Mr. Crerar said:

> If people want to wear diamonds and silks and have the money for it, at this stage of our country's advancement, I have no objection to it, but I do say this: that if we tax them with a customs tariff we must levy an excise tax on the home manufacturers. I would absolutely root out the principle of protection in our customs tariff.

Surely the leader of the Agrarian party will not deny what he said on those two occasions. He is frankly a free trader, and if the leader of the Opposition is returned without sufficient majority to carry on, and must depend upon the support given him by the Agrarian group to form a government, we must have free trade. The hon. member for Marquette could not possibly deny the western provinces what they have been asking for, and the policy upon which they have returned him to this House. If he did, he would betray the farmers of the West, he would lose his position in the Grain Growers Grain Company, and would have to withdraw himself from the political life of Canada forever. So he would stand firmly by the principle of free trade, and the leader of the Opposition is paving the way by which he can grant free trade to this country if such a condition should arise. He wants to be able to say to the people of Canada: I have carried out my pre-election promises. Did I not tell you it would be a tariff for the consumer and the producer? Of course, that is a free trade tariff.

The leader of the Opposition has taken a good deal of comfort out of the results of the by-election in West Peterborough. I might say he has been cackling over that one victory like a chicken over its first egg. Was there ever such an egg. Was there ever such a victory? The hon. gentleman's supporter who was elected in West Peterborough is not yet in this House, but he will come here as a minority candidate. He was elected by about one-third of the vote of that constituency. If that election tells us anything, it tells us of the futility of the multiplicity of candidates and of what I might call the group system of government. Otherwise it tells us practically nothing. The Government had a majority of the votes cast in endorsation of their fiscal policy, but the leader of the Opposition says that that was not an issue in that election or in any other by-election. He says that the only issue is the mandate of the Government.

At nearly all the meetings the leader of the Opposition has addressed throughout the Dominion, he has dwelt very much upon what you might call his Liberalism. It is almost a religious faith with the hon. gentleman. He harps back to the old days of Liberalism many years ago, when Liberalism really meant something, when it really had some principles behind it; but it has no principles behind it to-day under the leadership of the hon. gentleman. He has evidently forgotten that the principles of Liberalism which he announces to-day in this House are nothing else but a moth-eaten bunch of contradictions, inconsistencies, and deceit. The hon. gentleman has really missed his calling. He might pose as a first-class actor in a dime museum. He

could pose with a wig and beard as Ananias, and if he poses as well as he acts the part, he will be a success.

The Liberals on this side of the House did not leave their party; they took their party with them when they crossed the floor. On more than one occasion the Liberals on this side of the House have been invited to recross the floor and take up their old allegiance. We had an invitation a few days ago from the hon. member for Brome, handed out in a fine manner. That versatile gentleman can do it very well indeed. Then, in 1918, we had an invitation from the leader of the Opposition of that day (Mr. McKenzie), when he announced to this House and to the followers who had wandered away from the camp that the light was in the window and the latch string on the outside of the door. That light, Mr. Speaker, may be designated the light that failed.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): A good many came back.

Mr. ANDERSON: One or two political moths were attracted by the light, but the great majority of the Liberal Unionists who seceded from this side of the House have camped upon the trail uncertain whether to proceed or build a shack of their own. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) now looks very critically at the meagre fare spread in the Liberal kitchen, and has decided along with his followers to stay where they are until their own provisions are exhausted. They may then gradually go on into the Liberal camp.

The "mandate of the Government." It was the great theme of the address of the leader of the Opposition. What is a mandate anyway? Is it something you can eat that it should be exhausted so soon? The members of the Opposition must be famishing for something from the Government benches or they would not ask the question so often and reiterate it over and over again. There is constitutional authority for the conduct of this Government. If you consult the British North America Act of 1867 you will find, in section 50, ample constitutional authority for this or any other Government of this Dominion of Canada to take charge of the affairs of the country for a period of five years unless previously dissolved by the Governor-General. That is the only clause with regard to the constitutional authority of Parliament to sit for five years. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) mentioned in his speech in Toronto that if there was constitutional authority for the Government of 1911 to proceed to the country, the same authority could now be invoked by this Government. Any one will admit that; but there was no necessity for the Government of 1911 to go to the country; they were not compelled to do so. They went of their own volition, thinking they would secure a record vote from the people. But the people did not support them in their contention; they voted strongly against them at the time, showing clearly that they did not look favourably upon the policy which the government was then advocating.

In section 51, sub-section 5, it is provided that every ten years a census shall be taken and a redistribution made every decade after the year 1871, which redistribution shall be made by the Parliament then constituted and shall take effect when the term of that Parliament expires. If the leader of the Government should accede to the demand of the Opposition and go to the country at this time, redistribution could not take place before the expiration of the term of the Parliament then elected and would consequently be delayed for five years. As the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has so well pointed out, representation would then be denied the people in Western Canada and in such other territories where they are entitled to greater representation than they have at present.

Any Government that could be guilty of such an act and return here in violation of the principles of the British North America Act would, in very truth, be usurpers. It would be an autocratic act to prevent the people of Western and Eastern Canada from securing until the expiration of five years, after the date of the following election, the greater representation to which they are entitled. I do not believe that the leader of the Opposition can be sincere in his declarations; otherwise he would not take such a stand. If it should happen that the Government were forced to the country by the Opposition, the papers in Canada would not care to print what the Western people would say, for it would not be printable.

Now, with regard to the question of mandates. If the Government has a mandate, then the individual members of parliament have mandates also. In 1917 every member elected to support the Government had a mandate from the people to support the Unionist Administration not only during the

war but until the termination of the parliamentary period. Undoubtedly, the war was the main issue. There is no denying that fact. But it is news to me to hear the leader of the Opposition state that when the war was over it was incumbent on the Government to go to the country. I fought in that election, and I never heard the statement made, nor did it ever occur to me, that I was elected only for the period of the war. No one knew how long the war would last; no one knew how soon it would be concluded victoriously to the allies; and it was therefore absolutely impossible to say that the people of the country intended that the Government should hold office only for the period of the war. Nothing was further from their minds than such a supposition.

A mandate from the people is a command to do something; it is an order from the people for the Government to carry out its platform submitted to them. This Government has proceeded to do so, and to bring to fruition all the aims and objectives outlined in their platform; and I doubt whether there ever was a Government at Ottawa that more faithfully performed its duty in that respect. As I have said, every individual member elected to support the Unionist party had a mandate from his constituency to support the Government so long as it remained in office.

Hon. gentlemen who have seceded from this side and gone across the floor could take only one honourable stand. When they did not see eye to eye with their constituents, when they decided to abandon their allegiance to the present Government and cross to the side benches, they should have resigned their seats and obtained a new mandate from the people. They are the ones that are betraying the people, and not the Government. The hon. member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar) was the greatest sinner in this respect. He practically started a trek across the road, and it was his duty, as leader of the Agrarian party, to go back to his constituents and ask them for a new mandate, and confirmation of the position he has taken as leader of that party across the floor.

What does the Liberal party care for mandates? Let us go back to the election of 1896. The late Laurier administration, on the issue of tariff for revenue only, appealed to the people of Canada from one end of the country to the other and circularized them continuously throughout the election for support on that issue, promising that if they were returned to power they would abolish the protective policy and give to the people a tariff for revenue purposes only. They were elected on that issue; they received a mandate from the people to put that policy into effect. Did they do so? Mr. Speaker, history tells us that they did not; nevertheless they did not resign. Did they receive any mandate from the people of Canada to keep a protective policy in force in this country? They did not; yet in spite of that they remained in office for fifteen years, violating the first principles, according to their own views, of democratic institutions. And now they have the temerity to charge this Government, which is carrying out faithfully and fully its mandate received from the people, with usurpation of democratic power.

The hon. members of the Opposition have a great respect for the memory of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier; so have I. I regarded him as a great Canadian, a great statesman, and a man of unimpeachable character; and I think that what he said should have had some influence on the opinions of Opposition members with regard to the attitude they took in 1896. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who is in his seat to-day, was Finance Minister of that Government and received a mandate from the people to wipe out the protective principle from the statute books and instead to institute a tariff for revenue only. But he refused to carry out the pledge of his party; he denied to the people the right they claimed and kept the protective policy in force.

Why did the hon. gentleman do so? With other members of the Government who were in office at that time he sounded the manufacturing interests, what are called the "big interests," and found that they would not stand for a reduction of the tariff. The then leader of the Government, with whom was associated the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) accordingly capitulated to those "big interests." And yet these hon. gentlemen have the audacity to say to-day that the present Government is controlled by the same big interests. Mr. Speaker, it is the greatest piffle that has ever been uttered in this House, and I am surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite occupying so much time in dilating upon such petty issues. They have been raising a clamour all through the country and during the present debate on

this question. Of course, we have always had clamourers but we should not take them too seriously. In 1833 there were such clamourers and, speaking in the Senate of the United States, Daniel Webster referred to them as follows:

> There are persons who constantly clamor. They complain of oppression, and pernicious influence of accumulated wealth. They cry out loudly against all banks and corporations and all means by which small capitalists become united in order to produce important and beneficial results. They carry on a mad hostility against all established institutions. They would choke the fountain of industry and dry all streams. In a country of unbounded liberty they clamor against oppression. In a country of perfect equality, they would move heaven and earth against privilege and monopoly. In a country where property is more evenly divided than anywhere else, they rend the air shouting agrarian doctrines. In a country where wages are high beyond parallel, they would teach the laborer that he is but an oppressed slave.

That was the dictum of Daniel Webster in 1833. We have such clamourers in the Dominion to-day and we will have them so long as Canada is in existence. In the course of time we shall have forgotten the clamourers of 1920 and 1921, but we will always remember those sane Canadians who stood firm in support of constituted authority and of a progressive administration of public affairs in the Dominion. The leader of the Opposition has the audacity to ask the Prime Minister by what right and by what warrant he intends to rule this country. I tell him that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet are ruling Canada by the warrant of the loyal Canadian citizens who stood faithfully by their country and fought for it day and night throughout four and a half years of the most stupendous conflict in the history of the world. By virtue of that right and that warrant they are entitled to the support of every man in this House, and they are entitled to the support of Canadians who stood shoulder to shoulder with the Government in conserving Canada to Canadians in order that the leader of the Opposition might have a country to come back to and that he might have the opportunity to assist in advancing the progress of this country throughout the years of peace which we hope are ahead of us.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker—

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Would the hon. gentleman permit me, please, for a moment? If the present time would be agreeable to the leader of the Opposition, I would like now to return to the order of Motions, with the consent of the House, so that we might take up the motion of which I gave notice on Tuesday. It occurred to me that possibly my hon. friend would otherwise take up the time between now and six o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it would be proper for the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agree to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move the Motion of which I gave notice on Tuesday, to the effect that the Order of the House making the debate on the Address the exclusive duty of the House until disposed of be varied to the extent of permitting Bill No. 2 to be proceeded with by this House to a conclusion. I have already given the House the reasons why I make this motion. The necessity for this Bill being proceeded with is to enable its provisions to take effect in time to be put into operation so that it may be possible for the referendum to be held in Ontario on the date fixed, and obviate any further necessity of its postponement. I want to explain, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that this could only be gone on with, under the rules, by unanimous consent, but the leader of the Opposition not having seen his way, when I spoke to him last Friday to assure unanimous consent, I took the precaution to move to vary the rule. Consequently, I simply appear before the House asking that the Rule be varied by the will of the majority.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: As my right hon. friend has said, the purpose of his motion is to enable the Government to proceed with the Bill which has come to this House from the Senate providing for an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act, 1919, so as to permit a referendum to be taken in the province of Ontario in the course of the next month or two at a less cost than would be involved if the vote were to be taken under the Elections Act as it stands at present. I think I am right in saying that if this Bill, which has come to us from the Senate, were not carried, its failure to pass would not prevent the referendum being taken; it would not lead, as my right hon. friend

intimated on Monday, to the disfranchisement of any person in the matter of that referendum, nor would it necessarily involve any delay in the taking of the referendum. All that it would involve would be an additional expense of some $300,000 in the cost of the preparation of the necessary lists.

As I interpret the circumstance it means that, through the lack of foresight on the part of the Government last session in anticipating a possibility of this kind, if the Bill does not pass the country will have to suffer an additional expense of $300,000. Now it is certainly not the desire of any of us on this side of the House to cause the public to suffer any additional burden of taxation through neglect on the part of the Administration, and, as I see it, that would be the only effect of our refusing to permit the Government to make the change desired in a matter of procedure.

There might be one other consequence. Our action in refusing to make the change suggested would be deliberately misinterpreted throughout the country; the people would be led to believe that in some way the Opposition were averse to allowing an expression of opinion within a certain time on a matter of public interest. We certainly desire to give every opportunity for an expression of opinion to any part of the community on a matter of public interest. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to oppose this resolution.

One point that I wish to make perfectly clear, however, is this: We would not for one moment consent to the motion of my right hon. friend if in any way our action in so doing were likely to be interpreted as being prejudicial to the force of the amendment that is before the House at the present time, and which declares want of confidence in the Government as the view held by hon. gentlemen sitting on this side. With the distinct understanding, therefore, that our action in consenting to allow my right hon. friend to proceed will not in any way be construed, either in the House or out of it, as prejudicing the force of the motion of want of confidence in the Government which is now before the Chamber I am quite agreeable that my right hon. friend's motion shall pass.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to say a word anent the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition before the motion carries, Mr. Speaker. I thought I had made it very clear when I first moved the motion that the reason the motion intervenes and that this Bill is necessary is not because the previous Act was insufficient in the circumstances, but that until at the very eve of the passing of the Act or just afterwards it had not been called to the attention of the Government that were a plebiscite to be held in the year 1920 there would be this extensive disfranchisement of the soldiers. It is because that circumstance was brought to the attention of the Government, and for that reason alone, that the postponement took place, and it is in order to save expense in providing a new list that this Bill is introduced. There is nothing extraordinary about it at all.

I understand that the leader of the Opposition asks from me a covenant that his acceding to this motion—which, by the way is not necessary, unless his acceding to it would be required to obtain a majority of Parliament, which I think far from likely—shall not be construed as detracting from the force of the amendment now being pressed by the Opposition. I have never been able to see how his acceding to this motion could affect the force of the amendment—if it has any force. Certainly I do not intend to use it as detracting from the force of the amendment because I do not think it does detract, and, in fact, I never thought the amendment had very much force to begin with. We all know why the amendment was moved, and I do not think the country is going to be misled because we now interrupt the proceedings to take care of some useful matter of legislation. The country is not going to be misled by that consideration from fully grasping what the entire idea of the amendment before the House is, namely, to try to group a body of different opinions which cannot be grouped except under an amendment that calls for their being in power instead of us.

Hon. W. S. FEILDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, the intimation of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) that the Government rushed the Franchise Bill through last session without knowing what they were doing is one which we should all be ready to accept. There is a point, however, to which I would like to draw attention. If this is a purely formal, non-contentious matter, I do not see any reason why we should not allow the motion to be made, although it is a very unusual departure from the customary procedure. But I notice in the morning papers a telegram from Toronto—and I may say that I have no interest in the Bill one way or the other—that the Bill which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) is intro-

4 p.m.

ducing, is objected to by the temperance people of the country. If we are going to set aside the debate on the address to start a wrangle on this Bill, I question the wisdom of such a course; but if the Bill is purely non-contentious, I quite see the reason for making good the blunders of my right hon. friend, and we are ready to do so.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Hugh Guthrie (Solicitor General) Bill No. 2 to amend the Dominion Elections Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Ontario: Canada Temperance Act vote:

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think, Mr. Chairman, before you take up the sub-sections I will ask that the Committee do now rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow, I take this course because an amendment will have to be made to the Bill as it has passed the Senate, this amendment being requested by the various parties interested, and I think they are all agreed upon it.

Mr. BUREAU: By whom?

Mr. GUTHRIE: By the parties who are asking that the amendment should be made.

Mr. BUREAU: What parties?

Mr. GUTHRIE: One is the Ontario Referendum Committee, the other is the Liberty League; I think those are the only two. I believe the amendment that they propose is merely one which goes to the appointment of scrutineers, and there will be agreement on it; but the amendment has not yet been received by me, and I would therefore ask that the Committee now report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Progress reported.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH ADDRESS IN REPLY

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McIsaac, for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and on the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, a regretful occurrence, whereby the courteous words uttered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) last Thursday were met by something akin to an impertinence on the part of the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) precludes me from congratulating him on his attainment to high offices lest I should be willing to take the risk of being the subject of a similar sharpness.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am happy, however, to offer my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address for the most interesting speeches they have delivered. Indeed, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) upon the lofty remarks he made regarding unity and harmony in this country. The hon. gentleman evidently felt that it was the least he was bound to say, since the Prime Minister, who declares on every platform that he has a new love for Quebec and the French speaking people, had seen fit to deviate this year from the usual custom of having the reply to the Address seconded in the French language. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that time will not permit me to answer the funeral oration that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) has delivered on the already cold body of the Government, but I should like to correct a remark made by my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Harrison) regarding the pensions of the Grand Trunk employees. My hon. friend, if I understood him aright, tried to cast an aspersion on the sincerity of the hon. the leader of the Opposition regarding those employees. My hon. friend is to-day much more deeply concerned about the welfare of the Grand Trunk employees than he was when the Grand Trunk legislation was passed and when the hon. the leader of the Opposition presented a motion with regard to the Grand Trunk bill in the following terms:

> That this Bill be not now read a third time but that it be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by adding the following section:
>
> Any right or interest of any employee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company existing in the pensions fund prior to the strike of the Company's employees which occurred in July, 1910, is hereby declared not to have been affected by such strike or any circumstance or condition arising out of or in connection therewith.

This motion was presented to the House on Friday, April 23, 1920. In looking over the list of members who voted I fail to see the name of the hon. member for Nipissing. If I remember well, instead of voting for the employees of the Grand Trunk on that

occasion, he did the aeroplane act and flew out of the room.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, sins by omission. True it contains a somewhat clumsy attempt on the part of the adviser to His Excellency to draw into this debate the question of the tariff, which should be discussed when the Budget speech is brought down. But it is so clear a repetition of the campaign of the Prime Minister last fall in an effort to becloud the real issue before the people—that is, whether or not this Government has the right to remain in office—it is so clear an attempt to prevent discussion on most momentous questions that I was not surprised to see in the Speech from the Throne a reference to the tariff. The word is: "Shut off all discussion on perilous questions, and becloud the issue as was done in 1911 and in 1917." But, as we say in French, the hon. Prime Minister "a compté sans ses hôtes."

The amendment to the Address calls for a dissolution of the House. I should only be repeating arguments that have already been brought before the House by previous speakers were I to read articles which were written or cite speeches which were made during the election of 1917 to prove that at that time there was only one issue before the people, the question of the conduct of the war, that all other important questions were put aside for the moment, and that whenever we tried to discuss them with the electors in our different constituencies, this same answer came every time: "This is not the time to discuss these questions. This is a war election, and when the war is over the Government will resign and go to the country and we will then discuss all these important questions in the interests of the people.' I may be permitted however, Mr. Speaker, to quote a brief extract from an article published in that now famous paper known as "Knots and Lashings," supervised by the Government, in its issue of December 15, 1917. I read:

> There is one and only one election issue to be considered: shall we send reinforcements to the Front? If we shall aid our comrades, vote Union. If we shall desert our comrades, vote another way. The coming election is unique in two respects. It is being fought upon one issue, and one only,—that of compulsory service by the selective draft system. There are no other issues, because no other issue is big enough to intrude itself or be forced upon the consideration of men who are called upon to determine whether Canada is to hold her share of the line or drop out.

Sir, this was published in that most famous paper, which gave precise instructions to the men as to how they could perjure themselves and at the same time escape, through the good offices of a benevolent commissioner, the gaol penalty.

I will also deal, after referring to the omissions in the Speech from the Throne, with the—what shall I call it?—"please come-to-my-rescue" attitude of the Government towards Quebec, and I shall apply lightly—oh, very lightly, Mr. Speaker—the sterilized tweezers to the abscess which last Thursday came to a head in this House, burst, spurted out, and splashed the high ethics of parliamentary decency and the victim himself.

What are the issues which are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne but which are of momentous interest to the House and to the country, and on which the Government never had any mandate to decide policies? First, there is the railway problem. Then there is the question of the government-owned merchant marine. Then there is the Imperial Conference which is to be held in London next June. There is also the question of loans to bankrupt countries. These are momentous questions, which every one will admit were not discussed during the elections of 1917 and on which the Government has policies which were not determined, were not even presented or discussed with the people at that time. The Government has inaugurated most definite and novel policies on most of these questions, for the determination of which they have no mandate; nevertheless there is not a line about these matters in the speech from the Throne.

Take the railway policy for example. No one will deny that the railway question in this country is a most important one. No one will deny that prior to 1917, when the Canadian Northern Railway deal was being put through, and in 1919, when the Grand Trunk deal was put through, the policy of the Canadian people with regard to railways was private ownership. Can any hon. gentleman say that this question was discussed before the electorate? Can any hon. gentleman say that this Government went before the people in 1917, with the statement that they had decided to change from the time-immemorial Canadian Railway policy of private ownership to nationalization? Simply to ask the question is to get the answer that the Government had no mandate to determine such a policy.

I remember attempting to discuss this question of the Canadian Northern with a Liberal of my riding who expressed his regret that, for the first time in his life, he had to give a vote against Sir Wilfrid Laurier: He said to me, "I am against this Government on practically every measure that they have brought into the House; I do not accept their policy; I blame them for many things; I blame them, for instance, in connection with the question of nationalization of railways. But," he said, "there is only one question, the question of conscription"—and I wish you, Sir, to consider this remark—"and do you think that men like Mr. Carvell, Mr. Maclean and Mr. Guthrie who in Parliament have been bitterly opposed to nationalization of railways, would have entered the Union Government if this question could have been settled by the Union Government? "No," he told me, "these men entered the Union Government for the purpose of winning the war because they thought conscription was the best policy; but they are going to resign as soon as the war is over, because we have the promise from the Government that the Union Government was formed only during the time of the war; they will go to the people; they will discuss all these questions, and I shall be very happy to join again the ranks of the Liberal party."

Practically every country in the world has tried the policy of nationalization of railways and has discarded it. It would be tedious to the House if I were to read articles coming from different countries showing the utter failure of nationalization of railways; but may I be permitted to read just a few lines from the annual report of the president of our greatest financial institution, the Bank of Montreal? I quote the words of Sir Vincent Meredith:

> Canada to-day has a very large national railway system which is being operated at a heavy loss, thereby increasing the load on an already heavily taxburdened country. Sooner or later some means must be found to relieve this situation. Some confidently believe that by proper public administration of the lines, deficits can be cut down. My own view is that the proper solution will be found if the Government at the earliest feasible time, divests itself of ownership and operation of the roads and places them under corporate control upon terms fair to the country and upon conditions that will ensure the service for which the construction of the lines was undertaken.

Then there is the question of the Government-owned merchant marine. Can the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) state to the House that in 1917 when he ran in St. Lawrence, he discussed the question of a government-owned merchant marine with his electors? Can he say that he was elected on a policy of a government-owned merchant marine? I know that he cannot and he will admit that it was an entirely new departure from the usual and time-immemorial policy of the Canadian Government. Private ownership of merchant marine was the ordinary policy, and this is a new and novel policy. Has the Government then any mandate to go on and spend, as they did last year, $70,000,000 and to give contracts without tenders? Can any hon. member say that the Government has a mandate for such a policy? I will cite the opinion of the same gentleman, Sir Vincent Meredith, in the same annual report of the 7th December, 1920, regarding this policy:

> In the same connection, and speaking for myself alone, it would apepar desirable that no more national expenditure should be made for the building of ships. While a programme of shipbuilding during the war was commendable, subsequent developments dictate a modified policy. In June, 1914, the world tonnage totalled 49,000,000 tons; in June, 1920, it had risen to 57,300,000 tons, and, in addition, at the end of September this year there were 7,565,000 tons under construction. Tonnage at present exceeds requirements and in expectation of rate reduction and shrinkage in earnings, construction abroad has already been arrested, and empty tonnage is now laid up in many ports. There is no ground for the belief that this condition will quickly pass. The United States recently failed to secure bids for standard ships; Japan has cancelled orders for 1,000,000 tons in her own shipyards, and Norway is cancelling orders in Great Britain. These factors constitute, in my opinion, a danger signal that Canada might well heed and stop all further new construction.

Still, we read in the press that not later than a month or two months ago new Government ships were launched.

I come to another question which, in my opinion, is of paramount interest and of which also not a word was said in the speech from the Throne. There is to be held in London next June an Imperial Conference to which all the Prime Ministers of the Dominions have been invited and at which the internal as well as the external policy of the Empire is going to be discussed and decided. In the speech from the Throne at the opening of the British Parliament, His Majesty the King hoped that the conference would be "of the utmost value in bringing about co-ordination both in the external and the internal policy of the Empire." In a recent speech before the English-speaking

union, Mr. Winston Churchill, the new minister for the colonies, referring to that conference, stated "that an effective policy regarding Ireland, Egypt, and India will be discussed."

Why, Sir, not later than the 16th of February, this present month, the Prime Minister of England in his opening speech in Parliament, spoke of the intended conference and about the Dominions taking a share in the defence of the Empire. He also announced a far-reaching change in Imperial relations. Only last summer, a distinguished visitor from Great Britain inquired of some newspaper men whether in the case of a rebellion in India, Canada would be ready to send troops. What is the policy of the Government on these matters? What is that far-reaching change that is foreshadowed in Imperial relations? Is it possible that when His Majesty the King deems it important enough to be referred to in the speech from the Throne, when the Prime Minister of England thinks it important enough to mention in his opening speech in Parliament, and when a high official coming to this country from England speaks of this conference, and the possibility of Canada sending troops to India, that the Prime Minister of this country thinks it so negligible a matter as not to interest the people of Canada.

What is the mandate that was given to the members of the Government on this question? We would like to know the policy of our delegates. We have had very commendable delegates, it is true, men of talent who have done honour to Canada, but they went to these conferences in Europe without telling the representatives of the people in Parliament what would be their policy, and without even asking the members of Parliament to determine a policy upon which they would stand. We had a very significant example of this state of affairs only recently when the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), before the League of Nations, proposed as an amendment to the League of Nations exactly what the Opposition proposed in the House, and which was voted down by the Government supporters. Then, Sir, I ask is it not fair to dissolve the House and formulate a policy on this most important question and let the people decide whether or not this policy is incompatible with Canadian interests.

I may be asked where I stand on this matter. I will be very frank and brief. I want the delegates not to deviate from the principle that under all circumstances no matter that they may be, Canada's interests shall be first and foremost at all times.

Sir, through the will of Providence, we descendants of France became British subjects. Nature itself forbids us to deny the blood which flows in our veins. We have preserved for our old motherland a filial love, a deep affection that will only die with the race itself. It is the same love which I find amongst my English-speaking compatriots for the country of their origin. As I said before, through circumstances we became British subjects, and as such we enjoy important privileges and liberties. It is our duty and our interest to have for Great Britain a loyal and devoted respect, but although we have that respect and that loyalty nobody can reasonably expect from us towards Great Britain and the Empire the same love born of the ties of kinship that is embedded in the hearts of our English-speaking compatriots; although we piously preserve for old France a deep affection, although we have a great respect and loyalty and devotion for England, there is another country which we love more, nay, a hundred times more than England or France, a country which deserves to occupy first place in the hearts of every true Canadian. It is my only country; it is the country in whose sacred soil seven generations of my ancestors are sleeping their last slumber; it is that vast half continent bordered by three oceans, broad enough for every race and every creed, sprinkled with silver lakes and rivers, containing in its bossom inexhaustible wealth, covered by verdant mountains and golden prairies, and draping itself in winter with a vast ermine cloak. I love that country more than France or England, and you, Mr. Speaker, like me, must notice a deep feeling grip hold of your throat when its blessed name flows from your lips—it is le Canada, mon pays, mes amours.

Sir, there is another question on which this Government has no mandate, a question which was never discussed during the elections of 1917. It is the question of the Purchasing Commission. Sir, in olden days ministers were courageous enough to take the responsibility of the management of their departments, but now, purchasing has been turned over to an irresponsible commission. It was created during the war, I understand, and probably was very useful during the war, but, of course, this policy was not discussed in the election of 1917. Was it ever approved by the people?

Was it even approved by the members of this House? If I remember well, the Bill, as my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) stated the other day, was introduced in the House in 1919, and it was killed, the hon. member who made the most aggressive attack on the Bill being a supporter of the Government, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart). It was reintroduced by another minister last year, but in face of impending disaster the sponge was thrown into the ring, and the Bill died a peaceful death. But the new Prime Minister, who claims to be a democratic Prime Minister, willing to submit to the will of the people and of the members of Parliament, if I am not mistaken, passed an order-in-council reviving the Commission, in utter disregard of the will of the people and the members of Parliament. Surely, the Government will not contend that they have a mandate to follow this new policy of shifting the responsibility for purchasing from the shoulders of the ministers of the different departments on to the shoulders of an irresponsible commission.

I could enumerate many other things of which there was no discussion in 1917 and for which the Government has no mandate. But let me come immediately to a matter in regard to which everyone will admit without the slightest hesitation that the Government has not even the semblance of a mandate. I refer to the love-making to Quebec. Anyone familiar with the appeals that were made in 1917 at the last general election will readily admit that not only was the Government not given a mandate to make love to Quebec, but that, on the contrary, those who voted for the Government gave them a specific mandate to ostracise Quebec; and now they are changing their policy and, I must say, are proving wholly false to their trust when they court Quebec.

Why, Sir, the rallying cry of 1917 was this: "Shall Quebec rule? Down with Quebec!" and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and even in the trenches in France and at social teas in London, wherever a large vote was gathered, this was the slogan: "A vote for Laurier and for the Liberal party is a vote for Quebec and domination by Quebec." Impartial history will one day record that that same slanderous slogan had as much effect upon the electors as the other slogan with which it was coupled, namely, of winning the war. The Government has no mandate, I say, to make love to Quebec.

But it may be interesting to note and to speak for a while about the sudden affection, this newly-born love for my old province. In 1917 Quebec was a hindrance to Confederation: it was the contaminated black sheep of the family of this Dominion, which every other child was admonished and warned to shun; it was the backward, the ignorant, the outcast, the prejudiced, the priest-ridden province: I do not dare repeat the insults that were hurled at Quebec at that time, because if I did so I should be unparliamentary. Anyone who dared at that time to have intercourse with the Province of Quebec was banned from loyal and decent society. Quebec had to be isolated. But now, Sir, what do we see? The same papers that published these insults—I might say the same political stars who uttered these insults, and all these newspapers and public men that united in villifying her, cannot now find eulogies enough to extol Quebec's sane morals and institutions, and her sane love for law and order; and they even go so far as to concede that Quebec will be the last refuge of civilization in America, praying that she do not remain isolated from the rest of Canada.

What has happened? Has Quebec changed? Is she not the same province, the same law-abiding province, the same in heart and mentality, the same in her institutions as well as in her modus vivendi? No, Sir, Quebec has not changed: She is the same Quebec of 1917, of 1867, of 1840, of 1759, and of 1642. She has the same habits, the same institutions, the same religious love for law and order, the same respect for her devoted clergy. And she goes along topping the other provinces in agriculture, in industry, in social advancement, in increase in population, in absence of unrest, following the destiny God has laid down for her, and undisturbed by the social unrest around her. And as Quebec believes in the principle that insults and compliments are alike always exaggerated, she is not any more over-joyed now by the incense of flattery of which she is the recipient, than she was over-awed or over-excited by the mud that was slung at her in 1917.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you will probably ask me, if Quebec has not changed, whether the Government has changed. No, Sir. It is the same Tory administration with the same policy, and with the same friends, many of them still living, and with the same slanderers as in 1917. The bottom

of their hearts, or what they have in the place where their hearts should be, is still the same. Well, how is the situation to be explained if the Government has not changed and if Quebec is the same as she always was? Sir, the circumstances have changed. A new party has arisen in the country. That new party is not very friendly to the Government, and in order to retain power an alliance must be made with Quebec. So the orders have been given—tactical orders, I must say—to the slanderer and the fire-brand not to put any more coal on the fire, to close the dampers, to open the doors of the furnace and cover the fire with ashes for a while. But, Mr. Speaker, you can believe me, the fire is not altogether out, and if the Government found it necessary to stir it again in order to win an election, there is not an hon. member who would say that they would hesitate for a moment to open the dampers, to shut the doors again, to shake the furnace anew and to feed the fire with more coal. But, Sir, my province's motto is "Je me souviens"—I remember. Quebec will forgive; her religion obliges her to do so; but Quebec will not easily forget. On the contrary, she will remember. She will remember those who have slandered and insulted her as well as she will remember the stalwart English-speaking Liberals of the other provinces who stood by her in her hour of trial.

Some people say that we are isolated. From whom are we isolated? We are isolated from the Government. It surprised me the other day on reading an address from the Prime Minister to see that he had deplored the isolation of Quebec. If the Prime Minister were now in his seat I would simply ask him this: If he is in earnest in his desire to stop the isolation of Quebec, let him dissolve the House and bring on a general election. He would then find out that it is not Quebec but the Government that is isolated. Why, Sir, if we were to respond to the appeal of the Government, if we were to make an alliance with them, we would be isolated for the rest of our lives; we would be isolated as soon as the next election took place. The journals and public men of my province do not admit that we are isolated but in this connection it may be of interest to read an extract from an editorial published in the Toronto Globe of 11th September, 1920. The caption is "Office is not the true bond," and it goes on to say:

> It is the Government that is isolated from Canada. It has lost touch, not only with Quebec, but with the greater part of Canada. The temporary isolation of Quebec, due to causes which need not here be considered, is coming to an end and may almost be said to have disappeared. There is no fear of permanent isolation. French-Canadians can very well afford to wait.

The young French-Canadian when he goes to school reads a little book. It is a very interesting little book and very easy for a young mind to read, but at the same time very literary. The work has already been cited in this House this session. I refer to the Fables of Lafontaine. That work contains more philosophy than other books written by the great philosophers of all time. There are two fables in it which are particularly interesting. There is first the fable of the goat and the fox, and then there is the fable of the wolf and the stork. If I might give a resume in a few words, of the fable of the goat and the fox it is this: A goat and a fox were travelling in company. They had walked for quite a while and had developed a very strong thirst. Of course they were not in Ontario. When they came to a well they looked down into it and found that it was very deep. Nevertheless they were so thirsty they went down the well and after having satisfied their thirst they looked up and noticed its height. The fox saw that he could not reach the top without assistance, so turning to the goat he said, "You are a pretty big fellow, and with your front legs you can probably reach the top of the well. Why don't you put your front legs on the top of the well? Then I will run up your back, and when I am at the top I will pull you up;" and the goat believed him. The fox ran up the back of the goat and when he was up of course he could not pull the goat out but he made a speech. He made a speech to the goat on isolation. He said he was very, very sorry that the poor goat had got isolated at the bottom of the well and he spoke about the virtue of patience and resignation. Well, Sir, Quebec will not be the goat that will enable the foxy Prime Minister to run up its back to get out of the well he is in now.

There is also, as I said before, another fable—the fable of the stork and the wolf. There was a wolf which was very fond of birds; he used to play havoc with flocks of birds whenever he encountered them. He was very partial to storks and one day, after having made an onslaught on a flock of storks and having eaten three or four of them, a large bone stuck in his throat and he was in danger of choking to death. At that moment he saw a big stork and said

to him, "Come to my help. Come and pick this bone out of my throat so that I shall not choke. In return for that I will pay you well, I will be good to you." The stork was a little bit suspicious at first but finally, out of charity, extracted the bone from the wolf's throat and then asked for his salary. The wolf said "Salary! You are very lucky that I did not eat you while your head was in my mouth," and the stork became wise. I may say to the Government and the Prime Minister that the province of Quebec is a wise stork that will keep away from the wolf that will not pick the bone out of its throat; and besides the stork is a pretty popular bird in my province.

Now, Sir, I come to the disagreeable part of my address. Last Thursday we witnessed an unprecedented spectacle in our political annals, in fact a spectacle unprecedented in the annals of British Parliamentary history. In the past, Sir, men have severed relations with their party but they have always expressed regret in doing so. When the late Hon. Mr. Blair resigned from the Laurier Administration on the question of the construction of the Transcontinental railway he expressed his regret at having to leave his former friends. Also when the hon. Mr. Patenaude resigned from the Borden Government on the question of conscription he likewise expressed regret at having to leave his former associates. When the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) left the Union Government he also parted company on a question of principle, and he expressed his regret at having to leave his former friends. What happened last Thursday? Did the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), who then publicly left the Liberal party and his former friends, regret that he had to do so on a question of principle? He did not. To my mind, Sir, he was following orders. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, I repeat, was following orders. He was playing the third act of a four-act performance.

The first act was the preliminary conversation which the Prime Minister about his entering the Cabinet, and we had notice of it in the newspapers during the fall. The second act was the wholesale protestation of the Conservative heads of the district of Montreal, and so strong was their protestation that the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) hesitated. The third act was the carrying out of the orders of the Prime Minister to the hon. gentleman—orders which unfortunately were executed publicly last Thursday. Those orders were to publicly sever his connection not only with the Federal Liberal party, but the Provincial Liberal party—with all his friends of the Liberal party—and to clear himself of two grave accusations that had been levelled against him a few years ago. The fourth act was to be his entrance into the Cabinet. Will it ever be performed? I have my doubts, Sir, because the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe and Rouville overdid the third act.

Why, sir, who will believe for one moment that a man who had been connected with the Liberal party for over a quarter of a century, who had assisted at every caucus, who had always voted with us, who had attacked the Government violently every time occasion arose, who even last summer in his own constituency attacked the Government, and who had never protested against our policy, should come to the point like he did last Thursday and viciously attack all his former friends without exception? Who could believe that a man who six months ago in his own paper wrote a laudatory article about the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspe (Mr. Lemieux), could have made the vulgar, coarse and uncalled for attack on the hon. member as he did last Thursday?

Well, the hon. gentleman must have brought comfort to his new friends, if they thought of inviting him to their caucus, when he related to the House what purported to be a discussion in a caucus of the Liberal party between the hon. member from Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). An expression of apprehension passed over the face of the Prime Minister when this incident was related. May I surmise, sir, that the Prime Minister had a vision of the possibility of a future similar incident happening in his own party?

But the hon. gentleman did not last Thursday say that he accepted the views of the hon. member for Brome or the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. On the contrary he ridiculed what he described as the different attitudes of the two hon. members. But I remember well, not later than last session, my hon. friend answered the hon. member for Centre Van-
5 p.m. couver (Mr. Stevens who had been attacking the Liberal party on this question. That hon. member had then said:

Now, I should like to proceed to review briefly the attitude of my hon. friends opposite as given to the House and to the country in speeches delivered by the leading critics of the Opposition, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the hon. member for Brome.

After stating what free trade was, the hon. member for Centre Vancouver added:

But it is quite possible that the best of principles may be carried too far.

He was referring to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. Referring to the hon. member for Brome, he said that that gentleman had thus expressed himself:

That is the policy—referring to free trade—which the Liberal party aim at in the future; that is the policy which I wish to see adopted in this country.

In answering the hon. member for Centre Vancouver the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe and Rouville then said, and his words will be found at page 2606 of volume 3 of Hansard of last session:

My hon. friend has taken a great deal of pains to show to the House and to the country that there was a contradiction between the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Any man belonging to a party and speaking in his individual name has a right to give his individual opinion; but if he belongs to a party and if he wishes to remain in that party, he must adhere to the platform of that party. The Liberal party held a convention in August of last year; they propounded their policy, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the hon. member for Brome, when they speak for the Liberal party, must adhere to that party's platform as propounded at that convention. But it is strange to me that my hon. friends would go to such pains to find contradictions in the policy propounded by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, when he himself declared to the House and to the country that he is going to support this Government which has no policy at all.

As I have to go rapidly over a few extracts, I will not make any comments, but will leave the House to judge the difference between the statements made by my hon. friend on Thursday and the statements he made in the House last session.

My hon. friend says that he is for protection, and that the protection issue is the lofty reason why he severs his connection with the Liberal party. He does not want a reduction of the tariff. But in the same volume, at page 2610, we find a speech of the hon. member and in it occurs a remarkable utterance regarding the tariff. He who is now for protection and who does not want any reduction in the tariff said on that occasion:

I would say to the Government: Stop the profiteers and you will strike at the root of the high cost of living; there is no other way. You cannot instantly delate your currency because it would mean ruin to the country; but strike at the very root of the evil and you will cure the unrest which that evil engenders. I say again: Reduce the tariff and you will help to reduce the cost of living.

The policy followed by this Administration has had the result of creating an unrest which continues to grow every day and every week, and this policy is proved by its results to be wrong. Change it; reduce the tariff and you will reduce the cost of living.

The hon. gentleman stated last Thursday that we were not consistent. Let us see how consistent he himself is. Last year he voted for an amendment similar to the one which is now before the House, against which he declared himself last Thursday. Not only did he vote for that amendment; he spoke in favour of it. Every hon. gentleman will remember that that was the occasion on which he said that the hour of Quebec had struck. Now, what did the hon. member say? I find his words at page 65 of Hansard, Volume I, of last session The hon. member said with regard to the amendment:

Whatever the Government may say or do, nobody believes that they represent the people or that they were elected through a franchise which represented public opinion. Nobody believes it. They may say we have a sound and well balanced Government. But they are alone to say so and I think they do not even believe what they say.

Then he goes on:

In the public interest, gentlemen—

The hon. member evidently thought he was on the hustings.

In the public interest, gentlemen, do not hesitate to sink your personal ambitions to make up your mind to renounce the sweets of office, go to the country apeal to the people, and should the people through means I do not wish to qualify here, wish to give you another lease of power, you shall at least have public confidence behind you, you shall at least have the support of public opinion. Beware you do not tarry and wait till class feeling has reached such a pitch that you can no longer stem the tide. And that is why I cannot understand the position taken by the Government in refusing to accept the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member said the other day that the natural alliance for the province of Quebec was an alliance with Ontario. He said, as reported on page 86 of Unrevised Hansard of this year:

I have claimed all along that the natural ally of Quebec is Ontario. Since 1912, after the defeat of reciprocity in 1911, in the ranks

of my own party I have advocated that theory and preached it as a gospel.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that such a doctrine from the hon. member has reached my ears. But I did hear my hon. friend preach a doctrine with regard to an alliance with Ontario. Let us see what he said in 1918, as reported on page 1434 of Hansard, Volume 2, of that year, about an alliance with Ontario:

I said in my opening remarks that it was necessary to the welfare of the country that trade should not be disturbed and that peace and harmony should be restored. Some people contend—

The following words are very significant, Mr. Speaker.

Some people contend that this country is threatened with a yellow menace which is coming from the Asiatic continent. I believe that there is a yellow menace, but it is not coming from Asia; it is coming from Ontario It springs from Orange lodges and it sows hatred in order to reap votes at the polls.

Mr. DUFF: Who said that?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville. He also said in his speech the other day that he believed in the minority making an alliance with majorities when they cannot win them to their cause. Sir, I believe that a minority should fight for a principle, even if its fights without hope of success. But contrary to the opinion of my hon. friend, I believe not only that we have appealed to the majority, but that our appeal has been successful. Let the Government dissolve the House, and my hon. friend will find out whether or not I am right.

The hon. member also said in his speech that no one from the district of Montreal is proud of his leader, the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I may say that I for one am proud of him—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —and if I can judge from the applause which greets my remarks, there are other hon. members from the district of Montreal who are proud of him. I am not only proud of him; I am proud of his patriotism, proud of his services to the country, proud of the honour which he has brought to the name of the province of Quebec.

I wish now, Sir, to correct an historical error which occurs in the hon. member's speech. With his usual modesty, the hon. member compared himself to Lafontaine and Cartier—Lafontaine in 1840 and Cartier in 1849. The hon. member, as reported on page 92 of Unrevised Hansard, speaking of the Act of Union and the unrest that the Act had created in Upper and Lower Canada at the time, said:

Then Louis Hypolyte Lafontaine came into the public arena.

He appealed to the majority in the country and appealed to his own people, and the Union Act was passed.

Why, Sir, I was under the impression—and every man who knows the history of Canada can support my contention—that Lafontaine fought bitterly against the Act of Union, that a Tory Government at that time headed by Draper and aided by Lord Sydenham, did what this Government did in 1917—disfranchised numbers of the people. They even went so far as to go to the county of Terrebonne, where Lafontaine was running, with loaded revolvers to prevent the electors from registering their votes.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I do not know how I was reported, but any scholar must know that what I meant was, according to history, that Lafontaine came to have the Act of Union of Upper and Lower Canada accepted by the province of Ontario as in the province of Quebec. That is what I meant.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Of course, we have to accept my hon. friend's statement. But let me read again what my hon. friend said as reported on page 92 of Hansard:

Then Louis Hypolyte Lafontaine came into the public arena. He appealed to the majority in the country and appealed to his own people, and the Union Act was passed.

Nobody will infer from those remarks that Lafontaine came in only after the Act had been passed. Lafontaine, in a most famous speech which he made at the time, said:

Another question of no less importance is the Act of Union of the two provinces. It is an act of injustice and despotism because it was imposed on us without our consent; because it deprives Lower Canada of her legitimate representation, because it deprives us of the use of our language in the legislative proceedings, notwithstanding the treaties and the word of the Governor, because it forces us to pay without our consent a debt which we have not contracted, because it allows the executive to take possession illegally, under the name of the Civil List, without the vote of the representatives of the people of an enormous part of the revenues of the country.

My hon. friend may have been badly reported, but I hope when I repeat the words, reported in Hansard, of what he said about Cartier, he will not find again the same excuse. As regards Cartier, my hon. friend said:

Then in 1849, when the annexation memorandum was signed, and when the Parliament Buildings in Montreal were burned, when this country was on the verge of disruption, Cartier arose and appealed to the majority and to my people and they united together and peace was restored once more.

Cartier became a minister of the Crown only in 1855 and had nothing to do with the restoration of peace in 1849—peace which had been destroyed, together with the Parliament Buildings, by the loyal Tories of the time, who also assailed the representative of the Crown, His Excellency the Governor General, Lord Elgin.

I am very sorry that the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) is not in his seat, as it might be very encouraging to him to listen again to some remarks made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville regarding the Government. Speaking on conscription on the 21st June, 1917, as reported in Hansard, volume 3, page 2553, the hon. member said:

In order that everybody should be satisfied, the Solicitor General this afternoon, in his most suave manner, assured the people of Quebec not to worry, because the Bill would bear more lightly upon Quebec than upon the other provinces. . . . . We resent the insult whether direct or indirect. . . . . I will not allow any hon. gentleman to cast a slur upon us. I am not a minister of the Crown in this Government, thank Heaven!

This reminds me, Sir, of the other day when the hon. gentleman threw up his hands and said: "God save the Liberal party!"

Mr. TRAHAN: Who was the Solicitor General at that time?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The right hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Meighen). There is something I might say that is even more edifying, and we find it in Hansard of 1917, volume 6, page 5824. I might tell the House that the discussion was on the War-time Elections Act which had been introduced by the Solicitor General, now the Prime Minister, and this is what the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville said about this Act:

It has been said that the franchise legislation laid before this Parliament would be worthy of the German Kaiser. I think it is doing an injustice to the Kaiser, to compare him to this Government. . . . . Now, what do we see in this House? The most iniquitous measures, the most unjust and the most outrageous to the liberty of the citizens, are introduced into Parliament, and in what way? As the sponsor for such a Bill—

And the hon. member was referring to the then Solicitor General, now the Prime Minister.

—they pick out the man with the softest, the mellowest voice, a real eunuch's voice, might I say to express its full justness and sweetness.

This epithet attached to the quality of the voice of the Prime Minister might be the interesting subject of further conferences between the two hon. gentlemen. I will not speak of the grotesque and sacrilegious comparison the hon. gentleman has made between himself and St. John the Baptist, nor of the whole hour he took in trying to repulse accusations made against him a few years ago; but I will leave to his meditation words that he has spoken himself regarding the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), and that can be found at pages 76 and 77 of Volume 1 of Hansard of the session of 1919. I will leave the hon. gentleman to meditate over these words in an endeavour to find out if they do not apply to another member of this House apart from the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. The hon. member said:

The hon. minister also told us that "he was still a Liberal and that nobody could put him out." . . . The hon. gentleman announces that he is still a Liberal, that he was a Liberal when he entered the Cabinet, and that he will remain one. I shall not enter into any discussion with him on that point. I shall not discuss his motives for leaving the party, it is no business of mine. But speaking for myself, I tell the hon. gentleman I do not regret his exit from our ranks. When the fruit becomes too ripe, Mr. Speaker, it falls from the tree which has given it life and which has brought it to maturity. The tree still continues to grow and to give its own life to other fruit, but the fruit which has fallen to the ground is destined for destruction.

I will simply add—and that will be my last word—that my advice to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville is: Discuss these words with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, and ponder upon them seriously, because "birds of a feather flock together."

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to give a silent vote on this issue as is often my custom and I crave the indulgence of the House for a moment or two while I make a few remarks. I have endeavoured to follow the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) who has just taken his seat, and have tried to fix my attention on the little family quarrel there has been among hon. gentlemen opposite. Personally, I am not particularly concerned in that. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) claims to be the John the Baptist of

Quebec. Whether he is or not it is not for me to say, but certainly his colleagues seem to pay some regard to that claim. Personally, I cannot see on what ground the claim is made, but we do know that John the Baptist lost his head, and further we know why he lost it. It was demanded by a danseuse of questionable virtue, as the price of King Herod's pleasure. I do not know who represents that maiden who demanded the head, or who represents Herod, in the case before us. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had some questions to ask regarding the policy of the Government, and one which appeared to my mind to be important was as to what the policy of this Government would be at the Imperial Council. Has my hon. friend forgotten that this party has embodied the national policy of the old Conservative party? It is the same policy for which the Conservative governments in the motherland and in all the Dominions have ever stood. It is the Imperial policy. I want to read a clearer and better explanation than I could give of the Imperial complexion of that policy. I was tempted to give this quotation as I listened to the question which was put by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, and which, if I remember correctly, was this: "What will be the policy of this Government at the Imperial Council?" Then he went on to say "I stand for Canadian interests first, foremost and at all times." Well, I venture to say there is no Imperial or national policy in that. There is not a Canadian in this House but who stands for the same thing according to his light. There is not a Canadian who has ever attained a place in this House who would presume to stand in Canada for anything else. I want to read to the House a statement made by Lord Beaconsfield in Manchester in the month of April, 1872, when this question was under discussion. Yes, that is some time ago. This great Conservative fraught with all the knowledge of the past, and almost prescient of the future, gave utterance to this statement which I will read in the hope that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) may profit thereby. This is Lord Beaconsfield's statement, not mine:

> If you look to the history of this country since the advent of Liberalism forty years ago, you will find there has been no effort so continuous, so subtle, supported by so much energy and carried on with so much ability and acumen, as the attempts of Liberalism to affect the disintegration of the Empire of England and of all its efforts, this is the one which has been the nearest to success; statesmen of the highest character, writers of the most distinguished ability, the most organized and efficient means have been employed in this endeavour. It has been proved by all of us that we have lost money by our colonies; it has been shown with precise and mathematical demonstration that there never was a jewel in the crown of England that was so truely costly as the possession of India. How often has it been suggested that we should at once emancipate ourselves from this incubus? Well, that result was nearly accomplished when those subtle views were adopted by the country under the plausible plea of granting self government to the colonies. Not that I for one object to self government but self government in my opinion when it was conceded, ought to have been conceded as part of the great policy of Imperial consolidation. It ought to have been accompanied with an Imperial tariff. It ought further to have been accompanied by some representative council in the metropolis which would have brought the colony into constant and continuous relations with the home government. All this, however, was omitted because those who advised that policy (and I believe their convictions were sincere) looked upon the colonies of England, looked even upon our connection with India, as a burden on this country, viewing the financial aspect by those moral and political considerations which make nations great and by the influence of which alone men are distinguished from the animals. Well, what has been the result of this attempt during the reign of Liberalism for the disintegration of the Empire. It has entirely failed but how has it failed; through the sympathies of the colonies with the mother country. They have decided that the Empire shall not be destroyed and in my opinion no minister in this country will do his duty who neglects any opportunity of reconstructing as much as possible our Colonial Empire and of responding to those distinct sympathies which may become the source of incalculable strength and happiness to this land.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): May I ask the hon. member whether these views, expressed so eloquently by Lord Beaconsfield, are the views which he thinks his party stands for to-day?

Mr. SHEARD: Those were the views of Lord Beaconsfield, the leader of the old Conservative party in England in 1872 and I say that those views prepared the public mind for an Imperial Council, and a union of the colonies through colonial representation in England. That is going to be effected, I understand, in the coming year. The colonies will meet to discuss their fiscal and other relations with the Empire.

Mr. BUREAU: There are no colonies now. We are sister nations.

Mr. SHEARD: Yes, we have got a group of nations, and all the better if we have, if we are going to work in harmony together. The trouble with hon. members opposite is that they are out of step with the great

national ideals and aspirations; they are out of step with Canada, and want to claim that it is the fault of the Government. They isolated themselves; no one on this side of the House, no one representing any constituency on this side, has ever isolated Quebec. Quebec took her stand on the issue of conscription. The then leader of the Liberal party had a policy and he had the courage to announce that policy; all honour to him. He said that he opposed conscription because he did not believe in the principle of coercion; that the people of the province of Quebec would not submit to coercion. That, as I understand it, was the issue; it was a proper issue for him to take. No one found fault with him for taking that issue, but we did not agree with him, and as a consequence he put the province of Quebec where it is; as a result of his policy it was isolated. It was not the Prime Minister; it was not the Government; it was Quebec's own determination.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not cry over our isolation; cry over your own.

Mr. SHEARD: I am not advising you as to what you are to do, nor am I inviting you.

Mr. BUREAU: I hope not.

Mr. SHEARD: But members opposite are contending that their isolation is due to some iniquity on the part of the Government. They are oblivious to everything else but their own lack of force and power. Well, since then they have a new leader and they claim that we ought to get out because we were elected simply and solely to win the war. As I have often heard it repeated that we were elected as a war government and for no other purpose than to win the war, I have often wondered what was the function of the Opposition? Were they here in the Dominion of Canada's Parliament to oppose winning the war? I cannot understand the consistency of their attitude at all.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, that joke is exploded.

Mr. SHEARD: Yes, and there will be something else exploded in the province of Quebec before long, and the autocrats who are at the head and throttle of every effort to strangle free speech and other expressions of independence of character the very moment they are manifest will perhaps realize that even in Quebec the people rule.

Mr. BUREAU: In Toronto too.

Mr. SHEARD: Yes, there is free speech in Toronto, and we shall be glad to have an address from the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). Any time he wants to come we will give him a hall.

Mr. DUFF: Admission by ticket?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SHEARD: No, sir; we will have the doors wide open and will let the hon. gentleman hear, for once before he dies, the true echo of the voice of Canada; and there will be no free trade in it and no material reduction in the tariff.

Now, a good deal has been said of what the Union Government projected in the year 1917. I was one of those who had the privilege and pleasure of hearing the then Prime Minister's speech in that campaign; and I remember quite clearly certain points which he put forward as embodying the policy of the Government. The main one was the pledging of the country to conscription. The next was the abolition of patronage, and there was considerable talk in the city of Toronto regarding that issue, and some discontent, I will admit, was manifest. It required considerable explanation and it was made a very prominent feature in the speech delivered there by the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman then took up somewhat in detail the conditions that would arise out of the war, and we are still dealing with them now.

It has been stated in this debate that there is general discontent in the country; that the soldiers are discontented; that the labour unions are discontented; that the aliens are discontented; that the province of Quebec is discontented. Well, I come from one of the largest manufacturing centres in this Dominion and I have heard no discontent expressed regarding this Government. I have heard, however, decided and emphatic expressions from the organized labour parties of the city of Toronto that they want proper representation by population, and they have instructed me, as one of their representatives, to see that this Government gives it to them and sits in office till the lawful time arrives when we can have a new census and can have all votes equal. Now we have in Toronto about one vote to three votes in the rural districts. We have a population of about 550,000, and, I think, some six representatives. We want that changed, and we are going to sit here if we can until it is changed. We are going to give to those centres the representation

to which they are entitled; and if the cities and towns in the West, which our Agrarian friends represent, have the increased representation which they ought to have, are they not entitled to it? Is not that the spirit and idea of representation by population? After all, I take it that there is some force in the justice of the demand.

But we know perfectly well under the present conditions that the tariff policy is going to be a very important one. It is going to be the issue, whether hon. gentlemen wish it or not, and they know it. They are fully aware of that, and they think they will have a better chance, if there is not the full representation given to the mercantile and the manufacturing and industrial centres, which they will get under the redistribution, and where there has been shown the geratest increase in population.

The leader of the Opposition made a great flowery and educational speech in which he seemed to have adopted as his policy, so far as I could discern any policy —and I read his speech over a couple of times—a new slogan: "Quo warranto." There is one matter, he says, which transcends all others in importance, and that is the present position of the Government and of this Parliament in relation to the will of the people. The Government has no right to office because such is not the will of the people; it is the Government that is defective. Well, I entered this Parliament a comparatively new member to learn parliamentary procedure. I found members who were definitely pledged, and elected on their pledge, to support this Government and to assist them in all measures which they considered necessary and essential to succour and support our troops at the front, and I was somewhat surprised to find that before six weeks had elapsed they were crawling to the cross benches to fight hammer and tongs to beat the Government.

Some of these gentlemen sit on the opposite benches now. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is one. He is one of those who are now fighting strenuously against the present Government, and I ask what, in his case, became of the will of the people? Did he go back to get the opinion of his constituents on his attitude? Not a bit of it. He took the matter into his own hands. He said, "I am not going to sit there and support the Government although I was elected to do so. I am going to cross the floor of the House and sit with the Opposition and I am going to hammer the Government;" and he and others have been hammering the Government ever since. Do my hon. friends imagine that the public are going to take any great stock or pay much attention to the cry that this Government does not represent the people in the face of such actions on the part of hon. gentlemen sitting in opposition? I fancy these questions will be raised when we do have a general election.

Then the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères discussed the railway policy and the nationalization of railways. I well remember when the legislation for that purpose was introduced and the debate which took place upon it. I well recall the Minister of Railways asking the leader of the Opposition what his policy was on the nationalization of railways, and if I remember correctly the latter replied that he was quite prepared to announce a policy when he should be called upon to assume the responsibility of framing it. Well, that is on all fours with his attitude on the tariff. He does not want to announce his policy on the tariff. He has not got any policy. He has an association with the Agrarian members of this House who are sincere in wanting free-trade.

I acquit our Agrarian friends of any insincerity. They are demanding free-trade and they are going to work to get it, and they are going to have a large section of the West behind them in trying to get it if I understand the situation. But do not imagine for one moment that they are going to compromise themselves by taking any office under, or associating with, the befogged leader of the Opposition. They are going to frame the fiscal policy of the country if they have the power to do it and have the necessary number of votes behind them, and they are going to make the Government in office dance to the tune which they will play. Then my hon. friends opposite will have to declare what their fiscal policy is under their present leader.

Will the leader of the Opposition, or any living man, be able to frame or carry out a policy which will suit the province of Quebec and also suit our Agrarian friends who are demanding with all sincerity the adoption of free-trade in Canada? The people of Quebec know, just as well as I do, that their interests are the same as those of many of the other provinces. What they want is a policy of reasonable protection to

maintain the industries and maintain the use of the native products of Canada to be worked by our own workmen into finished articles; and no Government that adopts any other policy can long endure in the province of Quebec.

The leader of the Opposition does not know what his policy is on the nationalization of railways, and cannot declare it to-day. We know that the province of Quebec is in favour of the private ownership of railways. We know that the province of Ontario is crying out for the nationalization of railways. There you have the two sets of conditions, and we have to harmonize them and bring them into accord so as to secure the greatest good for the greatest number. As for us in the large centres of Ontario, we stand for nationalization of railways and we are going to work out the experiment as we now have it, although it is not of our seeking. It originated from a number of blunders and from mal-administration of railway problems in the whole Dominion on the part of a previous government. Still we are going to try and work the problem out to its ultimate end for the good of the great majority of the people. No doubt the province of Quebec will watch with interest the working out of the experiment.

We have been told a great deal about the influence of the by-elections, and the result in West Peterborough, Peterborough has been brought up as an example to terrify the Government. Well, the only one who carried out the idea announced by the leader of the Opposition was the former member for West Peterborough who sat in the House last year. Apparently the Opposition converted him into thinking that the best thing he could do was to have an election in his constituency. He tried the experiment on himself, he had an election, and where is he to-day? He is at home, and it will be a long time before we will follow any such leader as that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: You will take no chance.

Mr. SHEARD: As to what has been said about the ostracism of Quebec I regret it because I am earnestly desirous of seeing a united Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not brag; we are all right.

Mr. SHEARD: I return the compliment. I have great admiration for many of the representatives of the province of Quebec. I think they are very fine Canadians, so much so that in my opinion Canada would lose by not having them. With their polish, their graciousness of manner, their cordiality, and a great many more fine attributes—inherent to the race from which they spring—which have descended to them, we want them in the national life of Canada. We want union and harmony. We want the development of a large, free and progressive nation. We want a united people, we want to have Canadians united and animated by a love for Canada, and we do not want these petty differences that we have seen manifested so pointedly here this afternoon, and which we on this side regret.

We extend to hon. gentlemen opposite our commiseration on the quarrels in their ranks. We do not like the leadership which hon. gentlemen opposite appear to have. We take issue with hon. gentlemen opposite on their policy. Nay, we deplore their lack of policy. We deplore the condition that was so well illustrated last night by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) when he showed us that hon. gentlemen opposite have one policy apparently in Peterborough, Ontario and another policy in Kamloops, British Columbia. They have a policy for every day in the year and a policy to suit the weather, whether the sun shines or whether there is a down-pour of rain.

Listening to the efforts of the leader of the Opposition I was reminded of what occurred to me once when I was a boy. I was out with others working on a farm. It was in the spring of the year and the wheat was just sprouting in the field. In Ontario, you know, the farmers are very careful about their wheat, because a great deal of labour is required to produce it and to get it to grow, and the farmers have to fallow their ground. Well a number of us boys were going out one day and we were crossing a wheat field. "Hey" shouted the farmer who owned the field, "Get out of that wheat field, that is not the road." One of our numbers said "Mister, do you know where we are going?" "No," said the farmer, "I do not." "How then do you know," asked our companion "That this is not the road?" It appears to me that this story illustrates the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. We ask them "Where are you going?" But they do not know the road, and the leader at their head does not know either. How can a man lead when he does

not know where he is going. For my part I like to follow a leader who knows the road. We know that disasters often befall men who do not know where they are going —do not know whether they are going north or going south, and I honestly gather from the speeches of the hon. leader of the Opposition that that is about his position on this question.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and discuss some points about the tariff, but as I may possibly have a word or two to say when the Budget is uppermost, and as I want to make my points as clearly applicable as I can to the debate as it has occurred from day to day, I will leave it at that now. I hope the gentlemen opposite will consider carefully their ultimate decision regarding the disposal of John the Baptist, that they will read anew the parable in the Scriptures and give it careful consideration, and that they will remember that history may draw its own interpretation as to the character of the men who took part in the debate and action upon that issue.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crerar the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, February 24, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

George Newcombe Gordon, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Peterborough West, introduced by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. Charles Murphy.

REPORT TABLED.

General Rules and Orders of the Exchequer Court, in accordance with the provisions of section 88 of the Exchequer Court Act, chapter 140., R.S.C., 1906.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 10, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. McMASTER: The object of this Bill is to make it incumbent upon members who accept portfolios to resign all directorships in incorporated companies.

[Mr. Sheard.]

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LATE THOMAS P. OWENS.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE EDITOR OF DEBATES.

On the orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have learned this morning the sad news of the death of a long-standing servant of this House, the Editor of Debates, Mr. Thomas P. Owens. Mr. Owens was first associated with the work of Parliament as Hansard reporter not less than thirty-three years ago, and on account of his very long and excellent service, I think an exception might be made to refer very briefly to him now. Previously to that, indeed, he occupied a place above your Chair, Sir, as representative of a leading Canadian newspaper. He, therefore, was virtually during the whole of his life in association with the Canadian House of Commons. He was appointed associate Editor of Debates in 1913; he became Editor of Debates in 1916; and the worth, indeed, the expertness of his services, is known and admitted by all who knew anything of his work. The warmth and geniality of his Irish character are also qualities that we shall one and all miss from this time forth, and many an hon. member of this House on either side will feel the loss of a kindly and attractive friend.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is eminently appropriate that reference should be made to the passing of one who for many years has been a highly valued and much trusted officer of the House of Commons staff: As my right hon. friend has said, Mr. T. P. Owens was associated with the staff of the House of Commons for a period of something like thirty-three years, first as a journalist, later as a reporter on the Hansard staff and for some years past as the chief of the Hansard staff and Editor of Debates. All hon. members of the House who knew him will feel at this time a deep sense of personal loss. They will miss one who at all times was the most kindly, courteous, open-hearted and affable of men. Mr. Owens held a position of great trust and responsibility. He took much pride in his work, and it was recognized, I think, by all that he brought to that important position qualities of judgment, of efficiency, of industry and of impartiality, which have helped to place the Canadian Hansard in

the fore-front of the records of debates of any of the Parliaments or legislative assemblies in the world. We all deeply mourn his loss.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I was unaware, until I had taken my seat, that the late Editor of Debates of this House had passed to the Great Beyond. His death came as a shock to me. There is, I am sure, no member in this house who has not at some time experienced the kindness of our friend who has gone. I am, comparatively speaking, a young member in the House; I have not had the years of experience of either my right hon. friend who leads the Government (Mr. Meighen) or my hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King); but I know, as a comparatively new member of this House, one of the memories I shall always have with me is the uniform kindness of the treatment given to young members by Mr. Owens. At all times he was geniality itself. He was a faithful servant of this House; he often gave valuable assistance to young members who were getting acquainted for the first time with the work of this House. I am sure we shall all miss him, and his passing away is a loss not only to the House but to the country.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order, "Orders of the Day."

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I rather expected to find, at least the Government Order with regard to a motion which was passed yesterday, under the heading of "Orders of the Day." That not being the case, with the permission of the House, I desire to move, pursuant to the motion passed yesterday, that we pass to Government Orders now, for the sake of taking up Government Order No. 1, that is to say, Bill No. 2, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite competent for the right hon. gentleman, without leave of the House, to move to proceed to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to, and the House thereupon proceeded to Government Orders.

House again in commitee on Bill No. 2. to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1. Canada Temperance Act Vote in Ontario.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The committee will notice that there is in this Bill only one substantive clause which is divided into sections numbered (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). Since we met yesterday the Bill has received further consideration, and certain parties who are very much interested in the promotion of the Bill and others who are not so much interested have agreed to certain amendments for the purpose of bringing the proposed amendment more into harmony with the Franchise Act. The amendments proposed are as subclause (c) of clause 1 and a new subclause to be known as "(g)." Perhaps if I place those before the committee now, we can consider the clause as a whole. Subclause (c), which I will move, applies merely to the town of Aylmer and to the city of Peterborough. Voters' lists were prepared for the town of Aylmer last summer and for the city of Peterborough this spring, and it is proposed to adopt those lists subject to the ordinary right of adding names. The amendment is for the purpose of saving expense, and I think the committee will agree that, as the lists in those particular cases are of such recent preparation, nothing would be gained by having a full revision of those lists. The last amendment which I will move deals with the question of scrutineers or agents attending the polls. The two bodies in Ontario who are anxious to appoint scrutineers in support of prohibition are the Dominion Alliance and the Ontario Referendum Committee. They both desire power to appoint scrutineers but it has been deemed fitting that we should give them a joint power; that is, let them jointly name a scrutineer for each poll. On the other hand, the same privilege has been asked by the Citizens' Liberty League of Ontario, and it has been deemed proper to give them a similar right. These scrutineers will have the ordinary rights of the agents of candidates under the Franchise Act of Canada. The amendment is somewhat long, but that is practically the only point it deals with, namely, the appointment of scrutineers.

Mr. EULER: May I ask the minister whether these proposed amendments meet with the approval of both bodies that he mentions?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The suggestion is the joint suggestion of the three bodies I have mentioned. The meeting was held this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved to amend section 1 by inserting after clause (b) of the present Bill the following as clause (c) clauses (c), (d) and (e) thereafter becoming (d), (e) and (f):

(c) In the Town of Aylmer and in the City of Peterborough the voters' lists shall be the lists of voters as finally revised and completed for the last election of a member to serve in the House of Commons of Canada in the electoral districts of East Elgin and West Peterborough respectively; four copies of each of the said lists shall be furnished by the Chief Electoral Officer to the returning officer for the electoral districts in which the said town and city are respectively situate, and the said returning officers shall respectively furnish two copies thereof to the revising officers for the said city and town. The said copies shall be corrected by the revising officers, who shall deliver or send to each deputy returning officer, as required by Rule 20 of Schedule A to Section 32, one corrected copy of the lists for his polling division, and send the other corrected copy to the returning officer not later than the twelfth day before polling day.

The minister also moves to amend the said clause by adding at the end thereof the following sub-clause, to be known as sub-clause (g):

(g) in lieu of the provisions of Section 52 of the Dominion Elections Act, the following provisions shall apply:

(1) The Deputy Returning Officer, the Poll Clerk, one or other, alternately, of the two agents or electors representing the persons interested in promoting an affirmative, and one or other alternately, of the agents or electors representing those interested in promoting a negative answer to the question submitted, and no others, shall be permitted to remain in the room where the votes are given during the time the poll remains open.

(ii) On behalf of the persons interested in promoting an affirmative answer to the question submitted the Dominion Alliance (Ontario Branch) and the Ontario Referendum Committee jointly shall be entitled to appoint the agents aforesaid, and every such appointment shall be made in writing by such person in each electoral district as may be notified to the Returning Officer jointly by Ben. H. Spence and Andrew S. Grant, the secretaries of the Dominion Alliance (Ontario Branch) and the Ontario Referendum Committees respectively; on behalf of the persons interested in promoting a negative answer to the question submitted, the Citizens' Liberty League shall be entitled to appoint the agents aforesaid, and every such appointment shall be made in writing by such person in each electoral district as may be notified to the Returning Officer by C. D. Boyce, the secretary of the Citizens' Liberty League aforesaid.

(iii) If the Dominion Alliance (Ontario Branch) or the Ontario Referendum Committee, or the Citizens' Liberty League hereafter changes its secretary, such changes may be notified to the chief electoral officer, who shall advise the returning officers thereof, and notifications of the persons in each electoral district authorized to appoint agents may thereafter be given by the secretaries so substituted.

(iv) If only one agent is appointed under the provisions of the preceding subsections to act at any poll on behalf either of the persons interested in promoting an affirmative or of those interested in promoting a negative answer to the question submitted, such agent may select an elector to act and alternate with him, and if no agents are so appointed to act at any poll, any two electors may act as agents at such poll on behalf of those interested in promoting either an affirmative or a negative answer to such question, as the case may be, provided that an agent appointed as hereinbefore mentioned may at any time during the poll substitute himself for either or both of the electors, who have, in the absence of any agent, undertaken to act.

(v) Every agent or elector acting under the provisions hereinbefore contained shall, on being admitted to the polling station, take an oath to keep secret the answer made to the questions submitted by any voter who has marked his ballot paper in his presence.

Mr. DEVLIN: I just want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that whilst this is a Bill, I understand, to amend certain sections of the Dominion Elections Act so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, the town of Aylmer is really in the county of Wright in the province of Quebec. I believe, however, there is a place called Aylmer in the province of Ontario, and so as to avoid confusion, and as the people of the town of Aylmer in the province in Quebec have always been a temperate people and would not require any such legislation, the minister might in future in speaking of the town of Aylmer, refer to it as the town of Aylmer in the province of Quebec, and if he wishes to allude to the other place, which is named after the town of Aylmer in the province of Quebec, refer to it as Aylmer, Ontario.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am sure we all know the very excellent reputation of the town of Aylmer in the province of Quebec, but this Bill has reference at the present time only to the province of Ontario, so therefore I do not see the necessity of making the distinction.

Mr. BUREAU: Yesterday we were asked by the minister to adjourn the committee because of two bodies who were asking for amendments to the Bill. To-day the amendments are brought down, and they are so lengthy it takes the chairman ten or fifteen minutes to read them. We have never seen these amendments and know nothing about them, although from the chairman's reading, I understand, that some powers are delegated to men nominatively—one was named Mr. Boyce. I do not know whether provision is made for replacing him in case of death or other eventuality. I do not think it is right for the Acting Solicitor General to try and make us swallow an amendment of two or

three pages without a chance of reading it. If we simply say "yes," and let the amendments pass the House, without ever reading them, if anything happens afterwards, we would be told: "You do not attend to your duties; you just shut your eyes and let these things go through." I for one will not consent to these amendments being passed until I have had an opportunity of reading them in Hansard to-morrow morning and comparing them with the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to supplement what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) by pointing out to the minister that on this occasion he seems to have forgotten, or deliberately overlooked, the courtesy which is customary in cases of this kind of furnishing the Opposition, a little in advance of the meeting of the House, with a copy of proposed amendments. My hon. friend asked us, as a matter of courtesy, if we would permit the Government to go on with this measure and we gave our consent. He might, I think, have shown a little appreciation of the spirit in which we met him by furnishing us with a copy of these amendments before he asked us to vote upon them in this committee. The amendment is three times as long as the Bill itself, and unless this Parliament is to lose altogether its character as a deliberative assembly, we should have time to deliberate upon the amendments which the minister proposes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There can be no objection to the taking of a reasonable time to deliberate on the amendments. The only thing is, the time is limited, because the Bill will have to be assented to next week if it is to be operative at all. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition should not impute any discourtesy in this matter. He has endeavoured to do so, and I think the charge is rather small.

Mr. BUREAU: It is on a par with the answers of the Prime Minister.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The amendment is one appertaining only to the appointment of scrutineers. It was prepared at exactly three o'clock to-day and handed to my hon. friend immediately after prayers.

Mr. BUREAU: Too short a time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The charge of discourtesy is entirely uncalled for. However, if my hon. friends want reasonable time in which to consider the Bill, or the clauses submitted, why, the House will be quite willing, I have no doubt, to grant that time; and for that purpose I move that the further consideration in Committee be postponed, and that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow. But hon. members will have to bear this in mind, that if the Bill is to go through and become operative in order that the vote may be taken on April 18th, it will have to receive the Royal Assent next week; otherwise it will be futile.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not our fault if the amendments are not ready. The acting Solicitor General says that he got the amendment only at three o'clock. He knew yesterday that these people would ask for amendments, and it was not incumbent on the leader of the Opposition or of any hon. members on this side to get after those gentlemen, the Liberty League and all others interested in temperance work. It was the duty of the man or of the member handling the Bill, and if there is any delay in this matter we are not to blame. The only person to blame is he who has charge of the Bill, and those interested in it; and for my part I absolutely disclaim any share of blame which might accrue in respect of delay. On the other hand, I will not consent to the passage of any legislation, emanating especially from my hon. friend or from any other member on that side of the House, with my eyes closed or until I have had an opportunity to look into the matter carefully.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There would be a good deal of force in the remarks of my hon. friend if there were any radical change proposed. If there were any real substance in the amendments his statements would have some weight, but they deal almost exclusively with matters of form,—one affecting voters' lists prepared very recently—

Mr. BUREAU: Allow me a question.

Mr. GUTHRIE—in Peterborough, and the other appertaining merely to the appointment of scrutineers. I say they are not substantial changes and should not delay the Committee. But if hon. gentlemen desire time we will give it, provided, however, it be understood that this is not with any view to delaying the passage of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend says there is no departure from the law as it stands.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say that; I said there was no substantial change.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, will my hon. friends show me a clause in the election law where a third party not interested in the election is entitled to have representatives at the poll?—people filling a quasi-judicial role in the election. Is not that a departure from the principle of the Elections Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say there was no departure.

Mr. BUREAU: You said there was nothing substantial. Of course, different people may interpret the word "principle" differently, but I say that these changes constitute a substantial departure from the principle of the Elections Act.

Motion agreed to. Progress reported.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Wednesday, February 23.

Hon. THOMAS ALEXANDER CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of my contribution to this debate, I wish to say a word of congratulation to my right hon. friend who leads the Government (Mr. Meighen) on his accession to the important office of Prime Minister of this country. It is not too much to say that my right hon. friend has won his place by hard work and strict attention to the business of his party. It is particularly gratifying to myself, coming as I do from Western Canada, that one who has been identified with the life of Western Canada for many years should be chosen for this high office. It is perhaps an evidence of the growing importance of that portion of Canada in the councils of the whole Dominion. I do not know that I can extend my congratulations to my right hon. friend on the difficulties of the tasks that lie ahead of him; nevertheless whatever paths our fortunes in the future may lead us into, I am sure that he will give the best that is in him to the service of his country.

I desire also to offer my felicitations to the mover and seconder of the motion which we are considering. The mover (Mr. McIsaac) has been in this House for a considerable period. His speech was happily phrased and, of course, contained, as is customary on such occasions, the necessary laudation of the Government of which he is a supporter. That was to be expected. My hon. friend took a timely opportunity, for I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, from what I hear from his little province down by the sea, that he will not again have the opportunity of repeating the address which he delivered the other day on the occasion of this motion. That being the case, I am, shall I say, all the happier in offering him my felicitations. My hon. friend (Mr. MacKelvie), who seconded the motion, comes from a far western province; he is a new member in this House. I had not the pleasure of listening to his address, but from reading it and hearing what my hon. friends on both sides of the House have said in respect to it, I wish to offer him my congratulations on the success he made of a rather difficult job.

It perhaps might be in order now for me to say a word or two about the speech from the Throne and about the addresses given by my right hon. friend who leads the Government and by the leader of the Opposition in the opening discussion upon it. It seemed to me that their speeches might be paraphrased very briefly as follows:

The leader of the Opposition says: "I want you to get out; you are a usurper; your time has expired;" my right hon. friend the leader of the Government replies: "I am going to stay here just as long as I can." And that is about the sum-total of what was contained in the speeches of my two hon. friends. Now, I would offer this criticism, that the difficulties of the times we are in call for something a little more constructive from the leaders of the two majority parties in this Chamber.

I come now to a consideration of the speech itself, and I may say at the outset that it is rather a meagre bill of fare. In fact it reminds me somewhat of the statement of assets and liabilities that is put out by a concern when it is going into bankruptcy—

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: —and that is about the position, I am afraid, that my hon. friends opposite are in with respect to the present Government.

The speech, of course, contains the customary congratulations on the opening of Parliament, and the necessary admonitions

to members to pay strict attention to their duties, which of course was to be expected. But the speech goes on and makes a reference to the freedom from unrest in this country at the present time. That I think is a true statement. There is no country in the world to-day that is so free from unrest, or that has been so free from unrest for several years past, as this fair Dominion of Canada. I am particularly glad to see this statement in the speech from the Throne because a few months ago from a very careful reading of the speeches of the leader of the Government—speeches that he delivered in various parts of the Dominion, speeches delivered in the province of Ontario and also in the province of Quebec—I really was afraid, Sir, that we were in imminent danger of a red revolution in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: I think that perhaps now, in his sober moments, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister regrets the extravagance of his language on some of those occasions. At any rate, I am glad to know that there is an entire absence from his recent speeches of that note of criticism. My right hon. friend was playing at politics when he was engaged in making those speeches. He was endeavouring to raise the old prejudices and the old passions in this country—the prejudices of one section against another, the prejudices of one class in a community against another class.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Bolshevism.

Mr. CRERAR: And for what reason, Mr. Speaker? In order that he might reap some political advantage. Why did my right hon. friend take the occasion to make these speeches down in the province of Quebec? He knows that that province is one of the most cautious and conservative provinces in the Dominion as far as change is concerned. He goes to the province of Quebec and he raises this bogey. Why did he do that? To arouse prejudices. I do not wish to make my language too strong, but he did it, at any rate, to create a feeling in that province against the new political movement that has had its birth in Western Canada; and I am bound to say that he was not performing a very notable service to his country when he was doing that work. Mr. Speaker, the fishing in the province of Quebec has not beeen very successful. That is not because of any lack of effort on the part of my right hon. friend, because I have noticed a very enticing note in the speeches delivered by him there. Well, he has been successful in getting one recruit. That recruit is not yet seated on the far side of the Chamber, but he is working his way round and perhaps, eventually will land there.

In the speech from the Throne there is also a reference to the fact that the Department of Labour is carrying on an investigation into the matter of unemployment insurance and old age pensions. The speech simply contains the bald announcement. There is no statement of Government policy in the matter. The Government might just as well have inserted in the speech that the Minister of Finance was thinking of undertaking another tariff investigation. The bald statement means nothing. Has the Government any policy in the matter? Do they contemplate any policy with respect to these questions? If so, the House is entitled to know what that policy is. Is there anything behind this announcement in the speech from the Throne? Is it the purpose of the Government to introduce a measure dealing with these matters later on? I have just this to say in that connection: I have every sympathy with any movement that is designed or intended to alleviate distress in our country, or for that matter in any other country; but I assert, and I offer the suggestion to the leader of the Government, that this Canada of ours provides opportunity enough for labour to those who are willing to work so that they can make their way well and decently in the world, if they are given a fair opportunity to do so. For unemployment insurance and old age pensions, while they may, some time in the future, give concern to this country, there exists no very great need at present, provided we have fair and equitable laws and give every person in this Dominion a chance to make their living in decency and comfort. However, it might be, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends opposite, and the Government in particular, are contemplating an early appeal to the country and possibly they have in mind that some little advantage may be derived from holding out the proposition to the labouring people of Canada that they are considering their interests in the matter of old age pensions and unemployment insurance.

The speech also contains the announcement, which every one expected, that the Government are going to undertake tariff

revision at the present session. The Minister of Finance did very strenuous work in the journeys he made back and forth in Canada a few months ago, collecting evidence with respect to the character his new tariff proposals shall take when they are submitted to the House. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a labour of love as far as my hon. friend is concerned. I had the opportunity of attending the sitting of the Tariff Commission on one or two occasions and I extended my sympathy to my hon. friend because of the difficulty of the task he had. After all, was there very much need of all this show about the tariff inquiry? The Government had announced its policy a year ago, it was to be the old policy of protection in Canada—"adequate protection to Canadian industries." This tariff inquiry, conducted at considerable cost to the country, was, Mr. Speaker, just so much play in order to influence public opinion; and I venture this assertion—and I am sure the Minister of Finance if he were free to do so would endorse it—that in his whole investigation from Vancouver to Halifax, in all the mass of evidence he listened to and collected, in all the representations made to him, he really got very little that was of practical value in the framing of his tariff proposals. However, the work went on, and I will say this for the Minister of Finance, he discharged his duty in that regard very faithfully and energetically. The pronouncement in the speech from the Throne, in regard to the tariff, merely confirms what we already knew, or what any person familiar with the recent history of this country knew, as to what the policy of the Government is in the matter.

I wish in passing to make a few references to this subject. The speech from the Throne states:

> It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained;

Assistance to agriculture! I have been wondering if my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) got that little clause slipped into this declaration to leave the impression that a system of protection was of assistance to agriculture in this Dominion. Why, Sir, the thing is ridiculous. What are our chief argicultural products? They are wheat, live stock, dairy products, potatoes, fruits; and in every one of these products this country produces away and beyond what we can possibly consume at home. Therefore it follows, as night follows day, that the value we get for all these commodities is fixed in the markets of the world, and not in the home market. Consequently when my hon. friends in the Government make the pious declaration in this pronouncement, that they are maintaining this policy to protect argiculture in Canada, they are simply "beating up against the wind." It may be that some of my hon. friends opposite have in their constituencies market gardeners close to cities who will benefit temporarily by the exclusion of certain vegetables at particular seasons of the year, but to claim that protection is an aid to Canadian agriculture as a whole is to make a ridiculous assertion that has no warrant in fact.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to one other declaration in this respect. It states, that this policy of protection will be followed in order to secure revenue and to obtain the necessary protection of our industries. My right hon. friend who leads the Government (Mr. Meighen) placed the issue very fairly in his speeches throughout Canada in respect to tariff matters, and I commend him for it. I am among those who believe in clear declarations on questions of public policy, and my right hon. friend left the country in no doubt as to where he stands upon this question of protection. But he did not always support his conclusions by sound arguments. My right hon. friend stated at various places, as indeed is contained in this declaration here, that this tariff will be a tariff to produce revenue and to maintain protection. Now, I ask: How can that be done? If your tariff is a protective tariff, what is it based upon? It is based upon the principle of protection of your own home industries, and to the extent that it protects your home industries, it excludes foreign goods; and if it does, where does your revenue come in?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CRERAR: Surely my hon. friends opposite must realize the truth of this simple statement. Of course, it may be that their study of the question has been very limited, and that in the enjoyment of the privilege which has come to them under protection they have neglected to analyze the situation as far as its general effect upon the country is concerned. But, nevertheless, that is the plain fact of the case.

If your purpose is to get revenue from your tariff, you cannot get that revenue if your tariff is based on the principle of protection in the expectation of excluding goods from the country to encourage the development of industries at home.

Mr. CURRIE: Where did we get revenue in the past?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) will have his opportunity later. Now, I submit that there is a distinct difference between a tariff based on the principle of protection and a tariff based on the principle of revenue, and when my hon. friends opposite endeavour to link the two together they are simply endeavouring to mislead the people of this country; I commend my hon. friends opposite for the frankness with which they have placed the question before the country. But let them go a little bit further, let them make this statement to the country: Our protective tariff is a tariff to encourage industry at home and is not designed to raise revenue. If they will do that, I will agree that they are consistent throughout, but to the degree they endeavour to mix up the raising of revenue with the maintainence of protection they are upon inconsistent ground.

I stated a little while ago that the speech from the Throne was a very meagre document. One would think that we were living in the period fifteen or twenty years before the war. There is no reference in that speech to the most vital matters that are pressing upon this country at the present time; and if I may do so, I would express my regret that there was very little reference in the speeches either of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government or of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in respect to these matters.

I should like for a moment to deal with the financial position of this country. We have the statement in the speech from the Throne that we find in all such speeches, that the Estimates will be prepared with due regard for economy and the public interest. Now, it is a fact patent to everyone who is following with any degree of interest at all the business of this country, that our revenues at the present time are shrinking, and shrinking very seriously. The buoyancy in revenues that resulted from the buoyancy in business during the period of the war and immediately following it is disappearing, and I dare say that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is spending sleepless nights wondering how he is going to provide the needed revenue in face of the falling income. That shrinkage, Sir, I think is bound to continue. I am not a pessimist, but I believe in facing facts squarely. If you speak to business men, if you discuss the matter with the travellers of business firms throughout this country, you will find that business is dull if not indeed stagnant. I am afraid that is not a merely passing phase, because we have to study this thing in respect to our relationship with the whole world, and consequently in view of the fact that we will have difficulty in getting our revenues in future, the need of economy in our public administration is more pressing than ever before in our history.

And what are the facts in respect to that, Sir? I believe it was the tendency in this country, as it was the tendency in every other country engaged in the war, to spend freely during the war. War conditions developed spending habits not only in governments, but in individuals as well, and that was the experience in this country. And I offer a word of criticism of the Government, in that they have not given due regard to the needs of economy. Our total expenditure for the present fiscal year will be close to $400,000,000, if indeed it does not exceed that figure. Our total expenditure before the war was around $130,000,000 a year. My hon. friends will say: Oh, but we have had great increases to our national debt, and consequently in the amount of interest we have to pay upon it, all due to the war. I grant that. But if we take the total increase in expenditure due to causes arising out of the war, that in my judgment will not amount to more than $175,000,000. Now, if we take $175,000,000 from our $400,000,000, we still have $225,000,000 as the average expenditure of this country under normal conditions, whereas before the war that expenditure was $130,000,000 a year.

I can give further evidences of the lack of economy on the part of the Government. The Government to-day are building a dry dock in the city of Victoria. I believe that is to redeem a pledge made by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) when he was contesting the by-election in that constituency. According to reports, this dry dock will cost $4,500,000. At the same time we see reports in the press—and I believe they are true—that shipbuilding companies, and I believe as well a dry dock company in Prince Rupert, have gone

into the hands of receivers. Then we have the report which appeared in the press a few days ago—synchronizing, curiously enough, with the period of the by-election in the constituency of West Peterborough—to the effect that a dam was being built in Peterborough constituency at a cost of $250,000. This report has not been denied; indeed, I believe it had official authority. I merely refer in passing to a few of these expenditures, in order to emphasize the fact that this is not the policy this country should be following at the present time. What is needed in Canada is a programme of rigid economy in every department of the public service. That applies not only to our federal activities, but also to all our provincial governments and to individual citizens. Only by adopting such a policy can we retrieve our position and escape the dangers and difficulties that are ahead of us.

We could very wisely effect economy in another direction. We hear a good deal in these days, Sir, about a naval holiday among the nations of the world. Well, I think we in Canada might take a naval holiday. My hon. friend who has the distinction of being the first Sea Lord of our Canadian Admiralty may not agree with me.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not at all.

Mr. CRERAR: But I do think, Sir, that for the next five years we might very well forget about naval expenditures in this country. One of the greatest mistakes this Government has made, in my judgment, was the acceptance of several war vessels from the British government, resulting in our having to incur the additional expenditure, inevitably attendant upon it.

Then, we have the expenditure in connection with our militia. We are rapidly developing a ministry of war in Canada. Last year this Parliament voted over $22,000,000 for naval and military and police purposes in Canada. Is that economy? I suggest—and I do it in the best of temper and, I believe, in the interests of the country—to my hon. friends opposite, I suggest to the members of the Government, that in framing their Estimates for the present year they take into consideration the fact that we must get our country back into a solid financial condition, and that one of the agencies through which we must work to achieve that is the agency of economy in public administration.

And this brings me to another matter, and that is the condition of trade in Canada. It is a notable fact that our trade with Europe is falling off. The figures, Mr. Speaker, are illuminating and a little alarming. In 1918 we exported to Great Britain $568,000,000 worth of goods. In 1919 that had fallen to $528,000,000 worth and in 1920 to $341,000,000 worth. I venture to say that the coming year will show an even further decline in those figures. Our exports to France in 1918 were valued at $97,000,000; in 1919 at $65,000,000 and in 1920 at $47,000,000. Now, a very patent reason for this is found in the condition of international exchanges as between Europe and North America. The British pound to-day is at a heavy discount both in Canada and in the United States. That applies with even greater force to the French franc, to the Italian lire, and to all the currencies of Europe. And, as is natural and to be expected, European countries are doing business with other countries of the world where the exchange is more on a parity with their own than is the case in Canada and the United States. I am afraid, Sir, that this condition will continue for several years. One of the surest guarantees we can have of the revival of prosperity in America is the bringing about of a settled condition in Europe. But when we look over the European field to-day; when we see the consequences of the war in the disruption and the strife that still prevail as between nations; when we see European countries spending on armaments, and equipment for war the money that should be spent to feed and clothe their peoples—we are offered but a very dull prospect for any speedy revival of business and industry on that continent. Whether we wish it or not, therefore, these facts are patent and cannot be thrust aside. Where, then, are we to develop our trade? I submit, Sir, that the country with which we can best trade for the next number of years is the country immediately to the south of us, although some of my hon. friends opposite may not agree with me in this.

4 p.m.

Mr. CURRIE: I guess you can't.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend cannot trade with Europe. He cannot trade with Australia, because Australia cannot pay him. Where is he going to trade? Or is he going to surround this country with a high board fence and neither climb out nor

permit anybody else to climb in? If he does so, I venture the opinion that that course will not get him very far.

What are the figures of our growing trade with the United States? In 1910 we exported $110,000,000 worth of goods to that country. In 1912 that figure had grown to $112,000,000; in 1914 to $176,000,000; in 1918 to $440,000,000, and in 1920, the year that has passed, our exports to our southern neighbour had grown to $560,000,000. Is not that a desirable market to cultivate—the one to which your exports are growing, and which promises to take more and more still as time goes on? It is the eminently sensible thing to do.

I should like to say a word also in criticism of some of my hon. friends opposite who rather hold up the bogey of adverse exchange with the United States as a reason why we should cease trading with that country. The argument has been advanced that we should cease buying from the United States because they will not pay the full value of our Canadian dollar. Well, you might as well have the argument from an importer in the United States that he will not buy from Canada because we charge him a premium on his dollar when we sell to him. But as a matter of fact this condition, as was pointed out in this House a year ago, is not due alone to an adverse balance of trade with the United States. If my hon. friend opposite think that it is how do they account for this fact; that while in January a year ago the adverse balance of trade as between Canada and the United States was over $31,000,000, and our dollar was at a discount of a little less than nine per cent, in the month of December last, when the adverse balance of trade as between Canada and the United States was only $4,000,000, the discount on our dollar had grown to 19 per cent. If the discount on our dollar is due to the adverse balance of trade, why does it not tend to correct itself as the balance of trade tends to right itself. As a matter of fact, if we examine the trade figures as between Canada and the United States for past years, we shall find that ten years ago, fifteen years ago, the adverse balance of trade between Canada and the United States was relatively much greater than it is to-day. There can be no doubt that this market is a very valuable one for Canada. Moreover, I am commencing to note, amongst the business interests of Canada, a recognition of the need for extending our markets. A few weeks ago, Mr. John Galt, President of the Union Bank of Canada, made this statement at the annual meeting of that institution:

> It is clearly now the critical hour and the commercial flag of Canada should be carried into every available market abroad.

The policy of my hon. friends opposite is to keep goods out of the country and to prevent goods from going out of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friends have a very dim and misty understanding of the elementary principles of trade. Mr. Galt stated further:

> A larger vision and determination of this kind is necessary. We must either go forward or go back, and it cannot be thought that we are to recede into the position of a country that merely produces for home consumption, when we have demonstrated that we have the means and capacity for world competition in almost any avenue of trade.

That is a note I like to hear sounded by our business men throughout Canada—a note of optimism and courage.

A short time afterwards, Sir Herbert Holt, at the annual meeting of the Royal Bank, made a similar statement, as follows:

> Only by increasing the sale of Canadian commodities can we avoid increasing our foreign indebtedness. Never, even in war time, was it so essential to increase our exports. A duty falls on manufacturers to produce articles of a quality and a price that will compare favourably with foreign makes and on our agricultural interests to increase production.

I agree with every word of these declarations. They are wise and sound and courageous words. Ten years ago we had an offer of reciprocity with the United States in natural products, and to the great misfortune of Canada that proposition was turned down at that time. I was sincerely glad to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), in a recent address delivered in New York, spoke of the need of neighbourliness as between these two countries. I cordially agreed with every word he uttered. We should avoid anything that will tend to create animosities. But while the Minister of Trade and Commerce was pleading in New York for neighbourliness, some of his colleagues were denouncing our neighbours to the south because they were giving us only eighty or ninety cents for our Canadian dollar. My hon. friends should endeavour to be consistent in their policy in respect to this matter.

I am satisfied our Canadian manufacturers can hold their own in the American field. One of the strongest arguments used in Canada against the adoption of reciprocity was that if in return for the free entry of our wheat into the United States we permitted the free entry of United States flour and wheat into Canada, our Canadian millers would go by the board and their business would cease to exist. Is that borne out by the facts? We have had this condition in this country for the last several years, and what are the facts to-day? In the last four months our Canadian mills have exported on an average over 175,000 barrels of flour a month to the United States market, and that market is now becoming one of the most important markets for our Canadian millers. The fact is that we produce in this country things that are essential to the United States, and we should cultivate, in the most friendly way, the possibilities of developing that market for our products. Canada is a country of illimitable natural resources, we have one of the finest agricultural countries in the world; we have vast areas of timber and mineral wealth, and vast fisheries. What are we going to do with these? Let us develop these industries that are natural to the country, seek markets abroad, and as you seek markets abroad and your commerce expands, the wealth and prosperity of your country will expand as well. Our manufacturers are too timid; they are like timid children, afraid of the dark. You know, when a child goes into the dark, how timid it is, and after all there are no dangers there. But if our Canadian manufacturers will develop initiative and resourcefulness, and the capacity to stand on their feet without favour from the Government, they can hold their own in any market in the world, because they have in this country the natural conditions that will support them in doing so.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did the reciprocity agreement recognize the fact which my hon. friend has stated?

Mr. CRERAR: The reciprocity agreement went only a short step in the right direction. There is, however, one other criticism that I have to make, in the most friendly way, of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and that is that the Department of Trade and Commerce is not at the present time discharging its duty in respect to the development of trade with our great neighbour to the South. What are the conditions? The United States Government has to-day in Canada over one hundred consuls, the great majority of these being in reality trade agents. You find them scattered over this country from the Pacific to the Atlantic. What are they doing? They are, in their way, quite properly, placing with prospective Canadian customers the advantages of trading with and buying from firms in the United States. We have agents abroad, but where do we find them? We have a trade agent in the Argentine Republic; we have one in Australia; we have one in Brazil; we have trade representatives in China; we have them in New Zealand, in Italy, in France, in Holland and in South Africa; but we have not one in the United States. I would suggest, I hope in a spirit of constructiveness, the need, the advisability of the department over which my right hon. friend presides, getting busy in this direction. We have our greatest customers to the South. More than one-half of the trade of Canada is done with the United States, and in that direction lies the best opportunity we have in the near years approaching for the development and extension of our trade. The United States is changing. We hear at present a good deal of talk in the newspapers of the Fordney Bill, and of what the Republican party may do when it comes into office a few weeks hence. Any business man who is familiar with the present condition of public opinion in the United States is aware of this fact that there is not in the Republican party that strength of support for a protective tariff that there was a number of years ago. I have noticed that very prominent men in the Republican party are doubting the wisdom of the application of the principle of protection to American industries. And they are wise.

What is the position of the United States? The last census revealed the fact that in the United States proper there is a population of 106,000,000 people. Almost two-thirds of those live in incorporated towns and cities; one-third live in hamlets and unincorporated villages and in the rural districts. In the United States there are to-day two people eating food for every one that produces. What will be the condition twenty years from now—thirty years from now? Possibly many present here will live to see that country with a population of 200,000,000 people, and is it not the part of wisdom to develop our resources, to develop our agriculture, so that we will be in a

position to supply them with the foodstuffs they will inevitably need? They are buying foodstuffs from us to-day. Last year they took $150,000,000 of the foodstuffs we produced, and among this $30,000,000 worth of live stock. One of the best markets the western farmer has had for his wheat for the past five months has been the country to the south of us and a good many are looking with doubt and some trepidation as to what may happen the great industry of agriculture in this country should the United States again raise the barriers against Canada that existed prior to 1912. That emphasizes once more the unfortunate consequences that may flow from the rejection of reciprocity in 1911.

And now I come to another important matter, our national railways;—one would have thought there would be some reference in the speech from the Throne to their state of financial health. Last year this House was informed that our railways had a deficit of $48,000,000 and I saw recently a newspaper item stating that the deficit this year would run between $60,000,000 and $70,000,000. Since that statement was not denied, I take it that when the official figures are supplied some time hence they will be somewhere around that mark. Now that is a very serious state of affairs. There is no need here to go into the question of government ownership in Canada, and how we came to acquire these roads. We have to deal with the situation as it exists, but we have no suggestion from the Government in the speech from the Throne as to what shall be done in connection with this difficulty. We have even less from my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, either in the speech he delivered in this House on the Address, or in any of the speeches he has made throughout the country. Now it does seem to me that there are certain facts standing out in respect to this difficulty to which we should give consideration. I am convinced of this, that if our railway problem is made a matter of party controversy, nothing but harm can come to the country from it. I would offer this suggestion: that there should be appointed a special committee of this House to deal alone with this question, and reporting of course to Parliament. I think the Government might very well welcome that assistance. It is a difficult matter to discuss the problem here in this Chamber as a body of shareholders would discuss a similar proposition at a meeting, and it is idle now to discuss the causes that lead up to the present unsatisfactory state of affairs. We have to face the situation as it exists. But it does seem to me that if we had a special committee constituted from among the members of this House, who would go into this thing as business men, and not as partisans, we might possibly render some service in finding a solution for this difficulty. I am convinced that sooner or later, and I believe the sooner the better, we must have a revaluation of the whole system of Government railways in Canada. There is no doubt of the fact that there has been a duplication of lines owing to the method of building in the past, and much loss has arisen from that cause, not only in capital outlay but in operating as well. You can travel to-day west of Edmonton for several hundred miles and find this duplication. In some cases—I have travelled over the road myself—the rails are as close together as the two sides of this Chamber. The rails have been lifted off one road, but yet there are outstanding against it issues for which the country is responsible, running up to probably $100,000 a mile. If we get this thing down to a definite business basis, we can start afresh.

I would also offer this suggestion. The Board of Directors of the National Railways might well be reorganized. I believe the Government had that in contemplation a year ago. I would go even further and offer the suggestion that was made, I believe, when this matter was first under discussion by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), that it would be a wise step to give the employees of the Government roads one or two representatives on the directorate. To come through this difficulty successfully the roads must have behind them the loyalty and the interest of the employees in the system as regards its operation and management generally.

Then we must go a step further. We must develop business for the road, and in that connection I wish to make reference to the matter of immigration. That is a pressing question for this country, and yet no reference was made to it in the speech delivered by His Excellency the other day. Our national railways have this advantage, that in the greater part of Canada they pass through a territory that is fertile and productive. I know that is true of the Prairie Provinces, and I believe it is true in a large measure of Eastern Canada. Part of the solution of this question, I

am convinced, will lie in the adoption of a vigorous policy of immigration, to get immigrants who will go on the land. The immigrants when they come here should be settled—and the whole force and power of the Government should be exerted to that end—in the districts adjacent to our national railways. If that is done, they will at any rate create business for the roads in the future. The way is dark in connection with this matter, but I have confidence enough in our country and in the people of Canada to believe that if we set ourselves energetically to the solution of this problem before many years we shall emerge from the present difficulty, and in another decade or two our national railways will be an asset of which the country may justly be proud.

I had thought also that we might have in the speech from the Throne a reference to the proposed visit that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will make to attend the Premiers' conference in London, which I understand takes place in June. So far, we have had no declaration from the Government as to what will happen at that conference. I did notice, however, the other day a cable despatch from London, containing a statement made by Mr. Lloyd George in the British House of Commons, which assembled, I believe, the day after this House met. I want to read that statement to this House because I think it has some real significance for us:

> Mr. Lloyd George stated that the conference of Empire Premiers to be held in London in June will be the most momentous event in the history of the Empire.
>
> He declared that it was too much to ask of these small islands that they undertake the whole burden of the defence of a gigantic empire in every sea, and that at the forthcoming conference of Prime Ministers of the Dominions in London the whole problem of Imperial defence must be considered.
>
> There must be, the Prime Minister went on, co-ordination not only between the various services, but between the several parts of the Empire.

Now this is a very definite and very significant declaration that has come from the British Prime Minister within the last week or ten days. I wonder what the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has in mind in respect to this matter. Is it too much to ask that we should have a declaration from the Government in respect to all these matters that may come up? I hold this view, which I have expressed before in this House, that before this country is committed to any scheme of joint Imperial defence, or to anything else in the way of Imperial arrangements the

sanction of this Parliament should be obtained, and I offer this word of admonition or, shall I say, of advice to my right hon. friend, should he have the responsibility in the matter—that when he meets the British Prime Minister and the other members of the conference he will jealously guard Canada's rights and interests in these matters. I am sure it is his intention to do so, but I was a little bit diconcerted when I heard a month or so ago that my right hon. friend contemplated taking with him, as his colleagues on this mission, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ballantyne) who heads the navy of Canada and my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) who is the Minister of War for Canada. If this should happen to be the case I would all the more strongly urge upon my right hon. friend to step warily in his negotiations in this matter.

I come now to another matter, and that is the amendment moved by my hon. friend who leads the official Opposition in the House (Mr. Mackenzie King). My hon. friend has based his amendment, as I read it, upon this principle, if you wish—that my right hon. friend who leads the Government is a usurper and that consequently the Government has usurped authority in this country. Now, if that is the position taken by the leader of the Opposition I am bound to say that I cannot agree with him. The right hon. the leader of the Government comes to his office in a perfectly proper way. There are plenty of precedents, not only in this country but in Great Britain as well, to support his position; and if he had evidences that the country was behind him to-day, if he had a growing majority, or at least a standing majority that supported him, then he could on good grounds claim that he was entitled to continue as head of the Government in this country. But while I do not agree with my hon. friend who leads the Opposition as to the ground of his attack upon the Government, I agree entirely with his declaration that the Government has lost the confidence of the country; and conclusive evidence of that fact is found in the reverses the Government has suffered in the elections that have taken place within the last two years. It is true that the Government won two seats in the Maritime Provinces,—seats which they had carefully selected and very carefully handled when the election was on. They won one seat in British Columbia which my hon. friend (Mr. MacKelvie) who has recently taken his place in this House represents. But that was with a

greatly reduced majority. I would, however, point out the significant fact that the Government has lost every by-election held in the old province of Ontario; and I venture to say to-day that if my right hon. friend were to open up any seat in Western Canada and the great majority of seats in Ontario he would have the verdict that has been rendered by these other constituencies substantiated by the results. There is further evidence in the character of the appeal made, in the character of the tests that have taken place in these by-elections. Take any one of them: Were the real policies of the Government, the real questions before the country, discussed? I will give my right hon. friend the leader of the Government credit for this, that in most of his speeches he did come out frankly on the question of the tariff. But what of his supporters. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who I am sorry to say is not in his seat, took an active part in the East Elgin election; and what was the great national question that absorbed his attention? It was the salaries that were paid the officials in the Grain Growers' organization in Western Canada! That was the thing of paramount importance to my hon. friend from Frontenac. And then my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) was also there, and the great national question that absorbed that gentleman's attention was the amount of weed seed in screenings at Fort William.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I beg to take exception to the remarks of my hon. friend. He made that reference in an address in Aylmer. I reached that constituency the very day that he arrived there and consequently did not have an opportunity to make any such statement when he spoke there on that occasion.

Mr. CRERAR: I should be very sorry to do my hon. friend any injustice, but I read the newspaper reports, and I must give that as my evidence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: You did not read that in the reports.

Mr. CRERAR: I think I can produce evidence to that fact, but we will not bother with that just now. Now, let us come to the Maritime Provinces. What was the great question there? The great issue in the Colchester election, which returned the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy), was the combine of the Grain Growers in Western Canada. Protection? Why, the thing was scarcely ever discussed. But there was a promise of a post office, I believe, in the town of Truro, and there was a dim hope held out that a railway might be built through a certain section of that constituency. And then we come to the constituency of St. John, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore), who now presides over the Department of Customs. That hon. gentleman assured the good people of St. John that if he were only returned he would see that the Government did its duty by St. John. These were the issues discussed there. But were they the great issues that are before the people of this country? Why do not my hon. friends, when they are engaged in an election, discuss the real issues before the country, their administration, their economical management of the affairs of the country, what they will do with the railways, and what my hon. friend will do when he goes to London? But we do not hear anything of these questions; we have all these other issues discussed.

But, Sir, the strongest reason there is why the amendment of the leader of the Opposition should be supported lies in this fact, that my right hon. friend who leads the Government desires to reorganize his Government and cannot do so. Now, I do not think I am betraying any secret when I say that supporters of the Government in the country have stated that fact, that my right hon. friend desires to reorganize his Government and is waiting for an opportune moment to do so; and the opportune moment is the time when by-elections can be carried. I do not know to what extent my right hon. friend is going to reorganize his Government but I should like to know, for I have more than a passing interest in the matter. I should like to know who of the colleagues of my right hon. friend will be compelled to drink the hemlock! Who will walk the plank? I do not wish to make comparisons, but it is undoubtedly the desire of my right hon. friend to reorganize his Government. Now, Sir, a Government that is constituted in such a manner, where some are hoping to stay in and others are expecting to go out, cannot be a Government that will bring strength and courage to the management of the affairs of Canada at the present time. That constitutes the strongest possible reason why this unsettled and unsettling condition of affairs should terminate at the earliest possible moment; and for this and the various other reasons I have enumerated, I am going to support

the amendment offered by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, there never was a time when this country required a stronger Government; there never was a time when it required courage and vigour in Government so much as at this moment; and I see no prospect of such a condition in the present regime. My hon. friend is going along hoping against hope. He is hoping that the clouds may disperse and the sun come out, and that circumstances may arise whereby his difficulties will be solved. I am afraid he will find no consolation in that; it is a vain hope; and I am sorry to tender this opinion to my right hon. friend, but I am afraid that as the days pass the clouds will become thicker and the difficulties grow greater. Hon. gentlemen opposite urge a reason with a good deal of weight when they say that there should be a redistribution of seats before an election takes place. However, I have no very great confidence in the redistribution that my hon. friends will carry out. It is an open secret that the redistribution will bring about very considerable changes, and I am sure that the political engineers of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite have been very carefully surveying the ground to see where the proper lines should be placed in order to get the most effective results when the election comes on.

Mr. Speaker, we are now facing serious problems and I have endeavoured, I am afraid in a very imperfect way, to outline a number of them. They call for a policy of vigour, of courage, of determination of efficiency in the public administration of this country's business. My hon. friends opposite cannot hope in the present state of affairs to give that, consequently, believing as I do that we should have a new administration, that the people of Canada should have an opportunity to pronounce upon these questions, that the country needs vigour, efficiency and courage in its administration and that that cannot be secured until an election is held—for these reasons and these alone I shall support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House this afternoon on the questions that are before us, it is not my intention—

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Louder.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If hon. gentlemen will refrain from conversation there will be no difficulty in hearing the hon. member who at present has the floor.

Mr. HENDERS: It is not my intention to offer more than a few passing remarks on the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. leader of the Agrarian party (Mr. Crerar), but there are a few points in connection with his address to which I would invite the attention of the House. Those matters of importance to which he has referred and which should receive attention at the present time may be grouped under two or three headings. The hon. gentleman referred to the address delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in the city of New York a short time ago, when he pleaded for neighbourliness. It appears to me that some reason exists why at the present moment the thought and attention of the American people might be turned toward the attitude of those who are shortly to be entrusted with the government of that country, and that doubtless was the reason why the Minister of Trade and Commerce offered the suggestion which he did. Certain tariff proposals are being put forward on the other side of the line which it is hoped to put into operation in the not distant future, and in these proposals, some of us think, Canadian agriculture, our great basic industry, is receiving scant attention.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me expressed the opinion that we have little to expect, as agriculturists, in the shape of protection that would be of material advantage to us. But as I survey the proposed tariff changes of our American friends, I am fully convinced that our agricultural industry will suffer very seriously if these tariff changes are put into effect. The great wheat industry, for example, one of the main props of agriculture, will be hit very hard. The beef and live stock industry will also be subjected to a very serious handicap. Other Canadian industries will suffer; in fact, five or six at least of the contemplated duties will seriously affect agriculture in Canada. I can therefore readily understand why the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should feel some anxiety, and why it would be advisable to urge that favourable consideration be given to Canadian representations on this most important matter.

I can also understand that should our American friends deem it to be in the interest of their country to put into effect the proposed tariff changes, it would be

very necessary for us to consider what our tariff arrangements should be in that regard. It would be necessary that we should consider whether we will allow all the citrous fruits and vegetables which our American friends grow to enter our country free of duty, while they propose to tax to the very limit very important agricultural products, the market for which we depend so largely upon the country to the south to furnish.

The next point in the speech of my hon. friend to which I wish to refer is his statement with regard to the tariff. There was one important sentence in his statement on the tariff that I was pleased to hear him give utterance to; he congratulated the leader of this House on having made a clear-cut statement as to where the Government stood on the tariff question. I am sorry that I cannot return the compliment, for the leader of the Farmer's party (Mr. Crerar) in all his addresses delivered throughout the country, and in his remarkable speech this afternoon, failed to give to this House and to the people a clear-cut statement as to where he stands on the tariff question. But I am confident that both the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the Farmers' party will need to amend their statements along this line and tell the people definitely where they stand.

The leader of the Farmers' party states that of course there is a marked difference between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection, and that he stands for a tariff for revenue, while the Government stands for a tariff for protection. Well, if we are to judge these statements on their merits, that is in the light of experience, we can only reach the conclusion that a tariff for revenue must be a higher tariff than a tariff for protection. The Laurier Government went into power on a tariff for revenue, they proclaimed that that was their policy, and that they did not want any protection. And the statement is made that this Government is a protective tariff Government. Now, let us look at the results. The tariff for revenue purposes only, which the Laurier Government during the lengthy period of years that they were in office, exhausted their skill in framing required 20.18 per cent of revenue to be taken from the people on farm implements and other machinery. Turning now to the Government that is slated by the Opposition and by the Farmers' party as a high protectionist Government, I find that it has reduced the tariff on these articles to 14.61 per cent.

The previous speaker has stated that a tariff for protection cannot be a tariff for revenue, that revenue and protection are clear-cut and separate policies. If that be so, then, according to their practice, a tariff for revenue must always of necessity be a higher tariff than a tariff for protection. We do not believe in that sort of argument. We believe that it is possible to have a tariff for revenue, and at the same time to have the elements of protection in connection with that tariff, and to have that tariff brought to such a level that it will serve the best interests of our industries while giving to us a reasonable revenue for carrying on the government of the country. This does not necessarily mean a high tariff.

I will not attempt to follow the arguments of the previous speaker at any greater length at the present time, because I believe the proper occasion for the discussion of the tariff—will be when the Budget is brought down and we have before us the fiscal policy of the Government. But, Sir, I cannot refrain from giving expression to this one thought in passing. I cannot understand by what process of reasoning the previous speaker reached the conclusion he did reach from the line of argument he advanced, that he would vote for the amendment, when the leader of the Opposition, by an entirely opposite line of argument, reached the same conclusion.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House for a short time to a statement made by the leader of the Opposition with regard to practically refusing to allow the business of the country to be transacted because of what he asserts to be a fact, viz.: that the Government have no mandate from the people to carry on. In connection with that I have only this to say, that as far as I am able to follow him, there is very little in his argument to commend it to the judgment and intelligence of this House. This amendment is a challenge to the Government that they have no legal right to continue administering the affairs of state, that they have no mandate from the people, but that when elected their mandate was for a specific purpose and for a certain time, which purpose has been served and which time has elapsed. This is a somewhat new interpretation of the mandate given to the Government in 1917, and many of us on this side of the House believe that that mandate is capable of an entirely different interpretation.

There is no diversity of opinion as to the place the winning of the war occupied in connection with the affairs of Canada at the time this Government was elected. Viewed in the light of then important events the war was looked upon as the overmastering question that demanded our consideration; hence, due emphasis was given to it. A great issue was being fought out among the nations of the earth. A new doctrine had been proclaimed, a doctrine at entire variance with all our pre-conceived ideas of national life. That proud autocrat the German Emperor had asserted that he was a superman and that the German race was a super-race. Instead of the old belief that right is might, there was a revision of that order and the new adage was coined, "might is right." With that as their motto Germany had gone forth to assert herself and to propagate this new doctrine. The great issue was whether the influence of this new doctrine was to be the dominating influence in the world. The nations of the world grappled with this new issue. Many of them felt very keen the stress and strain to which they were subjected. The inroads which were being made upon our peace and harmony and good will by this new doctrine became such a menance to the world that life itself at the expense of the advancement of this doctrine became a matter of secondary consideration. Little wonder then that emphasis was placed on the question of the winning of the war, and that the government felt constrained to give it the highest and most prominent place in connection with governmental affairs.

But, Mr. Speaker, while that was the over-shadowing thought in connection with our national life at that time, that does not mean that it was the only thought; while that was the important work, the all important work, that does not mean that there was no other important work to be done. While many of us viewed that question as one, the satisfactory solution of which made the solution of all other questions possible, it did not by any means follow that we did not place value on the solution of these other questions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I rightly interpret the spirit and intention of the Union Government when they made their appeal to the country when I say that they received their mandate to carry on all the legitimate functions of Government, making them, of course, in every respect subservient to the great work of winning the war, but at the same time none the less important, none the less to be attended to, with perhaps one single exception. There was one question that was to be held in abeyance, one question that was not to be made an issue with the Government at this time, and the very fact that that question was particularized, was singled out and referred to as in a special class by itself, leaves us to the inference—and there is no other inference—that all other questions within the realm of governmental work were to receive fair and proper consideration.

My statement is borne out by the fact that while that one question, the tariff, was not referred to in the manifesto issued by the then leader of the Government, the supporters of the Union Government, upon appearing before the people, stated clearly and distinctly on the public platform that this question must be made an exception. I remember very well a meeting which was held in the city of Winnipeg, addressed by the present Prime Minister, by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and by the leader of the Agrarian party (Mr. Crerar). According to the report published in the press of the addresses delivered on that occasion, these gentlemen spoke of the work of the Government, of the magnitude of the war effort, of the necessity of getting people to unite their forces in this great work. And they referred to one exception, and only one. Now, if there were other exceptions; if other matters of government were not to be dealt with, would not occasions of this kind, and the manifesto which was issued, be the times and the places where such statements should be made? But in the manifesto there is not a word about it; there is just the one statement that the tariff should not be an issue during that administration, and as I say that statement was made, not in the manifesto, but in the press and on the public platforms where important addresses were delivered.

5 p.m.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERS: I hear the hon. member for Red Deer say "Hear, hear."

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I did not even whisper.

Mr. HENDERS: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I forgive the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HENDERS: I thought it was my hon. friend's voice that I heard. Not only

did gentlemen who represented the Government on public platforms refer to the matter in that light; other members who were selected and gentlemen who expected or hoped to be the supporters of the Government felt it necessary to refer to the question in that light. We have the statement published over the signature of members from the West in which they concurred in that view. Dealing with the matter of the tariff, they said:

> We have now in Canada a Union Government, formed under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden and embracing Liberal and Independent and Labour representatives as well as Conservatives.

Then it proceeds to state that the Government's policy goes farther than the raising of money for the carrying on of the war. It says further, referring to the Government's policy:

> It stands for carrying out the Military Service Act, to secure the necessary reinforcements for our soldiers, for adequate taxation of war profits and for increased taxation of incomes as necessitated by the continuance of the war. In addition to this it is pledged by the enactment of effective measures to prevent excessive profits, to the encouragement of co-operation with a view to the reduction of the cost of producing and marketing, and to the abolition of patronage by the extension of the principle of the Civil Service Act to the Outside Service. This goes far in the direction set forth in the Farmers' Platform and as a war measure, I believe, sufficiently covers the ground.

Then follows this further statement:

> In regard to the tariff permit me to quote from the statement recently issued in common with other Independent candidates in Western Canada. I am "prepared to forego the immediate discussion of the tariff as being, in the opinion of some, a contentious matter, if given full assurance that an adequate measure of excess profits and income taxation would be put in operation at the earliest moment and that thus a genuine mobilization of wealth would accompany conscription of men." The Government's policy meets this condition and on the basis stated I am prepared to give it my support.

The point I want to make is this, that there was only one exception made to the whole administration and operation of Government in connection with the policy and platform laid down by the Union Government at that time, and that exception was made by those men who declared that the tariff was not to be an issue during the administration of the Government in carrying on the war. Yet, within fifteen months, immediately after the first session of this House took place, lines of action were laid down and put into effect, and the result of that has been and is that the men who pledged themselves at that time that the tariff was not to be an issue, took exception to the policy of the Government on the tariff, and finally separated themselves from the Government and took positions on the other side. Why? Because they broke their pledge to the Government that they would not make the tariff an issue while the Government was carrying on the war.

Furthermore let us look at the record of the Government, and judge it from its record along the lines of legislation and splendid achievement. During the early days of its history, and even down to the very last session of the House, even the Opposition never seriously entertained the idea that the Government had not a mandate to function along ordinary lines. If it be true, as the leader of the Opposition recently has asserted, that the Government has no mandate now to carry on, since when did the leader of the Opposition arrive at this conclusion? If, as the leader of the Opposition says, this Government is functioning under usurped authority, when did that usurpation take place? If he concurs that the mandate was for the winning of the war and until demobilization ceased, then what about the legislation of the last session of this House? The leader of the Opposition, supported by all his followers, made no objection to the legislation of last session; that is, no more than the ordinary opposition that would be made by members in opposition. They put forward no contention that the legislation was not proper legislation because the Government had no right to function.

The many important measures that came before this House and were crystallized into legislation, received careful consideration by all the members of this House, the Opposition amongst them. That most important Bill, the Franchise Bill, which occupied the attention of the House for weeks, which was discussed, clause by clause, and the greatest care possible given to it, in order that the Franchise Bill might be one that would be a credit to us as Canadians—that Bill, with all the labour consequent thereto, was the work, according to the theory set forth by the leader of the Opposition, of a Government which had usurped authority and had no right to function at that time. I would like to understand by what process of reasoning the leader of the Opposition reached the exact point where, he said, the mandate ceased and this Government usurped power.

Let us turn to another phase of this question. We have listened to speaker after speaker who has attempted to cite precedent after precedent in support of the position he has taken that this Government has no right to function, should resign and should receive a fresh mandate from the people. In all the cases cited there has been, to my mind, one important factor which has been kept distinctly in the back ground, and that important factor is; Who, is the responsible party, who has the right to decide, when the right time has arrived for the Government to make an appeal to the people for endorsation or otherwise?

I may not have studied history and parliamentary procedure as carefully as many other members of this House; but as far as I have been able to make investigation along these lines, I have been led to the opinion that there were certain specific causes or reasons, and that these specific causes or reasons narrowed themselves down to a very small point when that decision was required to be made. The Prime Minister, who had been called to form a Government, was elected to these responsible duties for not longer than a certain period of time; but, at any time that he felt either that he lacked the confidence or the support of the people behind him, or that there was a great issue which, he felt, was of such magnitude that the people had a right to make a pronouncement on it, he had a right to call for an election and to make an appeal to the people.

There is another reason why an election must be held. If the Opposition in the House are able, not merely to assert that there is lack of confidence in the Government but are able to show cause by educating the representatives of the people in the House on that point; if they are able to introduce a want of confidence motion that will command a majority vote of the sitting members in the House, then they have established a reason why an election should be held. It is not sufficient for the leader of the Opposition and his supporters to keep crying continually " The Government has not the confidence of the people." Such petty whining may be carried to the point where those who are carrying on the propaganda may imagine they themselves believe it, but it will have no influence when considered by an intelligent electorate.

A few representative members of the Opposition in this House have gone up and down the country crying want of confidence in the Government. They have earnestly and seriously tried to raise that cry amongst the people, and in their vain imaginings they may have come to the conclusion that they have succeeded in doing so, as they have convinced themselves by the frequent repetition of the statement that there is lack of confidence in the Govment amongst the people of the country. But that does not prove anything.

I would be the last one in this House to support the Government in hanging on to office if I felt there was any truth in these statements. I have gone carefully through a large portion of my constituency; I have conversed with electors, those who were formerly Liberal, and those who now support the Union Government, and I make this statement to-day, that I have not found two per cent of the electors in my constituency who have expressed any desire for an election. The great preponderance of opinion expressed among my people is that this Government should carry on; that we should get further away from the unrest which is a natural outcome of the times through which we have passed in connection with the war and war conditions; that the country should have time to get back to normal conditions, and when we have done that then it will be the proper time for this Government to make an appeal to the people.

There is another point to which I wish to call attention Mr. Speaker, and that is that in all the discussion that has taken place in this House during the past few days there has not been one charge made against this Government of maladministration or of corrupt practices in any form.

If there is want of confidence there must be some cause for it. That cause would show itself in the work that is done by the Government. There would be either lack of efficiency in administration, lack of progressive legislation, or corruption in administration. Have we heard anything of this? Not one word, not one sentence, not one accusation that would place a stigma upon the Government in connection with its administration.

There is the further point of progressive legislation that is worthy of consideration by the members of this House. Has there ever been a Government in Canada that in the same period of time has put on the statute books of the country as much sane, progressive, and uniformly good legislation as the present Government. It might be well to call the attention to a few of the important measures that have received favourable consideration, but as my time is passing, and I have spoken much longer

than I had intended, I will leave that for some other time.

The Government, I take it, is challenged, and that challenge will have to be settled one way or the other. My reasoning leads me to only one conclusion, viz; that I must vote against the amendment. May I call attention to a particular matter that I think should have the thought and attention of the Government at the present time. If there is one question that is agitating the minds of Western farmers at the present time more than any other, it is that of the handling of their wheat products. Scarcely a day passes that we do not see in some paper an item regarding the handling of the wheat crop, the Canada Wheat Board, wheat pools, or a reference to some similar phase of the grain question. I believe it can be said without exaggeration that this is the question of paramount importance in Western Canada to-day. Rumours are rife, charges and counter-charges of wrong-doing are in the air, and the result is that the minds of the Western producers are agitated abnormally on this question.

The dismissal of the Canada Wheat Board meant that the business of handling our wheat reverted back to the Grain Exchange, to the old system of grain handling. Some of us were seriously disappointed when that reversion took place. In the appointment of the Wheat Board we felt that the Government had gone a long way towards solving this, one of the most important and intricate problems affecting the greatest industry of Canada. Of course, there were those who favoured the old system, and they were not slow in making their influence felt. Representatives of the Exchange found their way to this House purporting to give out information as to the difficulty that must accrue from this new system of handling our grain. They spoke of the general shortage of world supply and assured us that there was nothing to fear, that in any case the producers of grain were bound to receive a remunerative price for their product. It was stated that an abnormal price might be expected, and the people were led to believe that they might look for even $4 of $5 per bushel wheat.

What took place? The Grain Exchange began to function. In a very short time the price of wheat began to drop. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to point out why these prices dropped. I know that large bodies of responsible farmers considered that the grain exchanges were to blame. I do know that numbers of producers think that the short selling on the grain exchanges resulted in the lowering of prices. This lowering of price was instrumental in inducing a great many farmers to hold their wheat. They believed if they kept that wheat in the elevators they would eventually secure a higher price.

Under the rules and regulations of the Grain Act, when grain is stored in the elevators, it is well known to producers that the elevator companies are nothing more or less than storage companies. They have no right to dispose of that grain without the consent of the producer. It was therefore reasonable for them to expect that by their holding this grain out of the market they would create a demand for wheat which would at least have the effect of raising the price or of increasing its market value. But what did we find? We found that the producers by holding this grain did not secure the object they had in view, did not succeed in keeping it off the market and therefore that the purpose they had in view, by which they hoped to stabilize the price was entirely thwarted by the manipulation of the grain exchanges.

I am led to this belief by the statements made by a responsible minister of the Crown in Saskatchewan. This minister ought to know what he is talking about. He is closely indentified with both country and terminal elevators. His statement is that a lot of this grain to which I have referred was shipped from the company elevators and also from the public terminal elevators without the permission of the producers. This grain was thrown on the market and sold, and this act was the means of depressing the market and bringing about the conditions to which I have just now referred.

A statement of this kind made by such a responsible party ought to be sufficient in itself to call forth from this Government a very careful investigation as to its truth or falsity. If it is true that we have country elevators taking the wheat of the farmer, selling it without permission, utilizing the money, and then when the farmer does sell, possibly charging him storage and interest right up to date, it is a serious state of affairs and I can only repeat that this statement was made by a responsible minister of the Crown in Saskatchewan. It should be investigated very thoroughly by the Government.

Another point I should like to bring to your attention is this. I am credibly informed that the North West Grain Dealers' Association sends out daily state-

ments of prices to be paid at country points by country elevators; that all the elevators—and I emphasize that little word "all" operating at a country point receive their statement of prices through this channel, and that this fixed price must be the price at that point from the time the market closes until the opening of the market the following day, and must be adhered to by all the members of the Association, on pain of being expelled. Is that a just or equitable way of dealing with the farmers in the handling of their grain? Is it possible that there is only one source from which prices can go out, that all the members of the Exchange are so bound that they cannot vary to the extent of a fraction of a cent from this price so sent out, on penalty of expulsion from the Association? Where does the element of justice come in there? Surely it is reasonable to suppose that there will be prices for grain coming from different sources, and from different quarters of the world, to different members on the Grain Exchange, and all these prices will not be fixed definitely.

Would it not be reasonable to expect that buyers of grain soliciting these orders, securing these prices, might be in a position to allow the element of competition to enter in, and that the producer might reasonably expect to get some consideration along these lines. But all this is eliminated. The closing market price for the grain is taken, the freight rate is deducted among other charges, and then a spread is also taken for street wheat. This spread for a time last fall varied from 5 to 40 cents per bushel. The price sent out by the North West Grain Dealers' Association is invariably based on the closing option prices. No cognizance is taken of premiums of cash wheat. For instance, when there was a shortage of wheat last fall, dealers were paying as high as 30 cents per bushel premium over the prevailing price for No. 1 wheat. Do the farmers secure this? By no means. This premium of 30 cents per bushel on all wheat purchased between the closing and opening of the market went into the pockets of the people who operated country elevators, and it will be shown if investigated that very large sums of money accrued to these operators through this system.

With reference to the grain exchanges, while I do not make any charges against their operation, nevertheless suspicion has been aroused. Suspicion is rampant in the country that the operation of the grain exchanges is not strictly above board, and this Government will do well to see that a thorough investigation is made into the handling of the grain from the time it leaves the producer at the farm until it reaches the consumer.

Rumour has it that iniquity abounds—I can use no milder term—in connection with the sale of futures. Figures for the markets on the other side are available, and investigation would no doubt show that the practices on the other side can be corroborated by the practices on this side. What do they show where investigation has taken place? They show that the number of bushels of wheat bought and sold in Chicago averages per year three times as much as the total production of wheat in the entire world. There were fifty-one times as many bushels of grain sold on the Exchange at Chicago as grain shipped to Chicago. The actual grain available for delivery at Chicago averaged less than .28 of one per cent of the number of bushels sold. In other words, over 99½ per cent of the sales of futures are not followed by the actual delivery of grain. What may the condition of affairs be in Winnipeg?

Now let us have a look at the terminal elevators. The honourable member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), has, on numerous occasions, brought to the attention of the members that famous document, "the Price-Waterhouse Report." If any of the members have not seen this, I strongly advise them to secure a copy from the Minister of Trade and Commerce immediately. It is interesting reading. To think that any company could make as much money as some of these elevator companies, especially when they are supposed to be regulated by the Board of Grain Commissioners, is beyond me. Some of the large industrial companies have been damned for making excessive profits, but they are little tin gods compared with some of our grain companies.

Here are some particulars from the report and from the letter of Mr. Christie in the Farmer's Advocate: I say, Sir, is it not time that the Government listened to the members in regard to these overages and sale screening and scalpings? This report, Sir, has only to do with public terminal elevators. No investigation has been made of the private terminal elevators. These are the elevators that are permitted to mix grain to their heart's content, and being allowed, they take full advantage of the right. I have before me figures for one of these elevators at the head of the lakes. They show that this elevator received 323,930 bushels of No. 1

Northern, and shipped out 331,529 bushels. They received 382,822 bushels of No. 2 Northern, and shipped out 55,864 bushels, just 160,000 bushels more. And listen to this: They received 1,251,411 bushels of No. 3 Northern, and shipped out 2,619,391 bushels—just double as much shipped out as was received. In other words, this elevator received 1,960,729 bushels of wheat grading No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3 Northern, and they shipped out 3,486,786 bushels, or a surplus of 1,536,057 bushels. Just figure this out for yourselves, bearing in mind that the price of wheat last year was fixed at a comparatively high figure by the Canada Wheat Board.

Where did they get this surplus? This is a perfect legitimate question. I notice that they took in a lot of smutty, and tough wheat but they shipped very little of this low grade wheat out. In other words they bought the low grade wheat at a low price from the producer, and then by a process of mixing with higher grade wheat got it past the inspector. This is called promotion of grades, and is practised by all the private elevator companies at the head of the lakes. I do not think that in treating this tough wheat they use the drier very much because coal is too expensive. They probably just elevated the tough wheat once or twice and then were able to mix it with the straight grade wheat and ship it out.

I have only mentioned wheat. They do the same in regard to barley and flax. Talk about John D. Rockefeller making money; he is not in it with some of these private elevator operators. They are the real profiteers. You have no doubt been surprised at the figures of the overages in the public terminal elevators, but I venture to say, that every member in this House would gasp if figures were produced showing the earnings of these private elevators for the last five or six years. It is up to the Government to get these figures.

If you look up the records of what went through the drying process you will find that only a very small proportion ever reached the dryer. By elevating it once or twice they got it into such condition that by mixing it with dry wheat it went through very nicely. But the producer did not get the benefit of it. I would like to know what right has this association, and what right have the elevators to load grain out without the proper surrender of the documents by its owner. It appears to me that great laxity has been shown by its owner.

All these things added together make it necessary that steps be taken to see how many of these statements are true and how many are false. If they are true, I submit that it is the duty of this Government to see that regulatory steps are taken to cleanse the present system, and put it on an honest business basis.

All the evidence goes to show that a most important duty expected from the Government, is that of enquiring into the handling of our wheat crop. I think it wise to call attention to the matter now, in view of the fact that in a very short time it will be necessary for us to make preparation for the handling of our crop for next year. Upon the provision that is made by the Government for safely guarding the interest of the producer much will depend as to the quantity of wheat that we may expect will be seeded next spring. It is up to us therefore to leave nothing undone to give assurances to the producers that in connection with the handling of their wheat crop there will be no serious shrinkage or loss to them. We believe the time has come to appoint a commission with full power to investigate in every direction so as to bring out all the information possible in order that we may have the facts before us.

In saying this I do not wish to speak disrespectfully, or to in anyway disparage, the operations of any company or any method of handling wheat. I am merely calling attention to the fact that the people are agitated over the question, that there is a feeling of unrest with respect to it all through the country, and that the suspicion exists among the farmers that they are not being fairly treated. This unrest will not be quieted until the lid is taken off and the whole of the facts brought out. If the allegations to which I have alluded are not borne out after inquiry has been made, it will be to the interests of the Grain Exchange, and everybody concerned, that the facts should be known. The Exchange will then stand higher in the estimation of the people and confidence will be restored to all those engaged in the industry. If the allegations made are sustained it will be evident that the time has come when we must resort to other methods for the handling of our grain.

In my remarks I am entirely uninfluenced by any desire to interfere with the investigation which is being carried on by the Grain Growers' themselves in connection with this matter. What I am asking for will materially help them in reaching a

proper finding on the problem they themselves are attempting to solve. They will have my co-operation and support if they can propose a method which will bring about the desired result. I am sorry to have occupied so much of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I really could not deal with the subject within any shorter space.

Mr. HENRI E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative on every member of this House to clearly express his views on the important amendment which has been presented by the hon. leader of the Oppotion (Mr. Mackenzie King). But before doing so I wish to extend my congratulations to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) upon his elevation to his present high position, surely an evidence of the confidence which the supporters of the Government must have had in him. This promotion is undoubtedly due to his great ability, his great talents, and his great energy. I also wish to tender my sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Both these gentlemen certainly fulfilled the important duty entrusted to them with great ability and acquitted themselves in a manner that is a credit to themselves and their constituents.

It was a matter of great regret that the Government saw fit to depart from the old and well-established custom of having the Address moved and seconded in both the official languages of the country. It is certainly to be deplored, Mr. Speaker, that among the supporters of the Government there could not be found at least one hon. gentleman capable of moving or seconding the Address in the French language.

As I have already said, the amendment before us is of great importance and should receive the approbation of the majority of the members in this House, as it certainly has the approbation of the great majority of the Canadian electors. With the exception of the members of the Cabinet and their supporters, the amendment without doubt has the support of the country at large. Throughout the country the demand is everywhere heard for a general election. All classes and communities are calling for it. The consumers, the labouring classes, the returned soldiers, the farmers—and I can speak for the farmers because I represent one of the largest agricultural counties in the province of Quebec—are all urging a general election. The members of the Opposition are ready for a general election. We are not afraid to face our electors, we are not afraid to discuss the Government's policies; we are ready to meet the members of the Government, or their supporters in the province of Quebec or anywhere else. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I shall with great pleasure support the amendment which is now before the House.

Lately a great many compliments have been bestowed on the province of Quebec. The feeling which has existed largely since the general election of 1917 seems to have changed, if we are to judge by the kind words and bouquets which are being lavished on my province. We are delighted to see this change of heart, but we would appreciate it much more if it were supplemented by sincerity of purpose on the part of the Government. I refer more particularly to the capital of my province, the city of Quebec, which has been so unjustly treated. I was delighted to read in the newspapers a few months ago the speeches made by the Prime Minister in the province of Quebec in which he expressed his desire to see her united with the other provinces. I was also very much pleased to hear the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), one of the most aggressive members on the Government side against the province of Quebec, throw us some bouquets a few days ago. But, as I have already stated, Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec are not looking for bouquets or kind words; they are looking for the fulfilment of the solemn written obligations of the Government towards the city of Quebec.

I do not doubt the sincerity of the Prime Minister's frequently expressed desire to treat the province of Quebec on an equal footing with the other provinces, but it would be more to the purpose if he would at once give instructions to the proper departments of his Government to render justice to the city of Quebec, for then we would have an earnest of his solicitude for our so-called isolation. We are not asking for special favours. The eve of a general election is not the time for the citizens of Quebec to get down on their knees. We are only asking for the performance of what has been promised to the city of Quebec under solemn written contracts. We are asking the Government to fulfil their pledge to give us proper equipment for the Transcontinental railway; we are asking the Government to construct the long-pro-

mised and long-deferred docks and grain elevators; we are asking the Government to resume the works on the St. Charles river, on which nearly $2,000,000 have already been expended, and which works are now lying idle and useless. The late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Carvell, stated in 1919 that the work would be proceeded with, and he admitted that unless it were carried to completion the $1,750,000 already expended would be simply wasted. That work was suspended without any reason whatever, as I can prove to this House at any time by official documents. If it is really the intention of the Prime Minister to treat my province on an equal footing with any other part of the Dominion, I will ask him to order those works to be procedeed with immediately, for the money has been already voted for them, and they have been interrupted unjustly and without any reason whatever.

I would also ask the Government to fulfil their contract to complete workshops and put up the main building which has been agreed upon for the Transcontinental railway. The city sacrificed the Champlain market property, valued at over $3,000,000, on the strength of a written contract signed by the Federal Government and the city, under which the Government agreed to build workshops of the same size and type as those erected in Winnipeg—shops equipped for building cars and locomotives and giving employment to four or five thousand workmen, whereas the present shops are only employing about seven hundred. I would ask the right hon. the Prime Minister to see that this part of the contract is fulfilled without further delay.

I would also ask the Prime Minister, now that he has so much love for the citizens of Quebec, to see that justice is done to those people of that province who subscribed to stocks in the Great Northern and Lake St. John Railways and who have not been able to settle their claims with the Government, although numbers of petitions and demands have been made during the last few years upon the Government with a view to reimbursing those citizens who subscribed over $650,000 in connection with those two railways. When the majority shareholders are paid the full amount of their shares, the minority shareholders also should be reimbursed.

Let me mention one or two of the chief reasons why the citizens of Quebec subscribed to stocks in these companies. In respect of $200,000 worth of stock subscribed to the Great Northern Company, that company agreed to erect their repair shops in Limoilou. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker? The men employed at Limoilou have been transferred to the St. Malo shops. If it is the intention of the Government to dispense with the shops at Limoilou, why do they not—and I am pleased to see the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in his seat—reimburse the city of Quebec for the $200,000 subscribed by its citizens in order that they might have the shops at Limoilou? Certainly this should be done if the contract in respect to these shops is to be cancelled by the Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks this afternoon, I stated that the work on the St. Charles river was interrupted without any valid reasons being offered. I wish, with your permission, Sir, to give to the House a certain declaration made in the House of Commons by Mr. Carvell, then Minister of Public Works, as reported in Hansard of May 13, 1919. Mr. Carvell's declaration was made in reply to this interpellation of the hon. member for Lotbinière:

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister tell us if it is his intention to finish up the damming of the St. Charles river at Quebec?

Mr. CARVELL: There is no vote in the Estimates for that. The trouble with the St. Charles river proposition at Quebec is a very simple one. The scheme is to construct a dam across the mouth of the river where it empties into the St. Lawrence. There were to be two entrances from the St. Lawrence up into the basins of the St. Charles river. That was to create practically a lake 12 or 14 feet higher than the ordinary level of the river at low tide and, to some extent, higher than the level would be at high tide. The sewage of at least three-quarters of the city of Quebec enters into the St. Charles river above the location of this dam and before the work was started an agreement was made with the city of Quebec by which they were to provide for the sewage. There was to be a big trunk sewer constructed by which the sewage would be emptied into the St. Lawrence river around and below the dam at the mouth of the St. Charles. It will cost probably $2,000,000. I suppose they had some trouble about financing it during the war but no attempt has been made to take care of that sewage. They have refused to go on with the work until something is done about the sewage. If you build a dam across the St. Charles river and dump the sewage of 75,000 or 80,000 people into the river for a year you will have a pest house; you could not live alongside of it.

I would not take the responsibility of consenting to go on with the work until something was done about the sewage. With this, I take the same ground that I have taken in regard to St. John and other places. We have about $1,750,000 invested in the St. Charles river work at the present time and it will take another $1,000,000 to finish it. The money we have expended is absolutely lost until the work is completed but I cannot go on and complete it until something is done to protect the health of the city of Quebec.

It will be of interest to the members of this House to know the exact terms of the contract entered into between the city of Quebec and the Federal Government in regard to the work on the St. Charles river, regarding which work Mr. Carvell stated that the city had not fulfilled its obligations and that, therefore, the Government had not gone on with the work. With your permission, Sir, I will read the contract which was entered into between the Government and the city of Quebec:

Before Charles Juge Baillairgeon, Public Notary for the Province of Quebec, residing and practising in the said City of Quebec

Came and appeared:

His Majesty King George V, represented by the Honourable Frederick Debartzch Monk, Minister of the Public Works of the Dominion of Canada, the said Honourable F. D. Monk hereto represented by Mr. A. R. Decary, Engineer of the Department of Public Works, for the district of Quebec, according to a procuration signed by the Honourable F. D. Monk, in Ottawa, dated May 2nd, 1919, annexed to the minute of these presents after having been recognized and signed by the said Mr. A. R. Decary in the presence of the undersigned Notary.

And the City of Quebec, represented by His Worship Mayor Napoleon Drouin, duly authorized for the purpose hereof by a resolution of the City Council of Quebec, at a meeting held on April 19th, 1912; of which a certified copy is annexed to the minutes of the present contract after having been signed by Mr. Napoleon Drouin, in the presence of the undersigned Notary, part of the second part,—

Which said parties have agreed and covenanted as follows: to wit;

Whereas the party of the first part proposes to execute certain works of damming and dredging in the river St. Charles,

Whereas part of the actual sewerage system of the City of Quebec actually discharges in the said river St. Charles,

Whereas the works of dredging and damming in the river St. Charles, if executed, will consequently interfere with the proper discharge of sewers actually deversing in the said river;

Whereas it has been agreed between the parties that a contract would be signed in virtue whereof the said city of Quebec will save the Government of the Dominion of Canada harmless against any claims that may be made with regard to the said sewers.

In consequence, it is by these presents agreed and covenanted as follows:—

1. The party of the second part will, if the party of the first part executes the proposed damming and dredging works in the city of Quebec, save the Government harmless against any claim whatever that may be made in connection with the sewerage system actually deversing in the river St. Charles, or which may deverse in the said river, which sewers are under control of the said City of Quebec.

2. The Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other part will allow the city of Quebec, if said works are carried out in the river St. Charles, permission to discharge the sewers outside, through and at large of the proposed damming works on the said river, towards the St. Lawrence river, permission extending on all sewers which the city will have to construct to regulate the said sewerage system.

Done and Executed in Quebec, under the notarial number six hundred and twenty-nine of the minutes of the undersigned Notary.

In Testimony Whereof the appearers have signed on the fourth day of June of the year nineteen hundred and twelve in the presence of the said Notary, after due reading.

(Signed)

NAP. DROUIN,
ALBERT DECARY,
CHARLES J. BAILLAIRGEON, N.P.

I have read this contract so that there will be no misunderstanding regarding what was agreed to between the Dominion Government and the city of Quebec. The contract is nothing more and nothing less than that if the Government does the work, the city of Quebec will not hold the Government responsible for any damage which may be caused to the sewers. Therefore, when I state that the work on the St. Charles river at Quebes has been interrupted without any valid reason, I think you will admit, Sir, that my contention, which is that of the citizens of Quebec, is perfectly right. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) really has, as is stated, a special place in his heart for the citizens of Quebec, he should prove his good faith, not by throwing bouquets to the people of Quebec but by prompt action in doing justice to the citizens of the province and more particularly of the city of Quebec, who seem to have been boycotted by this Government in the past few years.

Besides the claims I enumerated this afternoon, the citizens of the city of Quebec have made another very important claim on the Government. During the riots in the city of Quebec, four most peaceable citizens were killed by the soldiers, who had taken control of the city by order of the Government, issued through the Militia Department. The Riot Act had never been read in the city before the shooting took place, and the mayor of Quebec, which position I had the honour of occupying at that time, had never asked the military powers to take control of the city, but we asked them to protect their own buildings in case the city police were not able to do so.

You, Mr. Speaker, and the citizens of Canada, are familiar with what occurred during the riots, and the unfortunate consequences. I repeat, four perfectly innocent citizens were killed by the soldiers, and a few others were badly injured for life. The parents of the slain, as well as the injured, have made claims on the Government, but their demands have received no consideration. If the Prime Minister really has so warm a spot in his heart for the citizens of Quebec, is not this a good time to prove his sincerity by settling these claims of the victims, and all the other claims which I have set forth this afternoon and evening in my remarks.

Mr. GEORGE BRECKEN NICHOLSON (East Algoma): Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset associate myself with the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in commendation of the speeches delivered by the mover and the seconder of the resolution now before the House. May I at the same time extend my personal congratulations to my right hon. leader, the Prime Minister, on his elevation to the highest office in the gift and service of the Canadian people. I should like to be permitted to go a little further and say that I think the House and the country are to be congratulated on the fact that when our great Prime Minister and leader, Sir Robert Borden, who piloted the affairs of this country during the whole period of the war, found that owing to a physical breakdown it was necessary for him to resign, there was found within the Government itself a man whose qualities of heart and mind so eminently fitted him to take up the reins of office and carry on from the point where Sir Robert left off.

I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lavigueur) will feel that I am at all discourteous if I do not attempt to follow him in the remarks he has made to the House this afternoon and evening. The first part of his remarks followed the general line that has been taken by members on the Opposition side of the House during the whole debate, while the latter part dealt with a subject apparently in dispute betwen the city of Quebec and the Government, of which I have no knowledge and am consequently unable to speak.

Coming to the debate itself, I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that in its course it has blazed out for itself a trail that makes it take a unique place in the annals of Parliamentary debate of a similar character in this country. The House has been in session almost two weeks. We have had placed in our hands by His Excellency the Governor General a legislative programme of some importance, notwithstanding the remarks made by my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) this afternoon. We were charged also with the responsibility of scrutinizing the record of the Government in the past and their programme for the future. In a word, we had before us in review the whole record of the Government, both in its administrative and legislative capacities. In such a review I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is usually the practice of the Opposition to take some part. As a matter of fact, I will go further and say that the debate on the Address is looked upon as the opportunity of the Opposition to scrutinize every act of the Government, administrative and legislative. It is looked upon as their opportunity to dig into and pry up, if they can, any weak spot in the administrative or legislative record of the Government.

But what has happened in this debate? It is now well on in its second week, and we have seen one hon. member after another on the opposite side of the House, from the leader of the Opposition down, rise in his place and talk about every purely academic subject under the sun rather than the Address of His Excellency the Governor General. There are two reasons for that. In the first place—and I think this is a matter upon which the House and the country can legitimately congratulate itself—the record of the Government has been such that the Opposition cannot, dig and delve as they may, put their finger on one single act of the Government and say: This is something you should not have done. Nor can they put their finger on one single proposal of the Government and say: This is something you should not do.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the marine policy of the Government?

Mr. NICHOLSON: If my hon. friend has any fault to find with the marine policy of the Government, it will be in order for him when he speaks in this debate to deal with that subject, but so far, his colleagues who have spoken have avoided anything in the nature of criticism of any part of the Government's policy.

There is another reason. You know, Sir, it is not a difficult matter for any dema-

gogue to indulge in destructive criticism, and to utter all sorts of declamations; but when it comes to a question of offering constructive criticism or helpful suggestions there requires to be something in the nature of unanimity of opinion amongst those who offer such criticism and suggestions. And for the leader of the Opposition to undertake to secure unanimity of opinion amongst his followers on any subject of public importance in this country at the present time, would create a situation that would find a fitting parallel only in the chaotic circumstances surrounding the tower of Babel. He simply could not unite his followers on any single subject of prime importance before the country, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

There is one other reason why the speech from the Throne and matters of a similar character have been studiously avoided. The leader of the Opposition and his followers do not want to discuss anything in the nature of a real and vital issue to-day. It is not in keeping with the arrangement that has been so studiously worked up between my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Notwithstanding all this, however, the debate has served some useful purpose. In the first place, it has shown both to this House and to the country the opposition to this Government in all its naked impotence.

Just analyze the situation for a moment. We heard the hon. member for Marquette this afternoon say that this country was faced with problems of supreme importance, problems that would require the attention of all thinking men if they were to be properly solved. Well, then, what has been the contribution of the Opposition? They have offered nothing but lifeless, meaningless opposition, the still-born product of the leader of the Opposition's political councils, capable of nothing but complete bankruptcy in statesmanship. He leads what is only an apology for what was once a great political party. Mr. Speaker, the debate has served another purpose: it has given an opportunity to the leader of the Opposition—I regret exceedingly he is not in his place——

An hon. MEMBER: Too bad.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Well, before I sit down it is my intention to address some definitely pointed remarks to the hon. gentleman's position and record. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that the debate has given to the leader of the Opposition an opportunity to occupy in the centre of the stage what would seem to be his favourite position, that of perhaps the greatest example of bloodless neutrality that this generation has produced.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let us just for a moment review the programme of legislation submitted to the House. The first item deals with unemployment in this country. Now, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Marquette said this afternoon, and notwithstanding the indifference with which that subject has been treated in the House the question of unemployment, I conceive, is of some importance; and every right-thinking man in this country must realize that our social conditions are not going to be what they should be until measures are found to cope with the unemployment situation. The leader of the Opposition, theoretically, when he is in his study writing books, is supposed to know something about the workingman's problems. But when he comes on the floor of the House of Commons and a great proposition is before him, where does he stand?

An hon. MEMBER: He stands right.

Mr. NICHOLSON: He says, Mr. Speaker, in so many words: "I wash my hands entirely of the question of unemployment. I am not interested in whether the workingman is employed or not; I am neutral." That is the position he takes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not at all.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Now, the next question submitted to the House in the speech from the Throne is unemployment insurance and old age pensions. This is a subject of prime importance notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary. It is a difficult problem. Every English-speaking country in the world is grappling with the problem of unemployment insurance and old age pensions, and every English-speaking country in the world will continue to grapple with it until it is properly solved. This Parliament has been charged with the responsibility of taking hold of that problem and dealing with it.

My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), for whose opinion I have the very highest regard, said in his speech that he hoped this Government and this Parliament would not press the matter of unemployment insurance and old age pen-

sions. I take exactly the reverse position. I hope that this Government and this House will press the question. Because it is very difficult is one reason why we should take hold of it and try to find a proper solution for it. And, Sir, I will go so far as to say that unless some system can be devised that will remove from the honest workingmen the spectre of the possibility that their families may suffer because they cannot obtain work, then our whole social system will go to pieces. I say again that this is a difficult problem, and it will require the attention of earnest, virile men.

Where does the leader of the Opposition stand with regard to this matter? Again, he virtually says, "I am neutral when it comes to a question of unemployment insurance and old age pensions."

The next item in the speech from the Throne is the question of Canada's position in the League of Nations and of a Court of International Justice. But surely. says the leader of the Opposition, this is going too far. Now, the whole question of the League of Nations and the setting up of a Court of International Justice has arisen out of the war, and it is because the steel has gone to the hearts and souls of millions of people all over the civilized world that there is a suggestion that we might possibly set up a work of League of Nations and should have a Court of International Justice. But the hon. gentleman says: "Have I not made it absolutely manifest that I have no interest in the war? Why should I have anything to do with a League of Nations or a Court of International Justice?"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: He says again: "I am a neutral."

An hon. MEMBER: Clever.

An hon. MEMBER: You do not like that.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The next point is the tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Now, hon. gentlemen need not get excited; it is not my intention to discuss the tariff in detail.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I will say, however, that the tariff is the most vital problem of domestic policy before the country today.

Mr. M. CLARK: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: "Hear, hear," says my hon. friend from Red Deer. Well, I appreciate his "hear, hear," because there is not a man in this House or out of it who knows the hon. member but knows that he is absolutely sincere in the position he takes on the tariff; and whether we agree with him, or disagree, we are ready and willing to accord him what is due to every honest man in the way of credit for a definite stand on any question.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain the Government's position on the tariff.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I say, Mr. Speaker, that until this country knows definitely what its future will be with regard to the tariff we shall not have stable business conditions. I heard my hon. friend from Marquette say this afternoon, in discussing the present commercial and business situation that there is uneasiness amongst the business men. Well, there will be uneasiness until they know once for all whether their busnesses will be subjected to the undue and unfair competition of the great industries to the south of us and the cheap labour of the whole outside world. But where does the leader of the Opposition stand with regard to the tariff? If I asked you, Mr. Speaker, where he stood you might answer the question perhaps by saying it depended upon where he happened to be at a particular time—because he has stood at every point of the compass on the question of the tariff in the last twelve months, and his party has occupied exactly the same position. The thing they are determined to avoid, if avoid they can, is the discussion of the concrete issue of the tariff either in this House or out of it. But side step it as they may they will be brought face to face with the straight issue of the tariff before this session comes to an end. The one thing that the leader of the Opposition and his followers have discussed during the present debate is the question of mandates.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." Well I am going to discuss that question purely from my own standpoint. I take it that each member can speak for himself, and for himself alone, when it comes to the question of mandates. I got my mandate from the people of East Algoma, the people amongst whom I have had the privilege of living and working during the last thirty-five years.

An hon. MEMBER: You have had it too long.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am answerable to the people of East Algoma, and I am not going to be dictated to by the leader of the Opposition, or anyone else as to how I am going to exercise that mandate. But the leader of the Opposition sets himself up in this House as the supreme arbiter of the mandate of every other member. Where did the hon. gentleman get that right? You will recall, Sir, that in 1917 he went up into the riding of North York, his native county, and made a moving appeal to the people there to give him a mandate, but they literally kicked him out of the county. In 1919 he thought he saw an opportunity of being elected in another county in his own province. There was a door standing partly open and he made an effort to get in through that door but the people of the county, knowing his record as they did, slammed the door in his face and he could not get a mandate there. Then along towards the autumn of 1919 the people of Prince, P.E.I., woke up one morning and found a basket on their door-step, and with that generosity characteristic of the people of my native province they said "We will take the poor foundling in and give it shelter until it can be determined whether it has any legitimate political parentage or not." That, Mr. Speaker, is where the leader of the Opposition got his mandate and yet he comes into this House and says to me and every other member who came here by virtue—

An hon. MEMBER: By virtue of the War Times Election Act.

Mr. NICHOLSON: —of the mandate of our constituents. You have no right to be where you are."

An hon. MEMBER: The people are getting uneasy.

Mr. NICHOLSON: As I said a moment ago, with that charity that all decent men should accord to a poor outcast, I am ready to accord the leader of the Opposition the right and the privilege of speaking for his foster political parents the people of Prince Edward Island, but I am not willing to accord to him the right to speak for the people of Algoma. The leader of the Opposition said in his speech that there was unrest throughout the country—and the statement was repeated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar)— unrest amongst the business men, unrest amongst returned soldiers. What has been the contribution of the leader of the Opposition and his friend towards the allaying of the unrest? Let us get down to one concrete case. What suggestion has the leader of the Opposition put forward that will have for its effect the allaying of the unrest amongst returned soldiers?

Mr. JACOBS: Turning the Government out.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I anticipated that reply. Hon. members opposite say, "Turn the Government out."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that I have struck a responsive chord in the hearts of my friends opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Just listen to them cheer in a minute or two. What happens when the Government is turned out?

An hon. MEMBER: We will be in power.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The leader of the Opposition made this statement up in Peterborough a short time ago:

> Turn the Meighen Government out and then it will be the duty of His Excellency the Governor General to send for the Leader of the Opposition to form a Government.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: If you will pardon me a slang phrase, can you beat that—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: We can beat you.

Mr. NICHOLSON: —as a means of allaying unrest amongst the returned soldiers in this country, to bring about a situation that would make it necessary for His Excellency the Governor General to send for the leader of the Opposition to form a Government? Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be unduly severe—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Hon. gentlemen may laugh but I will tell them this—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must appeal to hon. gentlemen to observe some semblance of decorum in debate. Doubtless the hon. member for East Algoma would be willing to concede the privilege to any hon. gentleman who so desires, of rising in his place and asking a question in proper form, but I submit that debate can-

not be conducted with a running fire of comment such as has occurred during the last few moments.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your desire to maintain the decorum of the House, but I can assure you that the hilarity of hon. gentlemen opposite gives me very great pleasure. I am glad to see the leader of the Opposition now taking his seat and, with your permission, Sir, I will repeat in his presence what I said a few moments ago.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Say it in French.

An hon. MEMBER: Dispense.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The leader of the Opposition has suggested that as a means of allaying unrest amongst the returned soldiers in this country, a situation should be brought about that would make it necessary for His Excellency the Governor General to send for him (Mr. King) to form a Government and become Prime Minister in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let me repeat what I said a few moments ago. I do not wish to be unduly severe, but I say this—and I say it looking straight in the eye of the leader of the Opposition and I ask his supporters to take it to heart—the mere suggestion that the hon. the leader of the Opposition should ever be called upon to occupy the position of Prime Minister or any other office of a public character that would bring him into contact with the interests of the returned soldiers is a flagrant insult to every man who put the uniform on during the war and fought for his country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

Mr. PELLETIER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am certain that the hon. member for East Algoma will, on reflection, realize that his last remark could not properly be made having regard to the proper conduct of debate, and that he should withdraw it.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I have very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing the remark if it is unparliamentary. I appreciate the fact that, faced with such a situation, any red blooded man in this country who stood behind and beside the men who fought for us overseas would have very great difficulty in finding parliamentary language in which to express himself.

Mr. FAFARD: You would not stand very long beside me, anyway.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Coward.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish the House to realize that to the best of its ability the Chair will endeavour to preserve the proper decorum of debate; by no means can the debate be conducted from the seats.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that it is not pleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite to hear these things. But I will just say this in conclusion in regard to this matter: They may squirm as they like—

Mr. DUFF: Order, order.

Mr. NICHOLSON: —but the fathers and mothers of the boys who fought overseas and the great mass of the public who stood behind those boys will not forget these things, whether hon. members do or not.

Mr. DUFF: Bunkum, rot.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the matter right there.

An hon. MEMBER: You have gone too far.

Mr. NICHOLSON: We have heard during this debate that we should have an election. I do not know if there is anything we need worry about in that regard, for we are going to have an election.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: You will never come back.

Mr. NICHOLSON: All right; as I said a moment ago I am in the hands of my constituents, and I am perfectly willing—

An hon. MEMBER: They will choke you.

Mr. NICHOLSON: —and I am perfectly willing to abide by their verdict. But, Mr. Speaker, I have the right that every hon. member has, and that the people have—the right to know what is going to be decided at the election. What are the issues that will be laid before the people? I have heard it stated in this debate that hon. gentlemen directly opposite have no policy. But that is a mistake; they have a policy for every parish, for every constituency, and for every province; and above and beyond all that they have one main policy: to make such an appeal to the people in the various parts of the Dominion that they may come back here

with just sufficient following to join up with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and his party and thus control the destinies of this country.

An hon. MEMBER: That is a good combination.

Mr. NICHOLSON: That is the policy. Now, under those circumstances where should we look for the policy that is likely to dominate if that situation eventuates? Is it to be expected that the vacillating group of men who cannot agree among themselves five minutes at a time on anything are going to be the dominant partner in the combination that is to govern this country? Not for one moment. It is that group led by the hon. member for Marquette and supported by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that will dominate the policy of the holy alliance which is to be consummated after the next general election.

Now, we come to this point—what is their policy, and whom do they represent? Sometimes they are styled the Agrarian party, sometimes they are styled the Farmers' party, and sometimes they style themselves the Progressive party. A greater misuse of terms could not possibly be suggested than any one of the three. What are they and who are they? They are here as the accredited representatives of the greatest corporation that ever came into existence in this country—the United Grain Growers' Company. That is who they are and that is what they are here for. I have proof of it under my hand.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: File the proof.

Mr. NICHOLSON: This is what the vice president of the United Grain Growers' Company has to say on the subject:

> Under the system we propose, men are not elected as representatives in the sense heretofore understood. They will go to Parliament as our delegates—

These are not my words, they are the words of the vice president of the United Grain Growers' Company. He says:

> They will go to Parliament as our delegates, to carry out our instructions.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend who made that statement?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Woods, vice president of the United Grain Growers' Company.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say that Mr. Woods has no connection whatever with the United Grain Growers' company.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I am ready to admit, that it would be exceedingly difficult for any man to say just who is associated with the United Grain Growers' Company and who is not. But I may just as well give this to the House right here since my hon. friend has raised the question. In 1918 the general manager of the United Grain Growers' Company, Mr. Rice Jones—am I right?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON:—came before a committee of this House, brought here by gentlemen associated with the United Grain Growers. He was asked the question, whether this corporation had any subsidiaries. He sat back in his chair in blank amazement. Any subsidiaries! Can it be expected that any ordinary man would carry around under his cranial bones sufficient information to say offhand what the subsidiaries of the United Grain Growers' company were? Mr. Woods, if not the vice President of the United Grain Growers' Company, is president of the Alberta Grain Growers' company which is closely identified and affiliated with the United Grain Growers' company. These are Mr. Woods' words, and let me repeat them:

> They will go to Parliament as our delegates to carry out our instructions. We will retain complete control by means of the recall, or advance resignation, &c.

That is just exactly what this party is that sometimes calls itself the Farmers' party, sometimes the Agrarian party, and sometimes the Progressive party; and that is why it is here.

An hon. MEMBER: National, Liberal Conservative.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I said a moment ago that you could not suggest a more violent misuse of terms than those titles. What has been their attitude towards the farmers of this country? What has been the attitude of the hon. member for Marquette, their leader, towards the farmers of this country? The hon. gentleman was Minister of Agriculture for at least a year and a half at a period when every government in Canada, provincial and federal, backed by the whole body of public opinion was bending its energies to increase production, when the Dominion treasury, one might say, was wide open for the hon. gentleman to use its funds in any way that would stimulate our agricultural production. Can he point to one single Act that passed

through this House at his suggestion to improve the condition of our farmers? Not one single act or suggestion. We are told that the hon. gentleman did have something to do with a plan by which the elevators at the head of the Lakes were permitted to use poisonous seeds in the manufacture of stock food for Ontario farmers.

Now, let us go one step further with regard to the position of this particular party concerning the farming industry of this country. Anyone who has given the question thought will agree that you cannot have stable agricultural conditions if you produce grain and nothing else; you must have mixed farming. How are you going to bring that about? By making it possible for farmers who are real farmers to get an abundant supply of stock foods—the by-products of the milling industry—at reasonable prices. What is the attitude of this organization towards the milling industry? Members of the House will recall that when this close corporation agreement was entered into between the two wings of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition the Toronto Globe had something to do with it; they put an asset into the pool by turning over to this organization in Western Canada their western correspondent, Mr. Norman Lambert, to act as secretary and general publicity manager for the group. Anyone who has had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Lambert and discussing economic problems with him will agree that he is a clear-headed man of outstanding ability. Mr. Lambert is managing with a very considerable degree of skill the publicity campaign for the hon. gentlemen who call themselves the Agrarian party. Let me quote from an article contributed by Mr. Lambert to an Eastern paper on the subject of the tariff. I will not read the whole of it; I will deal with only one vital point. Mr. Lambert, discussing the question of the manufacture of macaroni in this country and whether it should be imported, says:

> Prior to 1910 there was one macaroni factory in Quebec and one in Manitoba and Canada imported a major portion of the macaroni consumed. Since that time there has been established an additional factory in Alberta and a third factory in Ontario—

It was bad enough that we should establish factories in Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec to employ Canadian workmen in the manufacture of a food product for this country; but here is the pinch:

> —using as their raw material for the manufacture of macaroni, flour produced from Canadian wheat.

"Flour produced from Canadian wheat;" that is the sting in the thing so far as the United Grain Growers are concerned. Why should there be any opposition on the part of men who profess to be the friends of the farmers to the milling of wheat in Canada? Well, there is just this reason for it; the milling industry in Canada is the most serious competitor that the United Grain Growers of Alberta have. They buy a lot of wheat and they manufacture it into flour and mill feeds. Every bushel of wheat they buy is a bushel of wheat which the Grain Growers cannot buy and upon which they cannot make fat overages at the head of the Lakes; a bushel of wheat that they cannot ship out of the country through one of their subsidiaries, the Export Company of New York or the Export Company of Canada, and thus secure fat profits. That is why they are opposed to the milling industry; yet they 9 p.m. have the presumption to go before the people and say that they are the friends of the farming industry.

"But," they say, "look at the commercial business we are doing amongst the farmers; look at what we are doing for these men in Western Canada by getting them all the things they require—feed, clothing, machinery, fuel, and everything else." Well, just let us look at it. The manager of United Grain Growers, Limited, gave valuable evidence before a Committee of this House,—evidence which it is worth any hon. gentleman's while to read. I will not delay the House by going over very much of it, but here the question of flour comes in again: My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and other hon. gentlemen, going up and down the country in their campaign of abuse against other business men, have held up the millers as an institution that was bleeding the people white by the profits they were taking. In the year for which I am going to give you some figures, the Ogilvie Milling Company, the Western Canada Flour Milling Company, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company and the Maple Leaf Milling Company made profits ranging from 9 to 11½ cents a barrel on the flour they produced, and they did all the work of manufacturing that product. The United Grain Growers, Limited, carry on a sort of letter order business. They write a letter to some milling company and ask them to forward a car of flour to some farmer or group of farmers with draft attached to bill of lading. In this way they handled, without

the cost to them of a single cent, something over a million dollars' worth of flour, and they collected from the farmer between eighty cents and one dollar a barrel as their rake-off for doing it.

I shall not go over the whole list, but let me come down to the question of agricultural implements. The whole farming community, particularly in Western Canada, is suffering because of the high cost of their farming implements. The United Grain Growers, Limited, handle a lot of farming implements, and in the year for which Mr. Rice-Jones gave the figures, on every $100 worth of farming implements they sold to the western grain growers, they collected a profit for themselves of $21.06. Mr. Rice-Jones was asked: Do they give the farmers any service by way of time within which to pay for these goods? The reply was, in effect: "Nothing in the world—cash on the spot. We send in the order; the machinery goes forward, the farmer pays for it, and we collect $21.06 per cent."

At the moment I will not pursue that point any further. There is one other matter to which I wish to refer briefly. In the campaign that these hon. gentlemen carry on to divide this country along class lines, the Eastern newspapers are a constant object of attack. They are referred to as the "capitalistic press," a "hired press," and all that kind of thing. I am not speaking in defence of the Canadian newspapers; they are amply able to take care of themselves. But the House will recall that during last session the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid) stood up in his place and occupied over half an hour of the time of the House in the reading of a pamphlet issued by a man by the name of Murray, one time secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. The House will recall my hon. friend's peroration; he stood with his hands clasped across his breast and his eyes rolled towards Heaven in such a way as to cause one to wonder whether he was practising for an experience meeting of United Grain Growers or taking his part as end-man in a minstrel troupe that was going to stage a worn-out political farce.

What did Mr. Murray say to cause all this? He said that in his judgment the time had come when Canadian manufacturers should cease financing newspapers, the avowed object of which was to destroy the manufacturers' business. I am not going to say that Mr. Murray was right from the standpoint of those who say: "When thine enemy strikes thee on one side of the face, just turn the other." I am not sure whether that is a correct quotation.

Mr. DUFF: You have got that all wrong. You should study your Bible.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I am not here to defend Mr. Murray, however, when he says that Canadian manufacturers should cease financing newspapers, the avowed object of which is to destroy the manufacturers' business Perhaps he was wholly wrong. But just let us turn the camera in another direction and see what picture it will produce. The same Mr. Rice Jones to whom I referred a few moments ago appearing before this committee of the House of Commons of which the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid) was a member—and I think my hon. friend had something to do with Mr. Rice Jones coming here; my information is that my hon. friend is a director of the company of which Mr. Rice Jones is general manager—on this question of financing newspapers, said what? He said, in answer to a question by the counsel for the committee: "The Grain Growers Limited paid one political organ in western Canada $100,000 in one year." What for? For advertising purposes? No, for educational and propaganda purposes.

Mr. CRERAR: They did good work.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I have no doubt that it is quite true that, as a political organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, they did good work and the Western Grain Growers, out of the profits they extracted from the producers and consumers in this country, paid that political organ $108,000 for purposes of political propaganda. Yet these same hon. gentlemen will declaim in this House against eastern newspapers as being a hired press, paid political organs.

These statements are on all fours with the whole campaign these hon. gentlemen carry on. I said in this House last year, and I repeat to-night, that no honest man has any right in the world to criticize in the least degree the business that the Western Grain Growers are doing. So far as I am able to discern, they are carrying on an honest business; they are the largest commercial organization that ever came into existence in this country; but when they are doing that, what right have they to come down into eastern Canada or to go any other place in their efforts to set class

against class in this country or to tell me that I am not carrying on an honest business: that I am extracting undue profits from the people; that I am oppressing the workingman; that the farmers are not getting their rights? I say that the whole thing is a campaign of blatant hypocrisy.

Mr. DUFF: A guilty conscience needs no accuser.

Mr. EDWARDS: This must be hurting you.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: During this debate a good many things have been said regarding the declarations of the Prime Minister in favour of giving to the province of Quebec more adequate representation in the government of this country, and hon. gentlemen opposite have become cynically sarcastic with regard to that. I must confess I was amazed to hear utterances of this kind fall from the lips of some hon. gentlemen opposite. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), join in that kind of criticism of the efforts which the Prime Minister was honestly making. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), join with them in voicing the same cynical criticism of the Prime Minister's efforts.

Is there anything wrong with the declaration of the Prime Minister that he believes the province of Quebec and the French-Canadian minority of this country should have more representation in the government? Is there anything wrong with the suggestion by any public man that it would be wise and well to bring about a better understanding between the two races that are living and growing up side by side in Canada? The Prime Minister would be unworthy of the position he holds if he did not exert every ounce of influence that he has to break down misunderstandings that admittedly have existed.

Mr. CANNON: That he brought on himself.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to enter into a discussion with my hon. friend regarding that, because that is not my purpose in this debate. I prefer that, if possible, anything I may say with regard to that subject shall tend to create a better understanding and not a worse. We are never going to arrive at a right understanding by hurling insults across the floor of this House, one against the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The chief organ at least in this province of hon. gentlemen opposite undertook to fasten on the Prime Minister the charge that he had at some time in his life made a statement uncomplimentary to the French-Canadian minority in Canada. The Toronto Globe had to admit that they were not telling the truth. No hon. gentleman in this House has pointed to a single utterance derogatory in the least degree to the French-Canadian population of the province of Quebec or of any other part of Canada. It is the duty of every public man, whether his position be obscure or whether he occupies a more prominent position, to do what he can to create harmony and not discord amongst our people. Let me illustrate that if I can out of an experience I have had within the past six or seven months. It was my privilege last summer to visit the battle area in France.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh.

Mr. NICHOLSON: It was a very great privilege, whether an hon. gentleman says "Oh," or not; it was a very great privilege to meet the people in France, to see what is being done by these people who have suffered infinitely during the whole period of the war; to discuss with them the problems with which they were confronted, to see the devastated country and to get a glimpse of the spirit of the people in reconstructing that devastated area. During that period, it was our privilege to cover the whole battle area from the North sea to Paris, to travel the road that our Canadian boys travellel as they drove the Germans out of France during the last hundred days of the war, to go through that wonderful cemetery in the city of Mons where 80,000 refugees, women and children and men, were slaughtered by the Germans in the first onrush in 1914. It was our privilege to visit more than 100 cemeteries, to look upon hundreds of thousands of silent crosses, everyone typical of the sacrifice that sent the cold steel to the soul of some father or mother. On the 12th August when we arrived in the city of Lille on our way home, we got a copy of the Paris edition of the New York Herald and we saw, splashed across the front page, the announcement that a Soviet had been set up in Great Britain; that they had issued an ultimatum to the British Government that they must allow Poland to go under before the Bolshevists, and that they must clasp the blood-stained

hands of Lenine and Trotzky in a commercial treaty. The same Soveit sent delegates to France, and that is where they slipped a cog. That great Prime Minister, Millerand, called in the Prefect of Police and instructed him in words something like this: Do not take these men out and stand them against the wall to-morrow morning and shoot them, as you have a right to do, but just give them twelve hours to leave the country. And they left the country. Mr. Speaker, this is the thought that came into my mind. If all the sacrifice typified by what we have seen in the past three weeks means nothing more or less than that this world is to be submerged under Bolshevism, then in Heaven's name would it not have been better to accept our humiliation in the first place and save all the sacirfice? I ask this House and this country, if the sacrifice of 60,000 Canadians on the battlefields of France and Flanders means nothing else than that we are to be divided along racial class lines, then in Heaven's name would it not have been better to accept our humiliation and save the sacrifice? But, Sir, I have sufficient faith in the inherent common sense of the Canadian people to feel that that will not be permitted, and my final word to the Prime Minister is this: Go right ahead; follow the course you have blazed out for yourself; spend your energies in building up a united Canada, and Canada will stand behind you and achieve it.

Mr. DAVID A. LAFORTUNE (Jacques-Cartier): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread the speech from the Throne, and I have listened to the honourable members of this House, the mover and the seconder of the Address, and I hasten to congratulate them very sincerely upon the elegant form of their speeches, but with reservations as to their substance.

Since last session many most important men have disappeared from the political stage, but there is one whom I will never forget, I mean, the late member for Yamaska, Mr. Oscar Gladu, with whom I have lived, by the side of whom I have fought so many political battles; and I hasten to say that I shall keep of him a pious remembrance. This lamented gentleman rendered great services to his country, unforgetable services to his friends, and both sides of this House recognized his great eloquence and his unfailing loyalty.

To my mind the speech of the honourable Leader of the Opposition was truly a success. He spoke with ponderation, with dignity, with warmth and eloquence. His speech carried conviction to the minds of all unprejudiced hearers.

The honorable Prime Minister answered it with his usual cleverness, but he did not succeed in destroying the deep impression it had produced on impartial minds.

The speech of the honourable member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) was a most interesting one. He reviewed the principal political questions. He corroborated what had been said by his leader. He showed the inconsistency of the right honourable Prime Minister. He demonstrated the lack of sincerity of the Administration, that the Liberal conservative party is anxious for an immediate election, and that only the interested parties, those fearing the popular verdict, are opposed to it.

The right honourable Minister of Commerce (Sir George Foster) has greatly interested me in relating what has been done at the Geneva meeting of the League of Nations, and the House did the right thing in the ovation accorded him.

The right honourable minister has shown us the importance and the great necessity there is for all of us to learn to speak the two official languages of Canada, and therein lies a great lesson of tolerance and constitutionality for those who are denying to the minority the rights and privileges which we are claiming and which we will continue to claim.

The hon. member for Wright (M. Devlin) made a short speech, but, as usual, he has talked common sense and to the point, and he has strengthened the arguments of those of his friends who have preceded him.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has protested his independence. He says he is ready to vote for anything which might benefit his constituents. I believe in the sincerity of the hon. member. Those are also my principles with this difference that I remain with my friends and my party, and that I remain faithful to the Liberal flag. But I trust that the hon. member should give us a good vote, because the liberal principles in which he has been brought up cannot have been entirely obliterated. He has left us but I will not say never to return.

I shall continue to support the men who have brought so much prosperity to my country and who have managed our affairs with such great success, from 1896 to 1911.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) spoke for three hours; one hour was spent in making compliments to his old and former friends, to those who

have helped, supported and defended him, who have fought for him during the critical days; the two other hours were employed in explaining and confuting the charges made against him. But we are not to blame if the hon. member has been under a cloud of reprehension. That the hon. member has been forced to appear before the Superior Court and the Court of Appeal in order to protect his name, his character and his reputation, and in order to defend his conduct, there is nothing there that should concern us. Have we ever brought any accusations against him? No. Has he been successful in getting a certificate of good conduct? I do not know and I have no wish to know. But what I do know is that the hon. member, elected for a term of four years was only fourteen months in office, and that the parties concerned will never forget his memorable presidency of that society.

The hon. member has seen fit to speak of the member for Jacques-Cartier, your humble servant, because I am, he says, Crown Attorney while being also a member of this House. But how is it, then, that the hon. member came to Montcalm and Jacques-Cartier in order to induce my constituents to support me, as he well knew my position. What surprises me is that the hon. gentleman should take exception to that he himself having been employed by the Commission of the Municipal Code, in Quebec, during three years, at a salary of $2,000 a year.

I am not finding fault with him on that account; I only wish to point out the hon. gentleman's inconsistency, lack of sincerity and of memory. The hon. member has the right to abandon his party; he has the right to return to his old-time associates and to keep up family traditions; but has he the right to throw mud in our faces, and should he insult a whole party because they hold different opinions? Mr. Speaker, what is most precious to any man is his good name, his word of honour and his reputation. The hon. member is at liberty to leave our ranks, but he must not be indignant if we decide to remain faithful to our past. As far as I am concerned, I would feel dishonored if I should betray the liberal cause.

The hon. member, in the course of his vagaries, has certainly not sinned through an excess of modesty. It might even be said that there was in his speech food for scandal. In a very irreverent manner, he has compared himself to Saint John the Baptist, and in no way, Mr. Speaker, is such a comparison exact. Saint John the Baptist fed in the desert on grasshoppers and wild honey, and he has certainly not been drawn towards the other side of the House by a feast of grasshoppers and wild honey. Indeed, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe does not recall to my mind, in any way, the life of the Precursor. Instead of Saint John the Baptist I am rather inclined to be reminded in the present instance of the old-time processions of Saint John the Baptist day. To-day, in those processions, the little Saint John the Baptist and the little lamb which is his companion are driven like real aristocrats in a luxurious coach drawn by four horses. In the olden time, the little Saint John the Baptist and his little lamb were more in touch with the people, and used to march with the rank and file. The little lamb came first, followed by the little Saint John. As the lamb was not tamed, the practice was to prevent his pranks by means of a wide blue ribbon tied around its neck, and some one in front held tight the end of the ribbon.

As that was not sufficient to make sure of the tractability of the little lamb, the gentleman who held the blue ribbon in one hand also held a sack full of clover in the other. Mr. Speaker, the sack of clover was constantly kept under the nose of the little lamb which stretched its neck to snap up and eat the clover. However, as the intention of the guide leading the lamb was not to let it eat the clover, but only intended it as a bait which the lamb was following without ever snapping it, so when the procession was over, the little lamb had lost nothing of his appetite.

In that venture of the hon. member, I see a lamb having a blue ribbon tied to its neck enticed by a gentleman, the hon. prime minister, who holds in the one hand the blue ribbon and in the other the sack of clover ardently coveted by the lamb but held aloof by the prime minister. When the procession is over, the lamb will have as strong a craving as at the start and the prime minister will still have all his clover in store.

Mr. Speaker, as one thought recalls another, I have in mind a certain John Baptiste who was somewhat popular in his part of the country. He was an Indian from Caughnawaga whose full name was Baptiste Canadien. His main occupation consisted in shooting the Lachine rapids in a canoe, sometimes in company with tourists and sometimes alone. During the summer season, he followed another route to reach the city, but, Sir, the trip was

venturesome, even perilous, and in the long run that Baptiste Canadien, notwithstanding his experience and his great ability, gave a wrong stroke with the paddle, his canoe was smashed on the rocks and Baptiste Canadien, forced to swim, was cast on the shore of Crane island. Before long, our new John the Baptiste will find that his stroke was miscalculated and, being wrecked, he will not even have Crane island as a refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when I was young, which is long ago, I happened to be at the court house in Arthabasca when a very young man, a lawyer, showed a lack of professional courtesy towards Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The latter walked toward his young fellow advocate and putting his hand upon his shoulder said: "Sir, take this for a slap in the face". If it be true that great men do not die, Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George-Etienne Cartier, Sir Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine and Sir Wilfrid Laurier see and hear what is going on here below. When the latter meets the hon. member from St. Hyacinthe, he will say to him: "You have insulted my best friends, those who have helped me, backed me, fought by my side and followed me through thick and thin," and laying his hand on his shoulder he will say: "Sir, take this for a slap in the face".

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment submitted by the hon. leader of the Opposition asking for an immediate dissolution of Parliament, and I shall do so for the following reasons.

The new unionist party made this appeal to the Dominion electorate: Forget to-day that you are Liberals and Conservatives; put aside your political convictions, because the war must be won first of all; we are not the representatives of a party; we have an object in view. But now, war is over, the aim has been realized, the special mandate has been executed, make way.

In June next, the prime ministers of all the Dominions will go to England in order to discuss matters in the interests of the Empire. Mr. Lloyd George has just announced to the whole world that the meeting will be one of the most momentous events within the Empire. He also stated that Great Britain alone was unable to bear any longer the burden of expenditure entailed by the maintenance of its navy and army, and that the colonies should understand the necessity of sharing that expenditure.

You, Sir, the Prime Minister, will go to London during the month of June. What will be your answer to Mr. Lloyd George? What is your policy concerning this contribution which the Empire requests from her colonies? Have you asked the Canadian people in what measure they are prepared to make new sacrifices for the maintenance of the navy and army of England, or whether they are prepared to make any sacrifice?

Mr. Speaker, should Mr. Lloyd George invite him to give a pledge on behalf of Canada as to her taking part in every war of England, what will be the answer of the right hon. Prime Minister? Are not the people of Canada entitled to know, before his departure, what he is going to do there? Mr. the Prime Minister, it is your duty to consult them and to get the endorsation of your policy through a general election.

The future of Canada is at stake, and before engaging in a new course, find out the country's views and the policy it favours.

The Government must be in danger, in great peril, when we see them obliged to seek to seduce members of the Opposition. Do not the ranks of the Government's friends contain many most distinguished and qualified men? I might mention Sir L. O. Taillon, Hon. Mr. Patenaude, Mr. Bisaillon, Mr. Cressé—who is longing to enter the Government—Mr. Monty, Mr. Duranteau, Mr. de Lorimier, Mr. Lacoste, Mr. Godin, my cousin Mr. de Boucherville, Mr. Bonin, Mr. Morin, Mr. Bruchési, Mr. Curran, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Dussault, Mr. Millette, Mr. Bernard, Mr. Chatelle, Mr. Sauvé; in Quebec, Three-Rivers, Sorel, Joliette, Sherbrooke and even in St. Hyacinthe and St. Jerome, there are a number of good supporters of the Conservative party, honourable men, well qualified men, who made great sacrifices for their party, and who would be only too glad to have their reward. Why try and draw away members of the Opposition? Why invade our ranks?

Mr. McMASTER: (Translation.) Because we are better qualified.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) No, but we do not display the same craving. Mr. Speaker, let everybody remain on his own side and all will go well.

The new party is baptized. It has three names: National alias Liberal alias Conservative.

Why three names? Why so many aliases? Why, Mr. Speaker, when I am given a brief in a criminal court, and find several aliases to the party's name, I feel uneasy. I am sure of finding in the evidence

that the accused has tried to conceal his identity; I am sure that he has tried to arrange for an alibi, in order to be able to say, "No, sir, I was not there, I am not the man you are looking for." The Government is now seeking to deny its identity. Well, Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentlemen change names as often as they please, they will be recognized. As the old woman said, the more they change, the less they vary.

The honourable member has spoken not only of your humble servant, but he thought well to strike a little blow by the way at the honourable member for Gaspé (Hon. Mr. Lemieux), at Sir Lomer Gouin, at the honourable member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Verville), at the honourable member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), because these honourable gentlemen have occupations outside their functions as members of this House. But it seems to me that instead of blaming them, we, the French Canadians ought to be proud to see these gentlemen fill posts of confidence, most important financial posts, posts of great responsibility, posts of honour. When we see Sir Lomer Gouin become a Director of the Bank of Montreal, the first French Canadian who was ever given that position; when we see the honourable member for Gaspé in highly sought posts, directing our Canadian and even English finances; why do they occupy such posts of honour, these posts of responsibility? It is because they are worthy of them, because they have deserved the confidence of their fellow citizens. These posts are not given to every Tom, Dick and Harry. I would say to the honorable member: But why is he not in one of them? Why is he not given one of them. I will not abuse the honourable member; he is one of my old friends; we have long fought side by side and always respected each other; if he feels the necessity of dragging us in this debate, it is his right, it is his business, I will not treat the honourable member with abuse. I pay him my compliments. When one receives compliments, it is proper to return them.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the remarks I had to make on what the honourable members said. You will allow me now to pass to something else. I have fought the battles of my party for a great number of years, and I remember what took place in 1893. It is not a matter of yesterday. In 1893, Honourable Mr. Blake, wishing to withdraw from the Canadian politics, bid adieu to the Liberal party.

An hon. MEMBER: 1887.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) No matter; it was a little earlier than I surmised. He gave up the leadership of the Liberal party, and was replaced by the honourable sir Wilfrid Laurier. A great convention took place in Ottawa—I remember it as if it were yesterday; I was there, at the threshold of Parliament. It was a grand convention of the Liberal forces. A programme was prepared; the programme which the Liberals would follow if they came to power. There was unrest in the country at that time. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that things were in a sad plight. The situation had to be remedied. We meant to offer the electors a new programme, and secure their confidence. What was the programme of the Liberal party at that time? Two important by-elections had just taken place, the one in Montreal Centre, wherein Sir William Hingston and the honourable Mr. McShane were opponents; and the other wherein Napoléon Charbonneau, who later became a judge, and was opposing our old friend J. A. Descarries, of Lachine. Honourable Désiré Girouard had just been made a Justice of the Supreme Court. The election took place on December 30th, 1895, in the County of Jacques-Cartier where I was living at the time and where I still live. They were two fierce fights. The honourable James McShane was victorious and so was our friend Charbonneau, both with rather large majorities. These two by-elections rang the knell of the Conservative party. It was in the month of December, 1895. The honourable Mackenzie Bowell dissolved the Houses in April, 1896, and the general election took place on June 23rd of the same year. Now, there was a programme to be prepared for the general election. The then Government thought well to remain in office to the very end, to prolong its life to the extreme limits, to the month of April, 1896. There had then to be a general election. What was the programme of the Liberal party? What promises did it offer to the electors? First and above all, there was the settlement of the school question. This settlement of the school question was not so complete as we French-Canadians and the Catholics would have desired. We had wished for something more than Sir Wilfrid Laurier obtained; but His Holiness Leo XIII said, "Children of my Church, the settlement which is offered to you is not complete, but acept it and pray to God for the rest." This was done. The wish of

His Holiness Leo XIII was accomplished; the settlement was accepted; the school question was put aside, and the agitation ended. What Sir Wilfrid Laurier said was not that he would settle the question, but that he would do all in his power to settle it, so as to satisfy the superior authority. And thereby he removed from the political field a burning question.

The second question brought before the electors was the deepening of the St. Lawrence river in order to make Montreal the national port of the Dominion. The programme promised that should the Liberal party come to power, the insufficiently deep part of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec would be deepened so as to afford perfect, or at least as perfect as possible, facilities for navigation. We kept our pledge. The Government made enormous sacrifices to better the navigation bettween Quebec and Montreal. The late Hon. Mr. Tarte, who was then a member of the Government, made superhuman efforts to render this route navigable and safe.

What was the third promise made to the people? The abolition of the revisors, which the present Government wish to restore in this country—the famous revisors of the former government. When we reached the polls, we would look over the electoral lists; we would find that Paul's name was not there, that Baptiste's had gone, that André's had been forgotten, that Jacques' had disappeared. And they were all our Liberal friends that were missing. The Liberals promised to put an end to this system; that if they came to power their first move would be to abolish it, and to entrust the municipal councils with the electoral lists which had been very improperly taken out of their hands. And we did so.

The fourth promise to the electors was, that the public contracts would be given to the lowest tenderers, be they Liberal or Conservative. And the thing was done. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Administration was all devotion to the rights of the people, and has never consented to the granting of contracts otherwise; the lowest tenderers were those who obtained them. There were a few exceptions in unimportant matters; but as a general rule public contracts were always granted to the lowest tenderer. That is what we had promised.

We had also promised, Mr. Speaker, to insert in public contracts a clause by which the salaries of workmen, of all the employees in large public works, would be made secure; that the contractor, the subcontractor would be responsible for the salaries of the workmen—a security which did not exist hitherto. Until then, a contractor was given a contract, he handed it over to a subcontractor, the lattter turned it over to another one, and three times out of four the workman ran the risk of losing his salary. We put an end to that.

Now, we had also promised to put an end to deficits. Heretofore every accounting period ended with a deficit. Deficits, alway deficits, we had nothing else. Sir Wilfrid Laurier came to power in 1896. He did not succeed the first year in making both ends meet, on account of the deplorable state in which his predecessors had left the finances of the country; he failed, I say, to obtain a surplus on the first year, but all the subsequent accounting periods ended with considerable surpluses. And yet we had taken these gentlemen's tariff; we had stolen their tariff, as they were pleased to repeat it on every husting. "These bad Liberals have stolen our programme; they had promised a revision of the tariff, and when they came to office, they used the same tariff as hitherto". There was a little truth in this. But what did it mean? With the same tariff we obtained surpluses when they could show nothing but deficits. What did it mean? It meant that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had an iron hand under a silk glove; that he kept the taps, the locks and padlocks tightly closed. It was not in vain that they were locked, bolted and riveted. He held the reins of power with a firm hand, and if any rebelled, their affair was soon settled. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that a former minister, an eminent man (Hon. Mr. Blair) wanted to kick over the traces. Sir Wilfrid told him: "Sir, if my policy does not suit you, we can part company". You remember another man, by whose side I have fought, with whom I have worked, a business man (the late Hon. Mr. Tarte); so long as he abided by the unwavering direction of Sir Wilfrid, all went well; but the day that hon. gentleman wanted to do a little bossing of his own, he was told to withdraw, and he withdrew. He tried to kick, but with no avail. He was an honourable man, I have nothing to say against him; he was only a little headstrong, having overdone that peculiarity he was invited to step out.

How is it, Mr. Speaker, that this tariff of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Hon. Mr. Fielding) gave so much prosperity to the

people of the Dominion? How is it that this tariff, which the Conservatives accused us of having stolen from them, suited so well the interests of everybody? The reason is that these hon. gentlemen knew how to apply it, as we will know still how to apply it when the member for Queen's and Shelburne comes back to power.

We had promised the revision of the tariff, and the tariff was revised, perhaps not quite as the hon. gentlemen now at your right would have liked to be, which would have suited them better, but the tariff was revised so as to do justice to all classes of society. We had promised a partial reciprocity treaty, and before 1911, before Sir Wilfrid Laurier tried to bring about such a treaty, what did our opponents say when we met them upon the hustings? "You had promised us a treaty of reciprocity with the United States; where is your treaty?" They accused us of having failed to keep our word. They accused us of having failed to carry out that part of Sir Wilfrid's programme. And later, when Sir Wilfrid intended to bring about this partial treaty with the United States, these hon. gentlemen began by applauding. I remember when the late Mr. Patterson and the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne came back from the United States and announced their success in that country, that they had succeeded in obtaining from our neighbours what the former Administrations of Sir John Macdonald, of Sir John Thompson, of Sir J. J. Abbott, of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, had failed to obtain. The United States were willing to have a reciprocity treaty, but they wanted the lion's share. Once somebody was talking to a farmer of the lion's share—allow me this digression, Mr. Speaker—and he said: "What does that mean, a lion's share?" The other answered: "I am going to tell you. The lion begins by making a small heap, and he makes a large one, then he eats both." The United States wanted the lion's share. We had wanted to make a treaty, but the Americans would give nothing. The Americans are no givers. Well, they may be willing to give, but they want two to one, sometimes three. On the last attempt made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Wilfrid said: "You do not want to grant us a just share of the privileges and the rights we claim; so, there will not be any treaty. Farewell. When you need us, let us know."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier came back to this country, no treaty having been signed. Later on, what a surprise it was to receive news from those gentlemen, to hear that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and some of his friends were invited to go to the White House for the purpose of negotiating a treaty of reciprocity; Well and good, the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne was sent there, together with the hon. Mr. Paterson. They went to the White House and came back having obtained most advantageous privileges. Conservatives applauded; Conservatives would not believe what they saw or what they heard so pleased were they to know that the offer from the White House was so large and so favourable. That occured during the evening, but they took counsel with their pillow and the next morning these hon. gentlemen said to themselves: "We are foolish; we are raving; if we let that treaty pass; we shall never be able to regain power; let us oppose it". They changed their tactics and said: "We shall state that this means annexation". They started the cry against annexation; they defeated us with that cry. The said the treaty was tantamount to annexation to the United States. Oh! how dishonest they were, Mr. Speaker! Having shown reassuring dispositions, having said that the treaty was a splendid one, they altered their mind during night. The next day, it was althogether different. They overran the country, exclaiming: "Well the reciprocity treaty which you intend to make with the United States is nothing short of annexation." They succeeded in defeating us. Thus the reciprocity treaty fell to the ground and vanished. But, Sir, had it been a question of unlimited reciprocity, your humble servant would have been the first to vote against it, but the restricted treaty which was offered us was so advantageous, specially for the farming class, for the agriculturists, that we could have seen halcyon days had we succeeded in putting it through. But they did not consent; they killed the chicken in the shell and now we grieve about those conditions.

From 1896 to 1911, has not the tariff which was put in force by our friends been most advantageous? Have not manufacturing and industrial establishments of every kind wonderfully increased in number? There are in my constituency a large number of factories and many industries of all kinds. In 1896, there were but a few, however, from 1896 to 1911, their number increased in a wonderful manner; factories sprung up as if by enchantement and all sorts of industries were established in

large numbers. The labouring classes, mechanics, workingmen found employment and earned a decent livelihood for themselves and their families. Nobody complained of the tariff; on the contrary, every one was happy. The present tariff is not altogether the same as when we were in power. The right hon. gentleman tells us: "You are free traders; you are not Liberals, you are not protectionists". I shall tell him that I am neither the one nor the other, but I am for a reasonable protection, for a moderate protection as Sir Wilfrid Laurier would have it. This is my protectionist view: Give the manufacturers a fair and reasonable protection in order that capital may get a legitimate return, but stop at that so that the consumer, the mechanic, the labourer and above all the farming class, may have their share of the sun's rays, of liberty and protection. The industrial, manufacturing, commercial and farming classes became very prosperous at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be called to power before long.

Hre Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) Many are called but few are chosen.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I am in earnest when I say that the Liberal party will soon get into power. What will the Liberals have to do? They will have to attend to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. The boards of trade, the great corporations, the higher branches of commerce, the railway companies are clamoring for it. I am for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, which is a necessary undertaking asked for by every administration, whether conservative or liberal. The Government has so far made enormous sacrifices in order to lay out the route, to have soundings taken so as to know what was the obstruction in the way, what would be the probable cost; in short, to ascertain whether that route would be advantageous to the country.

What did they find? They found that the Northern route would cost about $110,000,000, while the Southern route would entail an expenditure of only $95,000,000. It might be a little more to-day. The figures I have given out might not be the exact amount, but we shall take it as the approximate cost of the building of the canal.

The canal would shorten considerably the distance from Georgian Bay to London; some say it would make it about 400 miles shorter, which means a saving of from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000. If the money were spent carefully, it would be of a great benefit to the country, for it would keep at least 15,000 people at work during ten years. Is it not worth undertaking the building of that canal and should we not consider carefully the advisability of starting the work? The Chambre de Commerce and the Board of Trade of Montreal, the largest companies, the banks and the leading financial firms of the country are crying out for the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen are not much concerned with the interest of the people since they do not listen to the advice of our leading citizens. We must build that canal. I was anxious to visit Georgian Bay; I went there and I saw the place. I realize that it would be a great mistake, and even more, to postpone any longer the building of the canal. Connecting Georgian Bay with lake Nipissing, there is Trent river, then Turtle river, the Mattawa and Ottawa rivers to the island of Montreal, and then you may go right through to Europe without transhipment, and reduce the cost of transportation by about one or two cents for every bushel of wheat. Then why should we not build that canal instead of spending millions as we are doing now? The liberal party which will be called to replace the present government will undertake it. Hon. gentlemen may say:

Why did you not undertake the construction of the canal during the fifteen years you remained in power? The answer is very simple: the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had undertaken considerable works, such as the Quebec Bridge, the Hudson Bay Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific; he wanted to have them completed before starting on the Georgian Bay Canal. That is what I would answer to hon. gentlemen. Instead of spending our money here and there without any necessity and without any advantage to the country, they should have undertaken that work. I say that the present government is not worthy of the confidence of the people and should not remain in office any longer. Before long we shall have to build the canal.

There is another thing to do and I have asked for it many times: I am referring to the building of a bridge between Vaudreuil and Ste. Anne. I have asked the government for assistance in order that we may build that bridge. What did they answer? They said they had no money. No money for bridges at Ste. Anne and Vaudreuil; they

are in the province of Quebec, they are not international bridges and there are no funds available for works of that kind. Did the millions spent in Vancouver apply to an international undertaking? And what about the money given to St. John and Halifax? They gave us that answer like a man who does not wish to answer at all. When you do not wish to help you always have a good answer to give. But I say that it is a shame to delay the construction of Vaudreuil-St. Anne bridge any longer. Think of an important city like Montreal, with a population of 600,000, whose people to pass from the island, have to use canoes, and the same lack of facilities is felt as regards vehicles.

People have been drowned, lives have been lost, because of this condition of things. And when we ask the hon. ministers who represent the Province of Quebec to help us in building the bridges, we are told: "It cannot be done, sir, there is no money, The time will come when you will discover that the people are getting restless; the hon. mambers will realize that the people are irritated, that they are getting angry; the time will come when hon. gentlemen will have to account for their doings, and the more grasping will have been the administration, the more severe will we be with these gentlemen.

What is the next plank of our platform? We have already stated what the liberals will do: We shall exact an account from those who govern us. We shalll ask for an account of the millions which they have had in hand since 1911. We shall enquire what has become of those millions. Where are those millions which have been given you in the people's interest? We shall have a great, national investigation, there will be no cuts and thrusts, but we will investigate everywhere, we will make a thorough search of all the public departements, asking the hon. gentlemen to produce vouchers for the money which has been entrusted to them. Then will they find the time long, then will they find that the people are severe, then will they find it difficult to produce an account with vouchers. Yet, that is what we shall ask them to do. We shall ask them how it happens that public offices are filled with employees of all nationalities, except French-Canadians. We will demand from those who represent the Province of Quebec the reason why they have tolerated such discrimination. You have but to visit the Publics Works and all the large departments, and take a list of those who are there, to realize how unfairly our compatriots have been treated. The liberal party will see that all be reinstated who have been dismissed, turned out, without an investigation being made, or with but a semblance of investigation, and this, because their only sin, their only fault, was that they were liberals. Our friends who have been turned out of power will be returned to their respective positions. We shall investigate and find out why these gentlemen have been driven out of power. We shall have no difficulty, I assure you, in proving the flagrant injustice which has beeen done them.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec is isolated. My hon. friends on the other side of the House will forgive me, but, the Province of Quebec is not isolated. Have we not three ministers in the Cabinet? Have we not the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who represents the Catholics, those who speak French as well as those who speak English? Is he not an honourable man? Does he not represent us in the Cabinet? Have we not the hon. minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) in the Cabinet? Have we not the hon. Mr. Blondin in the Senate? It is true that he was beaten twice, but he has been given a seat in the Senate as a compensation for these two defeats: "Go, take a seat in the Senate, sir, you will be given a portfolio, you shall represent the Montreal electors". We have three ministers in the Cabinet. We are told that Quebec is isolated? Not at all, though we may not have all that should be coming to us, notwithstanding our three representatives. They are honourable, distinguished men, who represent us as well as they can.

There is another thing which astonishes me, Mr. Speaker, that is, that, the liberal unionists should have such little influence in the Union Cabinet which is formed of liberal and conservative unionists. Have not four judges been appointed lately? Is there a "rouge-bleu" amongst them? Is there a liberal judge amongst the four who have been apointed? Where then are the unionists? What influence have these gentlemen that they should have been silent in the face of those appointments? What is the influence of the Liberal-Unionists, of the so-called Liberals who are Conservatives? What is the influence of these gentlemen? I would have thought that the unionist ministers would have had something to do with the Government, but, judging from evidence, they are doing absolutely nothing, they let everything go, swallow every new appointment, without a protest.

We are not isolated, but we are badly represented.

They shall have to face those from whom they have withdrawn the right to vote: the people who had comme to settle in this country at the cost of great sacrifices; they who have been disfranchised for fear that they would vote against the Government. That is an injustice.

They will get a square deal at the hands of the Liberals who will be called upon to form a government in place of this unfortunate administration; they will be given back their franchise of which — I shall not use too harsh a word because I might be called to order by the chair — they were so unscrupulously deprived.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: (Translation.) Fradulently.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I dislike to so characterize it, but that is the actual fact.

I remember a contest which gave me much trouble; I had to work day and night. It was the election in Châteauguay and Hon. Sydney Fisher was the candidate. The distinguished and elderly gentleman had accepted to contest the seat in Châteauguay. His opponent was Mr. Morris who, along with his good conservative friends of Ottawa, had caused the people to believe that a bridge would be built from Châteauguay towards Lachine as well as a dam at Caughnawaga. Vainly did we keep telling them that it was merely an electoral scheme, that there was no sincerity in such promises, that it was a subterfuge and they should not rely on such promises. Hon. Mr. Sévigny was there, going through the country and promising the construction of the Châteauguay bridge, and so the people of Beauharnois, Châteauguay and Huntingdon actually believed that a bridge would be built. In vain did we assure them: "It is all nonsense, you know very well that the government will not build that bridge". They replied: "We are sure to get our bridge". Well, it turned out that the bridge never was built and the thing was not even mentioned after the election. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Before Hon. Mr. Fisher leaves this world, will you be gentlemanly enough to go and apologize to him? Will you go to the man who is at death's door and say that you have not been fair towards him, that you have deprived him of his mandate under false pretences and by means of false statements? Hon. Mr. Fisher would at last have the satisfaction of knowing before he dies that hon. gentlemen have not been fair to him. I hope they will do so. I would be putting it rather strongly to say that they robbed us; but I contend that they secured the election of Châteauguay by means of that bridge scheme which they never had any intention to carry out. It was merely a mean electoral trick on their part. I charge you, gentlemen, with having secured the votes in that constituency under false pretences and let me assure you that in our part of the country we know how to deal with men who resort to such tactics. They may change names and go under various alliases, but we know where to find them and how to inflict the punishment they deserve.

There is another thing which the Liberal party will recommend when it gets into power. I refer to the widening of the Victoria bridge where a most painful accident occurred. The bridge is too narrow for pedestrians and vehicles. Last summer there was a collision between two motor cars and the result was that a young man, 25 years of age, fell over the parapet and was drowned. It is absolutely necessary that the bridge should be widened. We have granted millions upon millions to the Victoria Bridge Company with a view to securing a good and safe throughfare. The road must be improved in order to avoid a repetition of the accident which occurred last summer. The man who caused the accident was arrested and he is to be tried in March next. I hope he will come out of it all right. But, unfortunately we had to deplore the death of a citizen of St. Constant.

A bridge must also be built at Longueuil. The necessity of such a bridge was evidenced, last summer, when the Victoria Bridge was damaged by fire. The latter remainded closed for a long time causing much inconvenience to the public. I say to the hon. member of Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault): "You will have to make superhuman efforts, sir, to secure for your constituency the bridge which it needs so badly, and if you require my help as I need your own for the construction of a bridge between Vaudreuil and St. Anne, I shall give it to you. We shall reciprocate.

Before taking my seat, there is one question of vital importance for me that I would like to discuss.

I mean the protection we owe to the farmers, to the tobacco growers. There is in this country a considerable industry in the hands of the farmers, the tobacco industry. I have had the honour of representing the county of Montcalm for two

sessions, and I know what takes place there. I told these good electors in leaving that county to represent the county of Jacques-Cartier, that they would not lose me; that any aid, protection and work which your humble servant could do, should be forthcoming on behalf of those to whom I owe so much. The hon. member from Montcalm (Mr. Séguin) who succeeded me has done all that was possible for him to do, and has fulfilled his duty thoroughly. I have nothing that I could reproach him, but he has not yet succeeded in obtaining from the Government the aid and protection which we owe to these good electors. We have an important industry, that of tobacco growing. Lately there have been delagations, steps have been taken, associations have been formed, to promote the interest of tobacco raising in the country, and I am sure that the Westerners, the men of Kent and Essex, the hon. members who represent these electoral districts, will not forget this industry. They will insist, I am sure, in asking that the Government do justice to these tobacco growers. What must be done, Mr. Speaker? When Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power, when I entered this House for the first time, I began to agitate to better the condition of the tobacco growers and we succeeded very well. From a tax of ten cents a pound which existed then upon the importation of foreign tobacco, by virtue of many solicitations, of untiring insistence, of repeatedly renewing the attack, we succeeded in having the tax upon foreign tobacco fixed at 28 cents per pound. It was a great improvement that helped the electors of Montcalm, Kent, Essex, Berthier, L'Assomption, Farnham, Joliette and Terrebonne. It enabled these electors to succeed in their work, to better their social positions and the condition of their families, and, thank God, the men who laboured for the tobacco interest from 1896 to 1911 have done meritorious work. The duty on foreign tobacco should be considerably increased by the Government; I mean by the Liberal Government when it comes to power. For I have not much confidence in the present Government, I have not much confidence that it will do anything to better the condition of the planters; we must wait for the Liberals. Foreign tobacco still comes into our country in altogether too large a proportion. We still import about 20 million pounds of foreign tobacco, while in fact this importation should be kept down to a dozen million pounds at most. The consequence would be that our growers would produce more tobacco, would improve its quality, would make greater sacrifices to make it more desirable, more marketable, and a higher duty would insure enormous profits to the planter. The rate of duty which we should ask is immaterial but it must be sufficiently high to hamper in a due measure the coming in of the foreign tobacco which is competing with our Canadian product. This, Sir, is what should be done for the growers who have done us the honour of electing us in our respective counties, and to whom it would only be doing justice.

There is an industry, Sir, which does not exist in this country, but which should. Our farmers should be given the protection necessary to encourage them to grow beets. None but the farmers understand the importance and the necessity of Government protection for this industry, which is non-existent in Quebec. How is it that beet-growing is a successful industry in Ontario and that we do not have it in Quebec? How can this be explained? It is because the ministers who represent us do not take the trouble to study these agricultural questions, and abandon the farmers in their difficulties. How is it that the hon. member from St. Anns (the Right Hon. Mr. Doherty) who has to represent us in the cabinet does not take the necessary measures to protect the beet industry in this country? The hon. minister will say: "That does not concern me."

The hon. Minister of Justice will say: "It is none of my business, why should I bother about beets? Is it worth my while?" If the hon. minister knew how important and necessary it is, for the farmers of the province of Quebec to establish the beet industry, he would give a premium to farmers to encourage them to make preparations for this new industry. In doing this he would render a very great service to the electors, especially to those from the country.

The minister is bound to help us—he is appointed for that special purpose, to safeguard the interests of the people. Let me therefore tell the minister, that if he only devoted a fraction of his time to this industry, we should be very grateful to him, and when the time for his retirement comes, which by the way is near at hand, he would have the satisfaction of saying: "When I was in office, I did something for my electors." We, therefore await with confidence his answer, trusting he will give

this matter his serious consideration, in our behalf, we, the people of the farming community—I made mention of "we" with a purpose, as I am in need of this industry at home in order to improve my farm and help to defray the expenses of the cattle that are in my stables. The beetroot industry would prove very advantageous in order to enable us to further improve our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to a matter which is of mutual interest to both of us. This is the request I addressed to him during the past years: Do construct a viaduct or a tunnel under the canal so that the people of the cities of Emard, Côte Saint Paul and Saint Gabriel may circulate to and fro with ease, without apprehension and loss of time between their home and Montreal. I have shown the minister in what sad plight these people are. One would imagine he was deaf. Yet he seems to be all attention when I make a request, but I must add that he very seldom gratifies my wishes. I insisted on the importance and necessity of having this tunnel built. Can you imagine a population of 15,000 to 20,000 and even more, perhaps 30,000 souls waiting patiently for boats to pass through the canal so that the bridge may be opened to traffic again and allow them to return to work? Yes, a hard-working class of the people, where fathers, boys and girls are to be found awaiting patiently and wondering when the bridge will open so that they may proceed to their daily work. If they arrive half an hour late, the employer who checks them will deduct so much an hour, so much a day for the lost time. To think that the honourable minister is responsible for all this! I further charge him with turning a deaf ear to all these legitimate requests of my electors. His home is there in the neighbourhood and if he does not know the facts of the case, he should go and see for himself and verify the facts. These poor people are constantly writing to me as follows: "Mr. Lafortune, for God's sake when shall we have a tunnel?" I can only answer: When it will please the Minister of Justice who is your representative, to build one—sorry to say he is not often willing."A flood occurred and a number of people barely escaped being drowned; the bridge was carried away and no means, absolutely no means was left to cross over. This does not concern the minister for he lives in his palace, his family is free from cares, he has no anxiety,

If he only felt the pangs of anxiety, if he but knew what transpires in the life of these poor people, perhaps he would stop to think. But the honourable minister will come before the people, perhaps he will soon be seeking from these good people a renewal of their confidence. They will say to him: Sir, that tunnel that Mr. Lafortune so often begged of you, what has become of it? Where is it? It is still to be built. It is not important, no, of no importance whatever—it will open his eyes!

These are things that the Liberal party will have to do when they return to office. All our pledges to the people between the years 1896 and 1911, such as assistance, help and protection we have fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I have enumerated a number of things which the Liberal party will be called to do when they ascend to power. We shall ask these gentlemen who sit across the floor of this House to render a strict account of the things they have done, those they have left undone and the good deeds they might have done. Far in the distant past these words were flashed across a wall: "Counted, weighed and found wanting." Well, we shall weigh these honourable gentlemen's actions and shall ascertain whether they come up to the mark and have fulfilled the requirements. As for myself, your humble servant, I am a Liberal and will continue to be one as long as my confidence rests with my leaders.

I am not the slave of any one; I have no need of the favours of any political party in order to live; I will remain in the ranks of the Liberal party as long as I have confidence in the leaders who are an honour to the party.

At the time of the 1911 election, in Montcalm, a young man offered himself and was selected a candidate by a substantial majority of his fellow citizens. Your humble servant refused to have his name go to the convention. I said: "No, sir, I have no time to bother with that kind of conventions. I will put my name before the great convention, before the general convention of all the electors of the county of Montcalm, and if a gentleman of the opposite party comes forward hoping to succeed through a division of the Liberal vote, I have signed my declaration and have had it published in the newspapers, I will retire, will shake hands with the candidate chosen at the convention, and we shall crush the opponent". That is what I said in my declaration of principles, my declaration of faith. I am a Liberal, but

I do not bend my knee before men; before God, yes, but not before men. So long as I have confidence I will remain with my leader, I will remain with my party, I will remain the Liberal I am. Meanwhile, I pledge my loyalty to England, my heart to my country. Above all, I remain a faithful lover of Liberty.

On the motion of Mr. Blake, the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Right Hon. C. J. Doherty, the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Friday, February 25th, 1921

The House met at three o'clock.

PAPERS TABLED

Statement of bonds or securities registered in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.—Sir Henry Drayton.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That Messrs. Anderson, Douglas (Strathcona), Stewart (Hamilton), Armstrong (Lambton), Whidden, Nesbitt, Tobin, Lapointe and Maharg be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. Gordon be added to the Select Standing Committees on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

PATENTS OF INVENTION ACT

On the motion of Right Hon. Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) Bill No. 11 was introduced and read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I move to proceed to Bill No. 2, to amend The Dominion Elections Act.

Motion agreed to.

House again in committee on Bill No. 2, to amend The Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When this Bill was before the committee yesterday, clause I was read, and an amendment thereto had been moved by the Hon. Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). The amendment will be found printed, au long, at page 277 of Unrevised Hansard. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. BUREAU: I see by the Bill that it is brought down to amend Dominion Elections Act.

For the purpose of the vote on a question submitted under the Canada Temperance Act directed by His Majesty's Proclamation dated the fourth day of June, 1920, to be taken in the province of Ontario on the eighteenth day of April, 1921.

Now the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), in his explanation the other day, said (Unrevised Hansard, p. 253):

I thought I had made it very clear when I first moved the motion that the reason the motion intervenes and that this Bill is necessary is not because the previous Act was insufficient in the circumstances, but that until at the very eve of the passing of the Act or just afterwards it had not been called to the attention of the Government that were a plebiscite to be held in the year 1920 there would be this extensive disfranchisement of the soldiers.

I understood that when the Franchise Act was passed, provision was made to cover the case of a vote being taken in Ontario, and that the lists of 1919 were to be used. The Franchise Act was assented to on July 1, 1920. By the present Bill I see that the proclamation was dated June 4, 1920, and that it fixed April 18, 1921, as the date for taking the referendum. Therefore, the Government were fully aware on July 1, 1920, that this referendum was to be taken on April 18, 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There must be some mistake.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a mistake in the printing or somewhere else. Evidently something is wrong, and I should like to have that point cleared up before I vote on the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think I can explain the apparent discrepency. The matter was in the Department of the Secretary of State, and the proclamation was dated back to June 4, to coincide with the date of the Order in Council, though, as a matter of fact, is was issued much later.

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand aright, the proclamation simply recites what the

Order in Council contains, and if an Order in Council was passed providing for a referendum in the province of Ontario, it must have set the date, and if the date was set, it was the 18th day of April, 1921.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Order in Council does not fix the date. The date is fixed by the proclamation.

Mr. BUREAU: Does not the Order in Council decide that a plebiscite shall be held? Certainly, it is their duty to determine the date. The Secretary of State could not decide that without the knowledge and approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am informed by the Chief Electoral Officer that the Order in Council merely states that the request of the province of Ontario shall be granted, and the questions submitted to the electors at a date to be fixed by proclamation. When the proclamation was subsequently issued it was thought by the then Secretary of State that it should bear the same date as the Order in council, and that was the reason why, although subsequently issued, it bears on its face the same date as the Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: That is rather a lame explanation. Here is an Order in Council passed by the Government to authorize a certain thing. The Government by this Order in Council does not delegate its power to any man or minister to fill in what he thinks necesary, and then antedate it, for some reason or other which I cannot understand. When we say that a law shall take effect upon proclamation, surely my hon. friend does not pretend that he can antedate the proclamation. The proclamation is evidence of the date at which the law is to take effect. Now, either the Government knew or did not know on the 4th of June, when they issued the Order in Council and decided on the 21st of April, or whatever is the date, that a number of people had been disfranchised in the lists of 1919. If they knew, then I think they were derelict in their duty at the time we passed the law in not putting into the statute in the first instance what ought to have been embodied in it, that the latest lists, or whatever else they thought fit, should be used. I do not object to any of the provisions of the bill, because I am not particularly interested except in the amendment. I do not see why we should leave to posterity the name of Mr. Spence or anybody else, officials of these organizations, who seek to legislate us into becoming good people in spite of ourselves. I would therefore suggest that this amendment be amended by striking out, as it appears in Hansard—I have not a copy of the bill before me—the following words in lines nine and ten of sub-section 2: "Ben H. Spence and Andrew S. Grant." I think the statute will be fully effective and operative without the insertion of those two names. The clause would then read this way:

> (ii) On behalf of the persons interested in promoting an affirmative answer to the question submitted the Dominion Alliance (Ontario Branch) and the Ontario Referendum Committee jointly shall be entitled to appoint the agents aforesaid, and every such appointment shall be made in writing by such person in each electoral district as may be notified to the Returning Officer jointly by the secretaries—

And so on. Then in the second part of the clause I would similarly deal with the gentlemen who bears the name of Boyce. The words "Secretary of the Citizens' Liberty League" are, I think, ample. Further on in the third paragraph I would say that the Chief Electoral Officer shall be notified of the names of the secretaries of these organizations, and then the people who are appointed by the secretaries shall have the right to appoint the agents.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the committee will agree with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I may say that I did not draft the clause. The Chief Electoral Officer who drafted it quite concurs in the opinion that names are unnecessary, and if the committee agrees I have no objection to the suggestion to strike them out in both cases.

Mr. BUREAU: My motion, then, is to strike out in the second paragraph, in the ninth and tenth lines, as the amendment appears in Hansard at page 277, the words "Ben H. Spence and Andrew S. Grant," and to strike out in the last but one line of the same clause the name "C. D. Boyce."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. POWER: Will the effect of this clause be to exclude any other organizations from having representatives at the polls? Suppose the Women's Christian Temperance Union wished to have a representative at the poll, would they be excluded by reason of the fact that the Referendum League and the Dominion Alliance were already represented, or would it be only a question of precedence?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They would have no right to be represented at the poll.

Mr. JACOBS. Shame.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If we do not pass this legislation I doubt whether any one would have the right to be represented at the poll. The Franchise Act, upon which this legislation is based, provides of course for the presence at the poll of candidates or their agnets. There will be no candidates in this vote, and unless we specially appoint some one to attend in the interests of those who affirm and those who oppose the legislation, I doubt whether any one would have the right to be present at the polls. Those persons in Ontario who feel directly interested in the matter have met and have among themselves agreed as to what would be the best scrutiny to have at the polls, and they brought their joint suggestion, which is set out in the paragraph I have submitted as an amendment. For my part, I think it offers a fairly reasonable solution of the difficulty.

Mr. POWER: I do not wish to criticize the views of these organizations in Ontario, but under the Scott Act, if I remember rightly, when elections were held any elector was entitled to appear at the poll and, on being sworn, to act as representative for one side or the other. My point is that I do not think it is fair to deprive any elector of that privilege and to allow only certain organizations to appear in the poll. It might very well happen that in certain constituencies, or in certain localities, the representative either of the Alliance or of the Referendum League might not be competent, or might not be thought to be competent by those most interested.

Mr. JACOBS: Might not be sober.

Mr. POWER: I would not like to go so far as to say that; but it might be better for the conduct of the polling if some other party were represented in the poll, and I do not think we should deprive any citizen of the right to appear in a poll even in the province of Ontario.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It might be a wet day.

Mr. CANNON: In the event of the Dominion Alliance, or whatever it is called, appointing representatives in every polling division in Ontario how will they be paid for their services?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no knowledge on that question, I assume their services will be given free.

Mr. CANNON: As I understand, referenda were held in other provinces and after the vote had been taken the accounts were sent in to the Ottawa Government I would ask were these accounts settled by the respective associations or by the country?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not aware that the Government has received any accounts for services of that kind. The Chief Electoral Officer informs me that he is not aware of any either.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. POWER: Before the amendment carries I wonder whether the minister would guarantee to the committee that, once Ontario goes dry—and we all piously hope it will—it will remain in that happy and satisfactory state for some time, and that the country will not be called upon to pay for any more plebiscites. I would like to know from the Government how many referanda can be taken under this legislation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: One might be held under the present law each three years by any province that asks for it in the way prescribed by the Act.

Mr. BUREAU: It will be necessary to make a change in sub-section 3. I move to strike out the words in the third and fourth lines "hereafter changes its Secretary, such changes" and the word "If" at the beginning of the paragraph, and insert in lieu of the word "If" the words "the names of the Secretaries of".

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just before that motion is put let me say that another draft has been handed to me by Colonel Biggar, the Chief Electoral Officer. He proposes that sub-section 3 be made to read as follows:

> The names of the Secretaries of the Dominion Alliance (Ontario Branch) the Ontario Referendum Committee, and The Citizens' Liberty League shall be notified to the Chief Electoral Officer who shall advise the Returning Officer thereof, and notification of the persons in each electoral district authorized to appoint agents may thereafter be given by such Secretaries.

The language sounds to me as if it covered the point.

Mr. POWER: I want to ask one question which may or may not have a direct bearing upon the point. In elections held under the Canada Temperance Act how are the lists to be made? My reason for asking the question is, that in the city of Quebec there is a probability of our having an

election under the Canada Temperance Act within the next month or so. Will the minister therefore state how the lists are to be made up?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In future, at all elections to be held under the Canada Temperance Act, the machinery provided under the Dominion Elections Act will have to be adopted.

Mr. POWER: Even though it is the cumbersome and expensive machinery provided under the Act of last session for this purpose?

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend may call the machinery cumbersome but the Toronto Globe paid it a high compliment.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause as amended carry?

Mr. STEELE: Before the clause is carried I wish to propose another amendment. Under paragraph (c) of section 29 of the Elections Act a residence of two months in the electoral district is required of any voter. In paragraph (d) of section 1 of this Bill, instead of two months residence in the electoral district two months residence in the province of Ontario is required. There may be legal objections to doing so but I think it is very desirable that for the vote to be taken in April we should adhere to the residence in the electoral district for all voters. I would therefore move that:

Paragraph (d) of subsection 1, of section 29 be amended by striking out the words "Province of Ontario for" in line 24 thereof and substituting therefor the words "Electoral district wherever such person seeks to vote for at least"

Then the clause will read:

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (c) of subsection 1 of section 29, every person otherwise qualified to vote and not disqualified from voting shall be entitled to vote if he has ordinarily resided in Canada for twelve months and in the electoral district where such voter seeks to vote for at least two months before the first day of February, 1921.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This proposal raises a question upon which the Government would be glad of the opinion of the committee; it opens a fair field for argument. The section as it appears in the Bill provides for a residence qualification of twelve months in Canada and two months in the province of Ontario. The amendment proposes two months residence in the particular electoral district striking out the words "Province of Ontario." It is argued, and has been argued before the Cabinet committee who heard a deputation, that under the Dominion Elections Act the residential qualification is two months in the electoral district, irrespective of residence in the province The change here is to two months' residence in the province. The distinction is broadly this: The constituency in a referendum of this kind is a provincial constituency; the constituency under the Dominion Elections Act is an electoral district for the purpose of returning a member to this House. In the one case residence within the electoral district is required where you are only voting for a member to represent that particular district. But this is a question which will involve the whole province of Ontario, the whole province is the constituency, and in the drafting of this proposal the Chief Electoral Officer adopted that plan and provided for two months' residence in Ontario, as well, of course, as twelve months' residence in the Dominion.

I am told by the Chief Electoral Officer that experience in the West, where a similar vote was taken last October, would justify retaining the clause as it is in the Bill now before this committee. It is said that in many cases people move from one district to another within a province, and that those people are deprived of their votes; and the argument is made, that so long as a man resides within the province itself he should be entitled to cast his vote. These are the two phases of the question. I do not know that the Government has any particular view either way, neither do I know just what view the committee will take of it. In the meantime it is open for discussion.

Mr. NESBITT: What strikes me is that if the residential qualification embraced the whole province the deputy returning officer might have no knowledge of the voters. In the rural districts they can be introduced by an elector, and he can state that they have a right to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He has to swear to it.

Mr. NESBITT: He can swear to it probably. I do not care which way it is put, but during this discussion it struck me that the proposed change might open the door to fraud a great deal more if the residential qualification applied to the province of Ontario rather than to the electoral district, because in the latter ordinarily those who are going to vote are well known.

Mr. CRERAR: I quite concur in the remarks made by my hon. friend (Mr.

Nesbitt). I see no reason why the same provision should not be made to apply in this House as ordinarily applies in the election for the House of Commons. I can quite understand the possibility of a great deal of wrongful voting if the clause stands as presented in the amendment by my hon. friend who is handling it for the Government. We all know it is a regrettable thing, but nevertheless it is the fact that in cities particularly those can be found who will swear to anything if there is any financial gain to accrue to them. Fortunately they comprise a very small portion of our people. It would be quite a simple matter to get together a number of such unscrupulous persons and simply have them vote at every polling division they could visit in a day. On the other hand, as my hon. friend from North Oxford points out, if the residence qualification is confined to the electoral division, the people in that division are acquainted with those who are going to vote, and consequently there is not the possibility of fraud that exists in the amendment as introduced by the Government. I remember that a number of years ago a referendum similar to the one in contemplation was taken in the province of Manitoba. The way was open for fraud and impersonation, and in one polling division more people voted than there were men, women and children in it. It is better to avoid the possibility of such an undesirable condition of affairs, and I therefore very heartily support the proposal of my hon. friend from North Oxford.

Mr. LALOR: Mr. Chairman, I remember when the Ontario election law provided that the voter must be a resident of the municipality. I always thought that was a very unfair method. I have known many instances where farmers sold out and moved to the next district, thus losing their votes. I think very great objection will be raised by people in the rural districts when they find that because they have changed their residence they are not permitted to vote.

Mr. CRERAR: They are in the same position as if they were voting for the election of members of Parliament.

Mr. LALOR: I do not care. I believe that any man who is a bona fide resident of the province of Ontario has a right to vote, even though he may move from one county or township to another. I think it is only just and fair to any citizen that he should not be deprived of his vote on account of change of residence.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will the regular voters' list be compiled for the purposes of the referendum under the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, and will it be completed within a reasonable time before the actual voting?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In urban municipalities, the list which will be complied and completed within twelve days before the election. But my hon. friend will recollect that a different rule applies in regard to rural municipalities. There, notwithstanding whether a man is off the list or on, he has the right on election day to go to the polls and demand a ballot, but he has to provide himself with somebody who will vouch for him, and the person so vouching must be a resident of the electoral district and on the voter's list. He takes an oath that the man applying for a ballot is a qualified elector. Then it is the duty of the returning officer to hand the applicant a ballot, even though his name is not on the list. It is not so in cities, towns and villages. I think that reasonably safeguards the rural vote. Of course, you might find some scalliwags who would go from poll to poll and try to vote, but I think we have provided a sufficient safeguard, inasmuch as a resident who is on the voters' list for that particular division must take an oath in order to qualify an applicant for a ballot. In the Act as originally drawn we had a provision that two must vouch for an applicant, but at the instance of the committee who considered the clause we limited the requirement to one.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It seems to me that there is a difference between this vote and the vote for members of Parliament. You elect members of Parliament for one particular district; the man who is elected is supposed to be the choice of those who are electors resident in that district. In this case the whole of Ontario is one electoral district. It is not that prohibition shall or shall not prevail in an electoral district, it is as to whether it shall or shall not prevail in the whole province of Ontario. What is wanted is to get the vote of every qualified voter in the whole province in order to ascertain the opinion of the province, and I think you would cut off a great many people from voting if you made it obligatory that they should have resided in the electoral district itself for the time specified. The injustice which would be done in that case would be far greater than any that might arise through double voting or personation, pen-

alties for which are prescribed in the Act. Having regard to the fact that it is one constituency which is voting and in which every voter votes for the whole of the province, I should be in favour of leaving the clause as it is and not introducing the condition of residence in the locality itself.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): If this amendment carries, the effect will be the disfranchisement of a large number of voters. For instance, just about that time of the year the lumbermen in the northern country are breaking up their camps and moving out, and would not have two months' residence in any district at the time of the voting. It seems to me that by this provision an injustice might be done to large numbers of the working population who migrate from place to place.

Mr. STEELE: There is, no doubt, a good deal in what has been said in opposition to the proposed amendment. But in the guarding of the ballot box and in the taking of the vote we should endeavour to be consistent. Two months' residence in the electoral district is specially provided for in the Elections Act. I do not think that any member of Parliament would desire the removal of that restriction. In the coming referendum, I am sure, no one desires anything but a fair and honest vote of the electors of Ontario. But in providing machinery for the taking of that vote, at least the necessary precautions should be taken to protect the ballot box from any irregularity. We have thrown the door wide open by allowing any person whose name is not on the list in the rural districts to come up on election day, and, by taking the oath and being certified to by another elector, to vote. Personally I doubt whether even that is a wise provision in the Elections Act. However, apart from that, we have thrown the door pretty wide open, and while some people may be disfranchised if the local residence clause is inserted, we can under no condition, in no franchise Act, prevent the disfranchisement of some people. In the urban districts many persons will be disfranchised when the lists are revised. If we seek to allow every resident of Ontario to vote, then we are inconsistent in saying that in the urban districts any person whose name is not on the list shall not be allowed to vote. It seems to me that the proposed amendment is a wise precaution. It will, perhaps, save Parliament from a good deal of criticism afterward, and not very much objection would be made my those people who, under the amendment, would be disfranchised.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It seems to me that the weight of the argument rests with the hon. member (Mr. Steele) who has moved the amendment. It is a safeguard to provide that a man who votes shall have resided in the constituency for a certain length of time; if you take away that safeguard I do not see who is going to testify to the voter's residence in Ontario. The provision has always been in the Elections Act, and few are disfranchised under it. I was sorry to hear my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) say that some men were words cut out. Coming from the hon. prepared to swear to anything, particularly in the cities. Now, I would like those member, they have more significance than they otherwise would have. But I do not believe that he wished to insinuate that the man in the city will, because he lives in the city, take an oath that he would not take if he were in the country. I believe that those who live in the cities of Ontario are just as likely to swear to the truth as they would be if they lived in rural ridings. So far as the amendment is concerned, two months' residence surely cannot be considered as too much. I do not live in Toronto, but I would not be surprised if Toronto voted wet. If, however, you allow Toronto to be flooded with men from the rural districts and smaller cities and towns of Ontario, the vote for Toronto might be dry—something which Toronto did not intend or desire. I believe that Winnipeg voted wet and the rest of Manitoba dry in the last referendum on this question. Perhaps Winnipeg thinks it did the right thing; that is not for me to say, but Winnipeg would not like to have its vote submerged, even if it were a minority, by the transference of votes from other districts where they were not so badly needed. Without the proposed amendment, therefore, I foresee a condition under which men might move from one district in Ontario to another where their votes would count for the most. The question is, perhaps, difficult to decide, and no doubt whichever way you decide it a few will be disfranchised. But our law has been a good one in the past, and it seems to me that no hardship will be imposed on anybody by providing that the voter must have resided a certain length of time in the riding in which he votes.

Mr. ARTHURS: In Northern Ontario many voters quite frequently change their

residence from one constituency to another. This particular vote will be taken on lists, so far as the rural parts are concerned, prepared prior to December, 1919, and since that time many men have changed their residence. If this amendment carries these men will be deprived of the right to vote.

Mr. NESBITT: They can swear in their votes.

Mr. ARTHURS: Not unless they have been resident two months in the district in which they desire to vote. The proposed amendment would deprive many lumbermen and miners of their votes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that the real purpose of this amendment is to obviate the necessity of revising the lists and thereby save some $300,000. Has my hon. friend formed any estimate of the number of names that will likely be left off the lists as the result of our not having the full revision? As I understand it, any persons whose names are not on the lists will have to be sworn. Has the minister any idea how many persons will have to go to the polls and swear on their names in order that they may have the right to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It would be very hard to form an estimate. The man who could form the nearest estimate would be the Chief Electoral Officer, and he says that in some polls there will be very few names to add while in others there may be twenty-five, fifty, or even more. No estimate has been made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has my hon. friend directed the attention of the Dominion Alliance and the Ontario Referendum Committee to this effect of the amendment? Has he considered the possible effect that it will have upon the number of votes cast? I assume that many of those who would like to vote will be women who have never voted before; they may hesitate to take an oath in order that they may be entitled to vote. Then, there are many classes who might take exception to swearing their names at all. Has my hon. friend considered that aspect, and has he discussed it with parties that are likely to be interested?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The parties most interested have certainly brought that aspect of the matter to the attention of the Government, and we have discussed and considered it. There are two opinions on it. Those who are least familiar with elections and election laws seem to think there may be some crowding at the polls, some blocking, on account of the great number of people who intend to vote; but under the Act there is power to open such additional polls as may be necessary to accommodate the voters. That having been pointed out, I think in every case the objection has been withdrawn. I do not see any likelihood of any blocking of the polls even if fifty or a hundred voters have to be sworn, unless somebody deliberately occupies the time of the clerks, and a constable is on hand for the purpose of putting a man of that kind out of the polling booth.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My point is directed, not to the blocking of the polls, but to the effect of certain persons being obliged to take an oath before they register their votes. I understand, in this referendum, there will be a number of women voting who, perhaps, have not voted before. The point I want to bring out, is this, that if the law as originally drafted had been complied with, the names of all those persons would be on the lists, so that there would be no need for any group of people taking an oath; but in consequence of the change that is now being made, hundreds of prospective voters will go to the polls and will find that their names are not on the lists, and so they will be obliged to take an oath before they can be entitled to vote. I just want to make perfectly sure that the Government feels that the electors are satisfied as regards the possibility of large numbers of voters requiring to be sworn.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only complaint I know of on that score is one from a man who stated that his wife objected to the taking of an oath. The law, as originally drafted, adopted the Ontario lists, and closing the door in that way would constitute a far greater hardship than asking the people to take the oath. We have now opened the door, but we have prescribed one safeguard, that an oath shall be taken.

Mr. CURRIE: As regards this clause, the only attitude for the committee to take is that of fairness to all parties concerned. If the effect of the proposed amendment will deprive anybody of a vote, I for one will not support it. By passing this amendment, we shall certainly deprive a number of people of their votes, and for that reason I do not think the amendment should carry. Whilst an amendment similar to this would work all right in a

case where there were constituencies and we desired to prevent what is known as "colonization"—that is, having a lot of people moving over night from one constituency to another to carry it—but as this is a vote to be taken throughout the province we should take the broadest view of the whole matter and adopt a course which will ensure to everybody the freedom of the ballot. I speak feelingly on this matter, because by dodges and bars of this kind placed in the statute, I was twenty-eight years of age before I was able to cast a vote, although, under the law of the day, I was entitled to cast a vote at twenty-one. The whole history of the ballot is filled with restrictions placed upon the exercise of the franchise, and we should look at the matter from a judicial standpoint and say: We will not prevent anybody from the right of exercising the franchise, on account of residence, on account of age—that is, granted that we give them the full age of twenty-one years —on account of colour, religion or anything else. If we do that, I think we are doing what is proper. For that reason I do not see the need for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Perth South (Mr. Steele). If this were a case where a vote was to be taken by constituencies, there might be some argument in favour of this proposition; but I think the minister and the Chief Electoral Officer have taken the right course, and the ballot will be amply safeguarded, and no one can come forward and say: By some trick of legislation this House has deprived certain people of their vote, and the verdict of the people of the province would have been reversed if those people had been able to vote. For that reason I am in favour of the utmost liberality in the taking of that vote, and I trust the committee will hold the same view.

Mr. GUTHRIE: One point that has just come to my mind is that the experience in Alberta and Saskatchewan has justified the Chief Electoral Officer in making the change. In those two provinces the law under the Franchise Act requires residence for two months in the electoral district, and he received quite a number of protests from judges and temperance organs in each province pointing out the hardship of the provision. He received no protests from any one in the province opposed to it. In consequence of, and recognizing those protests, he drew up the present amendment. I do not want the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Currie) to suppose that I have any particular side or view on this question. I am not particularly concerned with it. Whatever is the view of the committee, that I am willing to accept.

Mr. POWER: Was this amendment suggested by any of the interested parties, and if so, by whom? Was this amendment approved by any of those seeking the referendum?

Mr. STEELE: I drafted the amendment myself and submitted it to the committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Solicitor General said that there had been a deputation asking for this amendment.

Mr. CURRIE: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not addressing the hon. member for Simcoe North. I heard the minister say that there had been a deputation asking for this amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I never saw this amendment until my hon. friend (Mr. Steele) read it to the committee a minute or so ago.

Mr. STEELE: Might I point out that about eight months ago this House adopted the Franchise Act in which appeared section 101, and I make this argument just to show that I am not guilty of any inconsistency or departure from principle; I am endeavouring to be consistent with what the House did eight months ago. That section as adopted provided for the use, in the vote to be taken under the Canada Temperance Act in 1920, of the lists as prepared for the provincial elections in 1919. That vote was not taken in 1920. Had it been taken, this very restriction which I propose now, requiring two months residence in electoral districts, would be in the Act. I did not hear any objection to that then, and I do not think any could have been made. Why the objection should be made now, I do not understand. I am sure the amendment which I have moved is not going to assist the temperance cause in any way, because the great majority of the voters in the rural districts are, I believe, in favour of prohibition and have always so voted, and if electors in the rural districts are disfranchised, the tendency will be to reduce the vote for prohibition. That is not the point I have in mind in moving this amendment. The provision requiring local residence is a good one in any election Act, and for that reason we should preserve it for this vote which it is proposed to take.

Mr. EULER: As regards the referendum, the main object is to ascertain the

wish of the people as a whole, not with any special reference to any particular locality as is the case in the 4 p.m. election of members of Parliament. That being so, the law should provide for as complete an expression of opinion as is possible, and for minimizing as much as possible the disfranchisement of any of the citizens. For that reason alone, I am going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the vote should be taken under the Franchise Act itself. I think the idea was, when the Government proposed that the different provinces should take a plebiscite, that the vote should be taken under the Elections Act as it existed at that time. If that is so, I think we should stand by that idea and whatever the Franchise Act of the Dominion was at the time, it should be used in connection with the taking of this vote. If the amendment of the Minister is carried, the vote will not be taken under the original Franchise Act, but under a special Act, with special provisions in it, and that was not the idea. I venture to say that the Minister of Justice had in mind at the time that the vote would be taken in the different provinces under the Dominion Franchise Act without any amendment whatever. I understand that the effect of the amendment of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), is to bring us back to the original Franchise Act, and I think that is the proper thing to do. The machinery there provided should be sufficiently broad to enable everybody to vote who has the right to vote. A great deal has been said in favour of that Act as giving everybody who is qualified the right to exercise the franchise. If that be the case, I think it should be good enough to enable the people of Ontario to express their views in a plebiscite without any amendment whatever. If the amendment of my hon. friend from South Perth brings us back to the Franchise Act which we passed only last year—it is not an old Act—I will support it.

Mr. MOWAT: The reason given for making a change from the original Act is the lack of experience, and if it is a fact that in Alberta and Saskatchewan the requirement as to residence in the locality has had a restrictive effeet, I think, in view of their experience, it would be a pity for us to stick to what we originally enacted. We must remember that this is the Scott Act (which used to apply only to a county) now being made to apply to the province as a whole. I am also much moved by the fact that the Minister's amendment has been discussed by the different representatives who came here, and if they are satisfied with the amendment proposed by the Government I think we would be making a mistake to change it, because they have the idea that what they approved is going to be adopted by the Government. If it is a fact, as my hon. friend from South Perth says, that it may deprive people who are living in the country of their votes, because of their moving about, that is all the more reason why we should stick to the amendment proposed by the Government after conference with these people representing both sides of the question. For these reasons, I think the amendment of my hon. friend from South Perth should not prevail.

Mr. CRERAR: I understand that the deputation which waited on the Government asked that this change be made, so the statement of my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) is entirely beside the mark.

Mr. MOWAT: I understood the minister to say otherwise.

Mr. NESBITT: In the old Scott Act as applied to a county the residence qualification and reference, not to the whole county but to the electoral district or polling sub-division. In the future, as the minister pointed out, they will go on the Franchise Act.

Amendment (Mr. Steele) negatived.

Mr. BUREAU: Before the amendment of the minister carries I should like the point I raised at the outset to be settled, as to the proclamation being dated June 4. The minister stated that that was to coincide with the date of the Order in Council. Am I to understand that the date of the plebiscite was not fixed by the Order in Council? If it was not, what officer, or what minister, or what department, fixed the date for the holding of the plebiscite?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that the Order in Council declared that the question would be submitted. The date for taking the vote was subsequently fixed by the proclamation, which named October 25. The date of the proclamation was made to coincide with the date of the Order in Council. The Chief Electoral Officer has given me that information, which he obtained from the late Secretary of State.

Mr. BUREAU: Therefore, the Order in Council simply recognized the fact that an

application had been made by the province for a referendum. What was the necessity for an Order in Council to do that? We are left in the dark, and this whole legislation turns upon that point. I do not think it is satisfactory. I do not wish to come in conflict with my hon. friend, but I think the Order in Council was perfectly useless if it did not state that the referendum would be taken on the 18th of April, 1921. If the proclamation is based on an Order in Council that does not state the facts, it has no authority either by statute or otherwise. I think this proclamation is not worth anything, and I do not believe there is any authority in the Secretary of State to sign any such proclamation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am also informed that by the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, it is enacted that the date shall be fixed by the proclamation.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask, then, what the date of the proclamation is?

Mr. GUTHRIE: June 4, to accord with the Order in Council. I do not know what turns upon this point, but those are the facts.

Mr. BUREAU: This is what turns upon it. The Government comes to the House with this legislation and says: We did not know at the time the Elections Act was before Parliament that it would be unfair to Ontario to have a referendum in 1920, as it would disfranchise a lot of people. The date of the referendum was postponed. I say that if the proclamation was issued on the day it is dated, all the facts contained in the proclamation must have been known on that date which is the 4th of June. Now the Elections Act was assented on the 18th of July. On the 4th of June we had not passed the clause which relates to the Temperance Act. That being the case, the statement that the Act was passed not well founded, and if there was anybody to blame it was the Government, who were derelict in their duty in not passing at that time the legislation that is before us now. But I will not censure them for they have been censured enough already.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On what authority does the Government give to a proclamation a date other than that of its actual proclamation? My hon. friend, I understand, says that the proclamation was issued some time in July, but that as a matter of fact it was given out to the public as though it had been issued on the 20th June. By what authority does the Government act in this manner? What right have they to alter the date of a proclamation and to antedate it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Order in Council of the 4th June was not issued under the Franchise Act; it was issued under the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, under which it is provided that the date shall be fixed by proclamation. The Order in Council—this is my information, I have never seen it—merely provided that the question would be submitted in the province of Ontario and the western provinces according to the demand therefor. The proclamation subsequently fixed the date. I understand that the proclamation was actually issued in July, but in its date it related back to the Order in Council and bore the same date. That was the view of the late Hon. Mr. Sifton, as to the proper date which the proclamation should bear. I am stating the facts as they are related to me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) contend that that is a proper procedure? What right has the Government to date back a proclamation to a time that suits its own convenience? Will the hon. gentleman seek to defend such a position?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the proclamation was regularly issued.

Mr. BUREAU: According to the principle laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie), a law becoming effective from the date of proclamation would be antedated a year before it was enacted at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The date of the proclamation is the immaterial part in this case; the time for the taking of the vote is the material thing. That is what is proclaimed; it is what is vital, and I think the proclamation is regular in this instance.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend is shifting his ground. The leader of the Opposi- (Mr. Mackenzie King) asks by what right the Government can antedate a proclamation as they please. I say it is immoral for them to do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say "as we please" or anything of that kind. I have only given my own opinion.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the Bill be read a third time? If there is no objection, it may

now be read the third time; otherwise it will have to stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that the Government requests that the Bill be now read the third time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then, Mr. Speaker, we will not offer any objection to its being read the third time at the present moment. I think, however, that the moment is appropriate again to protest against this system of rushing legislation. The rules of the House provide that every Bill should have at least three readings on three separate days. We protested last session over and over again against the habit into which the Government had fallen of introducing legislation at the eleventh hour and then rushing it through without giving hon. members of this House of Commons opportunity to deliberate thereon. This is the first piece of legislation brought forward this session, and lest the present procedure is to be construed as a precedent we might as well point out at once that strong exception will be taken to a repetition of anything of the kind.

Perhaps this may be an opportune moment to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that the amendments which we to-day have been called upon to pass are amendments to a section of the Elections Act which was considered at the very close of last session, when members of Parliament were obliged to sit far into the night and on into the morning, and when there was very little opportunity afforded for mature consideration of any legislation before the House. Had there been time for mature consideration, this neglect or oversight of the Government might not have occurred. May I further point out that at the end of last session we urged strongly that Parliament should be called at an early date this year. If Parliament had been summoned at an early date, which would have suited the convenience of all hon. members, it would not have been necessary to alter the regular procedure as has been done in this case and to rush legislation in this manner. In a few weeks' time the present fiscal year will have come to a close and we shall then be confronted, I presume, with a request from the Government that we consider granting some measure of supply without the House having any opportunity of looking at the Estimates. Let me inform the Government at once that it will be to their own interests to bring down the Estimates as speedily as possible, because we on this side of the House will not consent to the passing of estimates without having an opportunity carefully to consider what we are called upon to vote in that connection.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall take careful note of all that my hon. friend has said. It is hard to break off old habits all at once, and if he will allow this to go through we will reform so far as succeeding ones are concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: You promise anything at all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill be now read the third time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Thursday, February 24.

Mr. MATTHEW ROBERT BLAKE (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to offer my contribution to the debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on the excellent speeches delivered by them on this occasion. I wish also to congratulate our Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on his elevation to the high office which he now holds. As he is an honest man and one who is not fishing for compliments, I do not think he will suffer in any way by reason of the lack of deference shown by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) in his failure to congratulate him as other hon. members of the Opposition have done. I am satisfied that when history records the present period the work of the right hon. gentleman who now fills the office of Prime Minister will rank equal with the best achievements of his predecessors. This Government has been subjected to undue, unjust, and unwarranted criticism by many in this country during its term of office; but while that criticism is subsiding in the country in the light of the work of the Government, we cannot say that ma-

terial help in alleviating the present unrest has been contributed by the Opposition. The Opposition, as they did all summer, are still indulging in criticism and stirring up unrest in the country. In the old days, when over half of the population elected a Government, the majority stood behind that Government through thick and thin; and it did not matter what the Government might do or what measure might be brought forward, that majority supported the Administration unflinchingly. The shaking-up that took place in the forming of a new party in 1917 left every person free, independent, and unfettered to any party, and that being the case every one felt at liberty to criticise the Government. Hence a great deal of the present criticism. Fortunately the people of Canada are now settling down again. They thoroughly appreciate the good work which the Government has done and are beginning to applaud with much enthusiasm the splendid deeds which it has wrought. One outstanding issue, as has frequently been stated on the floor of this House, was presented in the pre-election platform of the Government—the vigorous waging of the war and the reinforcement of Canadian troops at the front. No one can deny that the efforts of the Government along these lines were most successful, for at the conclusion of the war the Canadian division stood at the very spearhead of the Allied armies. That division was undoubtedly the finest fighting corps in the Allied armies at that time and made the best record of any division. The Government deserves the highest praise for keeping the Canadian army at the top notch of efficiency, and for prosecuting its work in that direction so effectively. The achievements of the Government were, in fact, so notable that at the end of the war Canada could easily have laid claim to the full status of nationhood. I think it was the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who said in one of his speeches when Parliament was meeting in the Museum building that no previous Government in Canada could lay claim to have fulfilled so many of its pre-election pledges within six months after the contest. The fulfillment of its pledges is one thing that must certainly be put down to the credit of the Government.

I believe it was the mover of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne who made the point that the trade of Canada per capita had expanded to a greater extent than that of any other country in the world. The expansion of Canadian commerce has not been slow and steady; year by year it has advanced by leaps and bounds. The conditions in the country over which the Government have control must be excellent or such an unparalleled expansion of commerce would not have taken place as has taken place during the regime of the present administration. I think it can be truly stated that we have better industrial conditions in Canada than in any other country on the face of the globe. There is far less unemployment in this country and better relationship and a better understanding between capital and labour. We can only attain the progress that we should achieve in the next few years by continuing to maintain such good relations betweeen the two; labour realizing that capital is as necessary to its wellbeing as labour is as necessary to the wellbeing of capital. In the matter of industrial relationships this country is a model for the world at large. Our mercantile marine which has been so severely criticized made money last year, the hardest year it will ever have to encounter. This too despite the war conditions which shook up the trade routes and brought about the disorganization in the traffic that has been going on during the past few years. Our ships now sail the seven seas and sail them successfully. Our mercantile marine is a credit tc Canada.

In the re-establishment of the returned men no one can deny that Canada leads the world. In the Soldiers' Land Settlement we have trained, are giving loans to or have in training, some 64,706 men. Up to November 30, 1920, the number of veterans in communication with the Soldiers' Settlement Board was 100,000, and the number who applied for the privileges of the Settlement Act was 58,811. The number of veterans qualified but not yet located was 21,975, whilst 916 were in training under supervision of the Board, and 1,444 had completed training. To those who were in training the sum of $165,150 has been paid out as pay allowances during the time they were taking the course. Under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment some 50,788 men were under training up to February 19, 1921. A careful record is kept as to the disposition of graduates. These are followed up by department officers for a period of at least four months after discharge from training, and where employment has been constant for a period of four months after being placed in employment, the same is considered permanent and the cases are closed. Up to January 31, 1921, the following information was available with respect to cases considered

closed. The total number at that time was 26,891. Of this number 19,137 or 71.6 per cent were in employment along the lines for which they were trained; 5,604 or 28.84 per cent were in employment along other lines. The total graduates in employment represented 92 per cent. Of the remainder 205 or 1.76 per cent were out of employment; 844, or 3.15 per cent, could not be traced; 749, or 2.78 per cent, had left Canada; 233, or 1.94 per cent, were ill; and 99 or .37 per cent had died. The number of ex-soldiers on the strength of the department for treatment on February 5th, 1921, was 6,231.

I shall not bother to give the figures with respect to the disabled men who have been looked after. That information is available at the Department of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at any time. But I am satisfied that in the matter of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Canada has led the world. She started her methods before any of the other Allied countries and progressed in these respects, with such rapidity and effected such excellent organization that men were sent from the United States and Great Britain to Canada to study the methods employed by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Some 29,084 men have found employment in the Civil Service, making a total of 144,578 that have been looked after by the Government. It thus appears that nearly one-third of our army have been provided for in some way or other under the plans of re-establishment.

The provision of Soldiers' Insurance should not pass unnoticed. Under it soldiers can take out insurance without examination within a limited time. Canada leads the world too in the matter of payment of pensions. She is paying higher pensions than any of the Allied countries.

If the administration of this Government had not been so successful there might be some ground for the demand for an election. Hon. gentlemen opposite insist that the people are calling for an election but I have not heard anything whatever with respect to any such call.

The leader of the Opposition sought to make out a case against the Government where in reality no case exists. The tariff question has been made a political football for years and invariably at election time it is surrounded by a lot of camouflage. But really all are agreed on it. The speeches delivered during the West Peterborough election show the members of the Opposition to be in favour of reasonable protection. Even the leader of the Agrarian party is reported in one of his speeches to have pronounced in favour of reasonable and adequate protection. Although other issues have been raised at successive general elections the real big issue presented on every occasion has been the tariff question.

When the Liberals were elected in 1886 they reduced the tariff by .74 per cent. I find that when protection was taken off barbed wire and binder twine our Canadian manufacturers of those commodities went to the wall; and the only reason that cream separators, which were also made free, continued to be manufactured in this country was because they were being manufactured by Canadian branches of American institutions. If we had free trade to-morrow on all commodities, and two thirds of our industries went to the wall, Canada would soon regret having adopted the policy that has been put forward by the Opposition. However, I do not think the people have any fear of the Opposition ever putting their expressed policy into practice, because it is merely a platform to get in on but not to live by.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said yesterday that the prices of agricultural products were fixed in the markets of the world. Of course, and that is why Reciprocity failed, because the people appreciated the fact that Liverpool set the price of wheat irrespective of our fiscal relations with the United States. Therefore the chief plank of the hon. member for Marquette falls down, for it would be of no benefit to the Western farmer in disposing of his produce.

The hon. member also mentioned that both provincial and Federal economy was a pressing necessity if we were to improve our financial condition. Well, probably we all remember the talk that the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Allan) would give in the corridors along this line. I wonder whether the hon. member for Marquette has recommended administrative economy to the Government of Ontario. Although the chief platform of the members of that Government when appealing to the province for support was Greater Economy, the increase in the debt of Ontario since they came into power has been alarming. For example, although $6,000,000 was spent on their roads last year, I am told my hon. members from Ontario that there is practically nothing to show for that enormous expenditure. But that Government seems to be going ahead with the same lavish expenditure, probably ac-

celerated over last year's, and I think my hon. friend from Marquette would be well advised to visit Toronto now the Legislature is in session and advocate greater economy to his friends there.

He also stated that we should do more trade with the United States. But I do not see where we would benefit by that increase. At the present time we are buying very largely from the States; for example, for the ten months ended January 31, 1921, we imported goods to the value of $743,707,196, or 69 per cent of our imports and on that huge business I am told we were fined on the average 15 per cent, representing the difference in exchange. One of the prominent officials of the provincial government in Manitoba said to me after hearing the Premier speak in Winnipeg a year ago that if we had free trade the Canadian dollar would have fallen to fifty cents in a week. The more trade we do with the States the more is our dollar held at a discount, so the less trade we do with them the better. I would advocate doing less with them. I think an embargo on all manufactured articles from the States until exchange rights itself would be a very profitable thing, for then we could not be fined as we are when we do business with them, although they admit that we are the best customers they have. A greater buying of home products would make for a better condition in the Dominion. If a farmer sells $1,000 worth of products off his farm, and in return buys $1,000 worth of material, he is not getting his debt paid off. The sooner we appreciate the fact that we must buy less abroad the sooner we would be in a position to pay off our debts.

I have the figures of our imports for the ten months ended January 31, 1921. We imported from the United States $743,707,196, or 69 per cent of our total imports; in the year 1919-20 we imported 75 per cent from the United States, so we are working along the right line, having already dropped down 6 per cent. From the United Kingdom we imported $185,817,499, or 17 per cent; in the year 1919-20 we imported 11 per cent, which is an improvement on our Empire trade. From other British possessions we imported $43,029,240, or four per cent; it was four per cent the year before. From other foreign countries we imported $103,034,785, or nine per cent; it was eight per cent the year before, so there is not any improvement there. The total imports amounted to $1,075,587,720. Our exports for the ten months ended January 31, 1921, were as follows: To the United States, $491,075,856, or 45 per cent, against 39 per cent the year before, which indicates an expansion of trade along the right line; to the United Kingdom, $281,275,105, or 26 per cent—the year before the figures was 38 per cent, and the reduction is largely attributable to British exchange, which militated against our export trade with her; to other British possessions, $80,334,417, or seven per cent, as against five per cent the year before; to other foreign countries $221,959,676, or 22 per cent, against 16 per cent the year before. Our total exports amounted to $1,074,645,054, or almost balancing our imports. I do not see how the hon. member for Marquette can urge further trade with the United States in view of the exchange rate and the resultant disadvantage against us, especially when he admitted that the prices of farm products are fixed in the markets of the world and not in the States.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) stated that he would appreciate a flat declaration of policy from the Government. Why did he not make one himself? Last year when the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition were touring Western Canada I remember reading an illustrated article in Maclean's magazine by J. K. Munro, and one of the illustrations showed the leader of the Farmers sitting at home calmly smoking a big cigar with a wide brimmed straw hat on his head; and that is where he sat most of the summer, instead of coming out and giving us a flat declaration of policy. I think he has changed his policy two or three times since he became the leader of the Agrarian party, and still he is not prepared to give to the people that clear expression of policy which he demanded from the Government, I do not see how he could read the previous speeches from this side of the House without gathering from them a flat declaration by the Government in favour of reasonable and adequate protection—the same as he is willing to offer himself, and the same as the Opposition at Peterborough were willing to offer. The trouble is there is only one platform and everybody is struggling to get on it.

I join with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in pressing for an investigation into the grain dealing of the West. The report of Price, Waterhouse & Co., and the other reports we have got since on the elevators of there being something over 1,000,000 bushels of overages calls for investigation. It is admitted that the United Grain Growers and the various grain companies in the Farmers' organiz-

ation handled about 25 per cent of the grain of the West, and therefore they must have shared to a great extent in the overages which came from the pockets of the farmers. I know they are allowed a certain percentage of overages, but those percentages could not have amounted to anything like the amounts that were found in the elevators. Whether these are the total overages or not, God only knows; they might have shipped out a great deal of it beforehand. When the leader of the Agrarian party organized the grain growers, it was for the ostensible purpose of giving the farmers the full benefit of the sale of their produce—to give them a better price than they had ever received before and to make sure that there would be no thefts from them in the matter of shortages of wheat at the elevator. It was recognized that in the country elevator in the old days the man who could steal the most was the most valuable employee. I would like to know, and I think the country would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the grain business in the West is being run as accurately and as honestly and as properly as it should be. I want to press most strongly for an investigation. If the leader of the Agrarian party and his various lieutenants have nothing to hide, they will welcome an investigation and support the Government until that investigation is held. If, on the other hand, they have any fears in the matter, of course it will be their policy to turn the Government out with the utmost rapidity—that is, if they are able. I doubt very much their ability to do that.

The people are looking for performances, not for promises only. This Government has handed out performances along the lines I have indicated; they have not hesitated to do what they considered best for the country. I think it was Lord Randolph Churchill who, speaking to Viscount Morley, said: "You and Balfour believe in the solution of political questions." This Government believes in the solution of political questions; the Opposition believes in beclouding them—in pretending that the country needs an election, although there is no cry for an election at all. That cry is dying down, and everybody who has kept his ear to the ground, who has kept in close touch with his constituents, must know that—every member of the Opposition must know it.

The leader of the Opposition said that he heard everywhere in the West a call for a general election. I can speak for Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you where he heard the call for a general election in Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman issued a broadcast invitation through the press to all those opposed to the Government to meet him in Winnipeg, and then held a drawing-room in the Fort Garry Hotel. I suppose those whom he invited—that is, all those opposed to the Government—would include the O.B.U., all the agitators who might be found in the land, and a few disgruntled Liberals. One can imagine his lining them up against the wall, as a schoolmaster would his pupils, and saying to them: "Now, boys, what does the country need most? Say, 'A general election' ", and with one accord they cry out, "A general election". The leader of the Opposition did not hear from Premier Norris or his cabinet a cry for a general election. He did not hear from Mr. Edward Parnell, mayor of the city of Winnipeg, a cry for a general election. He did not hear from Frank Fowler, Isaac Pitblado or Isaac Campbell a cry for an election. All these were stalwarts of the Liberal party in Manitoba—from not one of them did he hear a cry for a general election. The only persons from whom he heard it were those opposed to the Government, which he picked up from every direction and invited to his drawing-room.

The leader of the Opposition has for nearly two years been obsessed with this idea of holding a general election and his becoming Prime Minister of this country, and that idea has become so thoroughly soaked into his cranium and into his system generally that he reminds me of some of the things which I have read in the Confessions of an Opium Eater. The Opium Eater says: "How came any reasonable being to subject himself to such a yoke of misery voluntarily, to incur a captivity so servile, and knowingly to fetter himself with a sevenfold chain?" The hon. leader of the Opposition, obsessed with the idea of obtaining power, feels that he should fetter himself with the sevenfold chain and that he should call for a general election. The Opium Eater boasts himself to be a philosopher. The leader of the Opposition puts me in mind of the old chap in the Taming of the Shrew who, when he found himself in bed, surrounded by luxury, and was assured that he was a lord, said: "And so I am a lord indeed." It is the same with the leader of the opposition; he thinks that he is a lord indeed, or is going to be as soon as he can get a general election. Last year many of his followers told me they did not want a general elec-

tion, and I do not think any of them want it this year. The Opium Eater also speaks about "creating an artificial state of pleasurable excitement." I suppose it is pleasant to the hon. leader of the Opposition to exist in a great state of excitement in connection with the idea with which he is obsessed, and to make big speeches in the House and throughout the country calling for an election. The Opium Eater also says "I do talk nonsense, not upon principle, but solely and simply because I am drunk with opium." The leader of the Opposition must surely be intoxicated with the idea of power and with the vision of himself on the pedestal as the leader of the country, or he would not talk the nonsense of a general election in the face of the general unrest in the country and the other conditions which at present exist. The Opium Eater also speaks in his dreams of foundations that were never to support a superstructure. That describes accurately the platform of the Liberal Party of 1919. He speaks also of getting into "An exalted state of irritability." Having regard to the last page or two of the hon. gentleman's speech as reported in Hansard, he must surely on that occasion have been in an exalted state of irritability. The Opium Eater also makes reference to his efforts to cut down the opium, and says that when the effect passed away he had terrible pains in his stomach. After the next general election the leader of the Opposition will find that many of his ideas have evaporated, and he will have these pains, too.

It has been said that the crucial defect in a politician is lack of fibre. Neither the leader of the Agrarian party nor the leader of the Opposition has had sufficient fibre to come out with a motion supporting his platform and laying down his policy. We on this side, during this session or at any time, would welcome any such motion on the part of the hon. gentlemen. If they have the fibre of politicians or statesmen, let them come forward and show the country what they stand for. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, go from one constituency to another with a new story for each place; as the member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) has said, they were a veritable political Santa Claus—handing out something new in every constituency they came to. Mr. Gladstone called faint-heartedness the master vice. I think that faint-heartedness is a characteristic of both of these leaders, for neither has come forward with a motion laying down the platform of his party.

Mr. McMASTER: We will have to get Dutch courage.

Mr. BLAKE: Hon. gentlemen can get that in Quebec over the week-end. By Monday we may expect them to have it.

Canada stands to-day on the verge of the greatest era of prosperity that she has yet witnessed, but she can only progress by showing to the world a united front. We cannot go forward if we stir up class hatred and class prejudices. But I am satisfied that the people are willing to forget these things and to settle down to sound and stable government which make for the building up of the Canada that should be. We shall have that, not by our dealing with or trusting to vague and indefinite theories and promises, but by a united, happy and prosperous Canada pursuing, with slight modifications, the same path which, during the last forty years, has built up out of the forest a virile and energetic young nation.

Hon. A. K MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, not desiring to cast a silent vote on the question now before the House, I wish to engage the attention of hon. gentlemen for, I trust, but a very short time. I rise particularly for the purpose of discussing briefly the question of the tenure of this Parliament, a subject which has already been very ably and comprehensively discussed by preceding speakers. I realize fully that I must traverse a road that is now well worn, but that is unavoidable.

I trust the House will pardon a slight digression from the discourse which I have outlined for myself. Since the close of the last session of Parliament the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Mr. Meighen) became Prime Minister of this country, and it is only natural that I should seize the first opportunity of extending to him my sincere and hearty congratulations. In 1868, when Disraeli succeeded for the first time to the office of Prime Minister in England, upon being congratulated, he said: "Yes, I have reached the top of the greasy pole." His most recent biographers have stated that no one more than he realized the difficulties of maintaining himself in that precarious elevation. It is in the loftiest peaks that we find the clouds and the snows. My right hon. friend arrives at his exalted position at a time when the political atmosphere gives a very low visibility, and I am sure that none more than he realizes the difficulties attaching to his position. Nevertheless,

I suppose many of his friends and admirers —and I concede he has many—will hope he has a reasonably secure hold of his high position, and on the other hand I suppose it is quite true that there are in this country many others who trust and hope his downfall is imminent and sudden. 'Twas ever thus and ever shall be, I suppose, in the politics of this and every other country.

As is well known to hon. gentlemen in this House, in 1917 I became a member of the Ministry of that day which was known as the Union Government. I do not in the slightest degree regret the action which I then took, and I only trust that, in the judgment of those who were associated with me, I honourably lived up to the obligations which the acceptance of that position implied. I cannot forget that, during two years or more, at an important time in the history of this country, I was associated very intimately with the Prime Minister as a colleague in the public service, and I feel I would, perhaps, be failing to perform a simple duty if I did not say, as an old colleague of the Prime Minister, that, in my observation and experience, he always carried to the discharge of his public duties, industry, capacity, talent, and, I believe, a sincere desire to render service to the State.

The amendment to the address is in the nature of a motion of want of confidence. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) may have had many reasons for moving this amendment other than those which were contained in his remarks at the opening of the session. I have read, with some little care, his speech in support of his amendment, and I perceive in it but one basic reason upon which 5 p.m. he asks for the support of hon. gentlemen, and that is that, under the Parliamentary system obtaining in this country and under the peculiar circumstances under which the election in 1917 took place, a dissolution of Parliament should take place at an early and appropriate time in the future. Whether I apprehend correctly or not his reason for moving the amendment, that, at least, is my position, and upon that ground I desire to support the amendment. I should have preferred, possibly, that the amendment had expressed definitely, but in general terms, the reasons which the leader of the Opposition gave in his remarks supporting his amendment. I suppose that is not, after all, very important.

I am not particularly interested in demonstrating one way or the other whether the Government at the present moment holds the confidence of Parliament or of the Canadian electorate. If it could be demonstrated to me with some reasonable degree of conclusiveness that the Government did possess the confidence of the electorate, I still would adhere to the position which I have just stated, namely, that a dissolution of Parliament in the early future is desirable. I am not interested either in deciding whether the occupancy of office by the Government at the present moment is properly or accurately described as being a usurpation of office. I have heard it described as being analogous to the position of an overholding tenant, but I am not very much interested in deciding whether that aptly describes the situation. The precise view I wish to give utterance to is that there was an express or implied understanding with the electorate that the present Government was to be a war Government; that the present Parliament was a war Parliament, and that its life was to be measured by the period of the war, supplemented by such further period as reasonable men should accord it, or by such further period after the conclusion of the war, as the exigencies of time and circumstance demanded. Personally I feel obligated to that position; because at the time of the election of 1917, I committed myself in that direction. I, therefore, feel I must at this stage implement the position which I then took upon this important question. I do not care what other members of Government may have said at the same time or what it has been alleged they have said. I speak merely for myself in this matter, and I rest my position absolutely upon what I said myself, and upon the obligations to which I committed myself. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, under the system of Parliamentary and responsible Government obtaining in this country, and under the practice as we know it and have known it for many years, and in view of the unusual circumstances attending the last Federal election, it is eminently proper and desirable, in the interests of the country, that a dissolution of this Parliament should take place at an early date and at an appropriate time. At the last session of Parliament the leader of the Opposition proposed an amendment intended to have the same result as the amendment now before the House for consideration. At least, it involved the principle of the dissolution of Parliament. On that occasion I voted against the amendment. I did so with deliberation. I believe I had good

cause to support the position that I then took. I feel I am quite competent to give, anywhere, and at any time, ample reasons justifying my vote on that occasion. Involved in that, however, would be matters more or less personal, which at this time would not interest the House in the slightest degree. Therefore, I do not intend offering to the House any defence for the position which I took last year. I think I was perfectly justified in voting as I did, and what others may think of it is of little interest to me.

Mr. Speaker, I admit quite frankly that it is quite a difficult task to induce members of any parliament to consent to a dissolution before the end of the constitutional term. Discussing a similar question on one occasion, Mr. Cobden used the following words:

> I have never been able to discover what was the proper moment according to members of Parliament for a dissolution. I have heard them say they were ready to vote for everything else, but I have never heard them say they were ready to vote for that.

I realize the force of that statement, and I suppose to a greater or less degree the difficulty exists to-day, and confronts any one who attempts to argue for the dissolution of a parliament before the end of its constitutional term. In discussing this matter and supporting this amendment, I must revert to past political events, as my reasons for supporting the amendment had their source in political events of three or four years ago. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in the year 1917 the Military Service Act was passed, and that was the primary cause of the organization later on, of a coalition ministry. Without that legislation, I fancy, there would have been no unusual movement in this country away from the ordinary political and party alignments. That coalition ministry was composed of members of both political parties. Many members of Parliament and many citizens of this country were of the opinion that after the adoption of the compulsory Military Service Act it was quite natural and proper there should be a coalition ministry, and that the carrying out of legislation of that character should be in the hands of a ministry that was not composed solely of members of one political party. There is a great deal to say in support of that view. The very fact, however, that in consequence of the passage of the Military Service Act there did come into existence a coalition ministry gave the impression to a large body of the people of this country that its life should be circumscribed by the period of the war, and for perhaps a reasonable time thereafter. That impression was very prevalent at that time, and, to a very large degree, it has since continued. I do believe that in the minds of a great many of the most intelligent and respected electors of this country there rests the belief that upon this ground, if upon no other, an early dissolution of Parliament might well be contemplated by the Government.

Another section of the Canadian electorate believed then, and still believe, that in an exhausting and protracted war the administrative affairs of this or any other country should be committed to a coalition ministry. There is much to say in favour of that view. In fact, I believe it was the dominant view in this country. In the abstract, I believe, it was the universal view of the electors of Canada, and the only criticism that was made of that suggestion was that it came too late and should have been adopted at the beginning of the war, so that from the beginning to the end of that awful struggle we should not have had any evidence of extreme partisanship in the administration of our public affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I do say that when the election of 1917 came, statements were made by newspapers, by candidates, by public men, and by private citizens, to the effect that the election was in the nature of a war election, and that the Parliament to be elected was to have certain limitations, and I submit it as my judgment, that it was not unnatural that the people of this country generally accepted that impression so given by the persons and individuals I have mentioned. It is not therefore unreasonable or unexpected, I say, to find in Canada to-day a large body of public opinion supporting a dissolution of Parliament in the early future. I do not think it is very important whether the Prime Minister made an express declaration on that point or not. I do not think it is very important what ministers of the Crown said or did not say. The important question is, what was the general impression left on the public mind from all sources, what was the general belief and understanding of the public in respect to this matter and if there was any real and substantial foundation for this belief or understanding. What was the understanding of the electorate? I submit that that is the important question, and if we can reasonably ascertain what that under-

standing was, I say it should be respected, and our course of action should present no very practical difficulties. It is, of course, difficult to present to Parliament concrete evidence upon this one way or the other. I merely wish to express what my own view of the matter is, namely—and I feel strongly and clearly in that view—that it was the belief of the Canadian electorate in 1917 that the Government elected at that time should have limitations and that the life of this present Parliament should also have distinct limitations altogether determinable by the period of the war. I have already stated that the fact that the Military Service Act was introduced in 1917 alone affords some justification for my reaching that conclusion. As a matter of fact, it was the only issue in that election. The members of the Administration of that day, I remember well, said repeatedly in Parliament that it would be the only issue. Indeed, there was no other issue; it was so entirely personal in its effect and application that in its very nature it precluded any other issue appearing in that election. And no other issue did come before the electorate on that occasion. The mere fact, I submit, of an election being confined to one issue, which issue could only exist so long as the war lasted, is a tremendous argument in favour of the placing of limitations upon the life of this particular Parliament. I cannot see how one can escape that conclusion, and I repeat again that I believe that this was the conviction of the Canadian people at that time, a conviction that still exists and that should, I think, be respected. There is another circumstance which, I think, justifies the position I now take and which affords further evidence in support of the statement I made some time ago that it was the belief of our Canadian people that the life of the Parliament elected in 1917 should have defined limitations. I refer to the War-time Elections Act. In 1917 I opposed that legislation, and a portion of my remarks upon the same have since been frequently quoted in Parliament, particularly while I was a member of the Ministry. I do not know whether these quotations from my remarks were made for the purpose of confirming my wisdom in respect of this Bill, or whether they were made with a view to demonstrating some inconsistency on my part. I might say, although it is altogether irrelevant at the moment, that I have not changed my mind in the slightest degree in respect of the War-time Elections Act. I am utterly incapable of apostacy upon that point. I think to-day exactly as I thought then. While I considered that this legislation was mischievous and possibly dangerous, yet late in 1917 when I became a member of the Ministry, I believed that I was justified in the circumstances in subordinating my views upon this matter to a more important principle. I do not regret the views which I expressed in relation to the War-time Elections Act. I do not refer to it now for the purpose of discussing the merits of the Bill; no good purpose whatever would be served by that. I refer to it only to demonstrate the position which I seek to establish, namely, that it was a circumstance creating and determining in the minds of the people of this country the conviction that the Parliament to be elected partially under this Franchise Act was to have limitations. Now, there are certain sections of this Act which I wish to recall to the minds of hon. gentlemen. First it will be remembered that certain citizens of Canada—naturalized citizens—were disfranchised. I am merely, I say again, referring to the effect of certain provisions of the Act, and not by any means for the purpose of raising any discussion as to their merits. That was one of the provisions of the Bill. Another provision was that of temporary and arbitrarily enfranchising another section of the community. It is also to be remembered that under that Act certain classes of women were enfranchised; and I assume that every hon. gentleman who listens to me is perfectly aware of the class of women who were so enfranchised. Now, I say, these provisions of the War Time Elections Act to which I have referred by themselves alone afford a powerful and almost unanswerable argument for the view that the Parliament which enacted this legislation, contemplated limitations to the life of the next Parliament, and that its term of tenure was not to be left to the constitution nor to the determined will of the Executive of the country. For what purpose was the War Time Elections Act enacted. There need be no doubt about this. If one refers to Hansard it will there be found stated very clearly and explicitly, I think by the present Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen), and by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that the purpose of the additional enfranchisement afforded by that Act was to secure the adoption and enforcement of the Military Service Act. The war has ended; the Military Service Act has been repealed and has been taken

root and branch from the substantive law of this country. The War Time Elections Act has been repealed utterly, and the special enfranchisements granted under that Act have been removed. I think the disfranchising provisions of that legislation have also been repealed. Almost every condition which one could imagine as dominant in that election has been removed; every possible issue that could have prevailed in that election contest has ceased to exist. I do submit, therefore, that it is my sincere judgment that, all these things having transpired, it is but a fair and just conclusion to reach that this Parliament was intended to have and should have limitations. That, I believe, was the intention of the preceding Parliament, and I believe it to be the judgment of the people of this country. Only a great emergency could justify such legislation as the War-time Election Act and the provisions contained in that measure. I remember that the members of the Government of that day in charge of the Bill declared openly and frankly that only a war condition could justify the legislation and they openly and frankly, as I have already said, declared the purpose of it. That purpose having been accomplished; the Military Service Act having accomplished what it was intended to accomplish, or partially; the war itself having ended, there is but one conclusion, for me at least, to reach—namely that the life of Parliament should have limitations. I wish to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I do not quite accept the theory that the termination of the life of this Parliament is a matter solely resting with the Government. In my opinion it rests just as much with every member of Parliament; I think every member must settle between himself and his electors the question whether or not, under the circumstances to which I have referred, he is entitled to vote either for the early ending of this Parliament or for its further continuance.

An argument I believe has been advanced, in this House, although I have not heard any of the speeches myself—certainly it has been raised in the press and outside of Parliament—that a re-distribution of seats should precede a general election. I quite understand how a contention of the kind might arise, particularly in certain sections of the country. My own view about it is that if there are good grounds for the early dissolution of Parliament, then the re-distribution of the seats of Parliament is not an important or relevant matter. I think the contention, or suggestion, lacks every element of conclusiveness, and in the circumstances I cannot conceive it a sound reason for delaying dissolution.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Would the hon. gentleman tell Frank Oliver in Edmonton to sing that song, so that we will not be held responsible for tricking the public if we have an election this fall?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend may have an early opportunity of conveying that message himself and probably it would be accepted with as much grace from him as from myself. The Constitution, Mr. Speaker, makes provision for the redistribution of seats after the coming census, and we have always abided by the Constitution in this respect. Therefore I say, that when the Constitution provides for the condition we might well leave the Constitution to operate as it was intended to operate, and as it has operated in the past. The Constitution, providing for the redistribution of seats, there cannot possibly be any injustice done to any province or any section of this country. If as a general principle an election should take place before the end of the Constitutional term of this Parliament there can be no sound reason for postponing that until after a redistribution, because, as I say, the Constitution of the country makes ample provision for the event. Further, it was never intended by the Constitution that an election should absolutely take place immediately following redistribution. As a matter of fact, and as a matter of principle as well, the makers of our Constitution abstained deliberately from making any such provision. It is not a part of our political system to have fixed periods for elections; the very opposite is the case. True, the Constitution fixes a maximum period for the existence of any Parliament, but that is an altogether different thing from having fixed election periods. There is a great deal to be said in favour of having a fixed election period such as they have in the United States. It may be, that political parties in this country shall become so rigid, inflexible and autocratic that the only way to safeguard the due and proper protection of public interests, and to ensure some independence on the part of members of Parliament will be to have fixed periods of election. That, however, is beside the matter I am discussing for the reason that under the British system fixed election periods have been deliberately abstained from, and have not been incorporated into

our Constitution. I remember further the fact that in 1891, in 1900, and in 1911 elections immediately preceded redistribution. There was no protest on the part of the Canadian electorate against such dissolution; no serious protest was heard subsequent to the election so far as I can recall; and therefore I say that it seems rather unusual to introduce the argument that redistribution should precede dissolution at the present time, particularly when there are outstanding so many strong and powerful reasons, such as I have tried to indicate, for the dissolution of Parliament within a reasonably short time. If redistribution of the parliamentary seats was within sight, I admit the contention would have force, but it is quite a distance forward.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if in now seeking to postpone an election until the redistribution we were seeking to establish and to place in the Constitution a principle that would remain there to guide us in the future and that should be enduring, perhaps there might be some force in the contention that redistribution should precede a dissolution of this Parliament. But the suggestion does not invoke any such principle. This Parliament, or the Government, might decide that redistribution should precede an election, but it would not follow that in 1931, or in 1941, or in any of the decades following thereafter, the same principle would prevail. Therefore I submit, Mr. Speaker, that little could be gained by adopting this contention as a principle at this time, unless there was some certainty that the practice would be followed by succeeding governments after following census taking and redistribution. Consequently, there being no enduring principle in the suggestion, I question the soundness of the idea that dissolution should be postponed in order to follow the next redistribution measure.

Again, we might ask: Are there any practical advantages or disadvantages in accelerating or retarding the election so that it may precede or follow redistribution? I think not. It is suggested that the Western provinces would in the event of redistribution obtain a greater representation than they now have. If that is correct, it follows that some of the other provinces will lose a certain amount of representation, for one section of the country cannot gain without the other losing. If it is sound for Western representatives to say that dissolution is to be determinable by the fact that they are to obtain greater representation under the next redistribution and that this election should be postponed on that ground, it would be equally sound for the losing provinces to say that dissolution should precede the application of the next Redistribution Bill. If one is right the other would be right; but I say they are both wrong.

Mr. EDWARDS: Carry that out and you would not have any redistribution at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No. I say that redistribution will come at the proper time and according to the period fixed by the constitution, and that shall afford ample protection for Parliament and for the people. Whether there should come dissolution earlier than redistribution is determinable on other grounds and principles.

Now the statement that the next redistribution should absolutely precede a dissolution disregards other factors, and is suggestive of territorial predominance or strength which is hardly desirable. It is suggestive of the theory that only through might is right obtainable. I make bold to say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the expressed views of some hon. gentlemen from the Western provinces, that this view does not convey the real opinion of the Western country. It would be strange if at this particular period there should be manifested so strong and inflexible a view in the Western provinces for redistribution that they would forego the early acceptance of a principle which seems to be strongly asserted there by all classes, namely, that there should be an early election. It would seem strange that they would forego the early application of that principle for an advantage in electoral representation which after all would not amount to so much, and which in any event will soon come.

I think it also might be said in very truth, that no western interests, nor the interests of any other section of Canada, will suffer by reason of the fact that an election might possibly take place before dissolution. I am sure no province really suffers from under-representation. I do not think any hon. member would have the hardihood to say that the representatives from the Western provinces are so unduly modest that they refrain from giving expression to western thought, western aspirations, and western wants. I think they are as aggressive and as insistent as representatives from the other provinces in placing before Parliament what they

conceive to be the interests of their particular section of Canada.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to emphasise once more that if upon any possible principle there should be a dissolution of Parliament considerably ahead of the end of the constitutional period, then the contention that we should await a redistribution after the census which is about to take place, is one which has no firm or sure foundation and should not be invoked as an answer to the demand for an early dissolution.

I shall not detain the House any longer upon the amendment or upon the motion. I think I have said substantially what I intended to say when I arose to my feet. I have necessarily been covering ground which has been stated and restated several times during the course of the debate. My only purpose in engaging the attention of hon. gentlemen for a little time this afternoon was to enable me to place before them the reasons which move me to support the amendment, and having done this, my remarks are concluded.

Mr. FRANK S. SCOTT (South Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with others who have preceded me in this debate in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne for the excellent speeches which they delivered. So much has been already bestowed upon them in the way of eulogy that I feel it is unnecessary for me to go further in this direction.

I wish also to join with the other speakers in extending to the Prime Minister my congratulations upon his being called to the high office which he now occupies. I feel that the people of Canada already know that he has splendid qualifications for the position, and I believe that in the fulfilment of his duties he will live up to the best traditions of Canadian statesmanship.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two with regard to the speech delivered yesterday afternoon by the hon. member for Marquete (Mr. Crerar). In his opening remarks he stated that he saw no constructive ideas in the speeches of the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition. If I were to endeavour to sum up the speech which he himself delivered, it seems to me that I could with almost equal force say that after all it contains very little that might be described as constructive. It is true that he alluded during the course of his remarks to quite a number of questions that are attracting attention throughout the country at this time, but I fail to see where he introduced anything into the discussion of these questions that was at all constructive. If I were to pass an opinion upon his speech in a general way I should say that it was most pessimistic in its tone and that it was given over almost entirely to fault-finding.

The hon. gentleman made some reference to the railway situation, but he did not offer anything in the way of constructive suggestion or express any particular view as to how the present situation should be met. It is true that he did say that at no very distant date we should have a revaluation of our railways. But I think that in one of the first speeches delivered in this House by the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) he said that that was one of the things that might in the future require the attention of the House. But a revaluation of our railways at the present time would not alter the present situation one iota. Our national railways are not earning sufficient to pay operating costs, and it makes no difference whether the capital cost of our railway system is $200,000,000 or whether it is a one dollar bill. There is not a great deal, therefore, in a contention of that kind.

The hon. gentleman also tried to bring it home to the House that there had been a lack of economy in the administration of the public affairs. With that suggestion I do not at all agree. I am satisfied that the Government has in every way tried to practise economy in the administration of the different departments. But I should like to offer one suggestion to my hon. friend, the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) made an allusion to it. The member for Marquette was one of those who were instrumental in bringing into power a Farmers' Government in Ontario. I join with the member for North Winnipeg in suggesting that the member for Marquette get in touch with the Premier and the leaders of the Ontario Government and that he have a heart-to-heart talk with them regarding the financial situation. I know that political opponents very often attempt to take advantage of a situation like this, but I do not speak of the matter from the political standpoint. I want to assure the hon. member that financial men are to-day very deeply concerned about the manner in which the Farmers' Government in Ontario have been administering the financial affairs of that province. This problem is one of the most serious ones

that at present confront the people of Ontario.

The hon. member also said that what we required in Canada at the present time on the part of the Administration was a policy of vigour, determination, efficiency and courage. I am sure that we all join in that sentiment, but these words, coming from the lips of the member for Marquette, mean more than would seem on the surface. They mean, in the first place, that the present Government are lacking in these very desirable attributes and that if the leader of the Agrarian party were called upon to administer the public affairs he would be able to supply that deficiency. Now, I have no desire to detract from the ability of the member for Marquette. He at one time held the portfolio of Agriculture in the Government, and I have no reason to suppose that he was anything else than a very capable administrator. But I am not prepared to say that among the hon. gentlemen who were with him at that time in the Government he was such an outstanding figure or was a man of such superior ability that he can now offer to this country an administration such as it requires. I admit his capability, but great as it may be, I do not think there was anything in the administration of his department while he was a member of the Government that would justify the people in thinking that he is the man who should in the future take charge of the administration of the country's affairs.

As I listened to the hon. member's remarks it occurred to me that the situation which confronts us at present is similar to that which existed in Ontario just prior to the last election. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there was a great deal of class feeling and class consciousness; that we heard a great deal about the grievances of the farmers and were told that when the farmers came into power they would remedy those grievances. Now, a Farmer Government was returned in Ontario, and for a considerable length of time has been carrying on the affairs of that province. They have had one session of the legislature and they are now having a second. But notwithstanding the fact that they represented themselves as a class suffering under great disabilities and having many grievances awaiting only the opportunity for their adjustment, up to the present not a single Act has been passed in the legislature, much less any measure introduced, having for its object the amelioration or lessening of any grievances under which the farmers were alleged to have been suffering. For myself, I have no sympathy with the idea that everything is bad in the two old political parties. But I am confident that if the hon. member for Marquette and the Agrarian party were by any chance called upon to carry on the affairs of this country they would not, as was the case with our friends in Ontario, when faced with the responsibilities of office, be able to carry things on very differently.

During the course of this debate we have heard a great deal about the Government's mandate to carry on the affairs of the country. This afternoon we heard from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who is a lawyer and who arrived at one conclusion. We heard this same question discussed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), who was, like the hon. member for Halifax, at one time a member of this Administration, and we find these two gentlemen, both no doubt well posted and thoroughly conversant with public affairs, arriving at two entirely different conclusions. The hon. member for Marquette says that the Government has a mandate, while the hon. member for Halifax says that the Government has no mandate. I am not a lawyer; but I have my idea regarding this question, and if I were to sum it up briefly, it would be this. I was a candidate for Parliament in 1917, and there was absolutely no conditions or reservations in that candidature. I was elected for a Parliament, and I consider it my duty to continue in my seat in this House until the Government of the day sees fit to dissolve this Parliament. Having heard the opinions of legal men on both sides of the House, I may say that this debate might be continued throughout the entire session, but I am convinced as regards my position and that is all I need satisfy myself about at this time.

For some time past we have been hearing about the necessity for a general election. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) says that there has been and is a widespread demand for an election. Speaking once again only for myself, I must disagree with him; my experience has been that the people with whom I have come into contact in my part of Ontario, and more particularly the business people of that province, are strongly opposed to a dissolution of Parliament at the present time, and for a very good reason. We all know that business conditions in this country during the past year have not been what we would like them to be. Business

has been bad, very much disorganized. Canada, like all other countries in the world, is now passing through that period of reconstruction that we all expected. Unemployment exists; in many places our industries are idle, and the feeling in Ontario is this, that it would be nothing short of a national crime for the Government of this country to precipitate a general election at this time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was giving certain reasons why I believed it was inadvisable for the Government to make an appeal to the country during the past year. There is one other point that I might perhaps make in that connection, and I make it more particularly for the benefit of the leader of the Opposition. I wish to tell him that in my own constituency Liberals, men engaged in business, and prominent in their various walks of life, who in days gone by gave their allegiance to the party which he to-day leads, have been the most outspoken in expressing a desire that there should be no appeal to the country at the present time.

I pass on now to deal with the amendment which was introduced by the leader of the Opposition. His amendment is to the effect that the Government does not possess the confidence of the House, or the confidence of the country. With regard to the first point, the question whether the Government possesses the confidence of the House will be finally decided when the vote is taken, in a few days, no doubt. That will provide a proper answer to that question. As to whether the Government enjoys the confidence of the people of this country that, after all, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. MacLean) stated this afternoon, is, and can be at best, only a matter of opinion, and in that connection I must say that there is a very great difference of opinion.

If I were looking for an opinion upon a question of that kind it does not seem to me that I would be likely to go to gentlemen situated as are the Opposition. I submit that you could go into any legislature in Canada, and perhaps into any parliament in the world, and not find it a difficult task to persuade those who were sitting in opposition, partisans, that the government to which they were opposed did not enjoy the confidence of the people of the country. But I do not take a great deal of stock in opinions on that question from such a source. While there may be a difference of opinion as to whether the Government of this country enjoys the confidence of the people, I think there is small room for doubt whether the leader of the Opposition and the party which he leads enjoy the confidence of the people. It seems to me that the most superficial observer of the present political situation must be impressed with the fact that, aside from the province of Quebec, the Opposition are not in very high favour at the present time.

We have heard a very great deal from the leader of the Opposition about the defections that have taken place from the Government side of the House, and in that no doubt he is in a measure correct. But I do not see how it can afford him much consolation, because, if one looks across the floor of the House and among the members who sit under his leadership, one cannot see that he has made any very substantial gains duing the last few years. While there have been defections for certain reasons, the men who have seen fit to cross the floor of the House have been loath, indeed, to place themselves under his leadership.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I have been much impressed by his speeches both in this House and outside. One would think to hear his speeches that recruits, not only in this House, but from one end of the country to the other were flocking to his banner. It is difficult to understand how he can think so. His attitude reminds me of the days when as a boy I used to spend my vacations on the farm. One of the most enjoyable things I remember doing in these days was to go out and gather the eggs. Sometimes, when we were looking for eggs, we would come across a clucking hen. We would take hold of her and toss her out into the barnyard. She would ruffle up her feathers, spread her wings, and make a great fuss. It is a most peculiar thing, but do you know, Mr. Speaker, that if there were a thousand small chickens in that yard, she would imagine that she owned every one of them. And so it is with the leader of the Opposition. He looks over this House and over the whole country and seems obsessed with the idea that all the political chickens that are passing to and fro are ready to join him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are getting fewer on the other side, at all events.

Mr. SCOTT: Before six o'clock I gave a few reasons why I did not believe it was desirable, or in the interests of this country, that there should have been a general election during the past year. So far as I personally am concerned, I think that is a matter which should properly be decided by the Government of this country, and again, so far as I am concerned, if the Government should decide to dissolve Parliament and make an immediate appeal to the country, I shall be perfectly satisfied, but I believe that dissolution should come about in a proper and constitutional way, and should not be dictated by the leader of the Opposition. I have no doubt that the constitutional course will be followed.

I feel, however, that before we have an appeal to the country there are a few things which should receive attention, and I should like to point out in that connection that there are certain things which should receive the attention of the leader of the Opposition before the electors are called upon to make a decision between the two political parties. One of the points I have in mind is this: I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition if he has entered into any alliance or understanding with the Agrarian party. I would like to go a little further and ask him this question: If not, does he propose to do so either before or after the election? I ask that because I believe it is going to have a most important bearing upon the result of this election, and it is only fair that the people of the country should understand perfectly not only where the Government stands but just where the Opposition is at this time.

The leader of the Opposition has said that the policy of the Agrarian party and that of his own party are practically identical. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the two parties opposite stand for the same principles there is no necessity for their separate and individual existence. If their principles are identical, why should we not have one Opposition party and let the people of Canada make their decision between that party and the party represented on this side? The answer which the leader of the Opposition will give to the questions I have submitted would, I claim, make a vast difference in the situation in the province of Quebec. I listened with a great deal of interest the other day to the speech delivered to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) because, while I confess that I do not have very much opportunity of coming in contact with the public men in the neighbouring province of Quebec, I have during the last two years been brought very closely into touch with a large number of business men in that province; and I want to say that in my conversations with those men from time to time I have found that they give candid expression to practically the same sentiments as those uttered the other day by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe.

Now, the hon. gentleman in his speech covered a great deal of ground, and if I were asked to summarize that speech in a few words I would say that the message he brought to this House was that he was not prepared, in the name of Liberalism, to be led into an alliance with the Agrarian party for the reason that he did not believe in their policy and in their principles. I want to emphasize once again that the sentiments that have been expressed to me on very many occasions, not by men who had any political purpose to serve but by unbiased men of prominence and weight in the province of Quebec, who were only interested in the welfare of this country, are in keeping with the whole trend of the speech delivered by my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe.

Gentlemen on the other side of the House following that hon. member endeavoured to reply to him, but I submit that while there have been interchanges of personalities there has been no serious attempt on the part of hon. members opposite to review the statements made by the member for St. Hyacinthe. I venture to say that, if an issue of that kind were faced fairly and squarely before the people and were decided on its merits, the leader of the Opposition would find after the next general election that he would not have the bulwark of which he boasts at the present time—a solid province of Quebec. I confess that I have my doubts at this time as to whether that issue is going to be fairly and squarely placed before, and decided upon its merits by, the people of the province of Quebec. We have only to listen to the speeches that are delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite to discover the effort that is being made and the well defined plan that is being followed in order to becloud the issue.

What is the situation? One gentleman after another has risen in his place and has represented to the people of his constituency—for their speeches are intended for distribution there, and it is there that they will have their effect—that the Prime Minister of this country (Hon. Mr. Meighen) is a man who is an enemy to the province of Quebec and has missed no op-

portunity of casting scorn and discredit upon them; and hon. members opposite try in that way to becloud the issue and cover up the true issue which should be placed before the people of Quebec in the next election.

Now, one of the things which I have learned since becoming a member of this House is that a public man must needs be very careful in any statements that he makes. There are acute minds on both sides of the House, and I have found that very often a word or a sentence uttered in some long-forgotten debate is at the appropriate time recalled by men of retentative memory in order to destroy an argument or confuse political opponents. The right hon. gentleman who to-day fills the position of Prime Minister of this country has been for a number of years in public life, and from the time he entered the House of Commons, I think in the year 1908, he has been a marked man. Political friends and political foes alike said, from the day he first entered Parliament, that he would travel far; and they have not proven false prophets, because the hon. gentleman to-day occupies the highest and most distinguished position in the gift of the Canadian people. Mr. Speaker, the point in that connection which I want to make is that when hon. gentlemen opposite make insinuations and try to represent the Prime Minister of this country as one who has slandered the French race and the province of Quebec, it is no wonder that we, his friends, challenge them to produce the evidence. Is there any hon. gentlemen who, if he believed that one single sentence could be found that would bear out this contention, would not produce it and quote it on the floor of the House? Now, Sir, that method of warfare, I am sorry to say, is not confined within the precincts of this House, nor is it confined to the province of Quebec. A great national newspaper in Ontario, the Toronto "Globe," made a similar reference to the Prime Minister some months ago. That newspaper was invited to produce the proof to substantiate its statements at that time, but up to the present it has failed to do so.

Now Mr. Speaker I pass from that subject. There is one other matter to which I would like to refer at this time. I would like to direct one more question at my good friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I have always held that hon. gentleman, and I assure him I do so still, in the very highest esteem. I always listen with a great deal of interest to his speeches, and never miss an opportunity of hearing him, because he is such a master of parliamentary eloquence. I remember well the speech which he delivered in the Budget debate of 1918, which speech suggests the question that I would now like in all kindness to put to him. The question is this: I would like to know how the member for Red Deer views the prospect—perhaps at the present time more than a prospect—of an alliance with the party led by the leader of the Opposition. I ask this because of statements made by the hon. member in the speech in question. I re-read the speech the other day and I will just quote a few sentences from it. I think that all the members of the House might well read that speech with interest, but at present I wish only to quote a few sentences for their consideration. At that time the hon. gentleman was speaking as a supporter of this Government and from this side of the House. Addressing himself to hon. gentlemen opposite he said:

> I conducted a missionary enterprise of persistency and consistency for years in the ranks of gentlemen opposite. When they were in power I sat in the colony and made attempts at their education,—the moment I mentioned the rights of the farmers or anything relating to low tariff I want it recorded as my distinct impression that I saw nothing but frowns upon their faces. And the reason was this—they came into power practically a professing free-trade party. They certainly did take the duty off cream separators. I worked that free cream separator on Western platforms until my arm was actually aching. They took the duty off binder twine. Sir, I threaded binder twine until there was not a fibre between my fingers. They introduced the British preference, and as long as I could I kept trying to defend my own constituency for sitting in such a Liberal party by praising the British preference, turning the free trade cream separator and fraying binder twine. That having been done, what is their subsequent record? After early attempts at tariff reduction, hon. gentlemen sat back, enjoying luxurious office, drawing their salaries with promptitude and basking in the smiles of those gentlemen whom I would never describe as bucaneers, basking in the smiles of these bucaneers and companies that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) denounced this afternoon in a voice which reared itself to the sky.

A little further on, Mr. Speaker, I find this sentence in the same speech:

> I do not think I need to say any more to explain to my hon. friends where they are so far as Western Canada is concerned. Western Canada did not quite believe in their sincerity because Western Canada knew their record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say. I believed, and I still believe, in the consistency, the earnestness, and the

sincerity of my good friend the member for Red Deer. I cannot think that he is altogether satisfied with the way things are drifting in public life in this country, and while I am prepared to believe that the hon. gentleman has played an important part in bringing the Agrarian party into the position which it occupies to-day, I do not think that his counsels are given very serious consideration by the men who are directing the destinies of that party.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, in rising at this late period of the debate it will be very hard indeed for me to avoid making reference to subjects which have already been dealt with. I shall not attempt to present any more bouquets to the mover and seconder of the Address but will simply say that I agree with all the good things that have been uttered with respect to them. I extend, however, my hearty congratulations to the Prime Minister, for more reasons than one, on the very rapid rise which he has made in the public life of Canada. The right hon. gentleman told me himself, not so very long ago, that he was born on a small farm in the province of Ontario.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is the place.

Mr. REID: True, that is the place where the boys that climb the ladder of fame are born. The right hon. gentleman said of this little farm where he was born, that the trees were so thick between the house and the concession road in the days of his youth that he could not see the teams as they passed up and down. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that on that farm the right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Government learned the lessons of stick-to-itiveness that have helped him to climb to his present high position.

The old province of Ontario has good reason, Mr. Speaker, to be proud to-day not only because our worthy Prime Minister was born within its precincts, not only because of the great success that he has achieved in public life and the character which he has maintained, which has been referred to by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, but it also has reason to be proud of the fact that another Prime Minister was born on one of its farms. I refer to the hon. Mr. Drury, the Premier of the province. Mr. Speaker, there is yet another farmer's boy. I refer to the hon. T. A. Crerar, leader of our party, who was born on a farm in the province of Ontario, and who can tell but that in a very near future he may be the leader of this House. The present Prime Minister has climed to his high position in a little less, I understand, than thirteen years. Someone found him in a little town in the province of Manitoba, because then Portage la Prairie was not a very large community. At that time the right hon. gentleman was a budding young lawyer in Western Canada; and I want to say to young members of the House that he has set the pace; he has set an example, for young men throughout the Dominion, and what he has done they also may do. But Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that if they would follow in his footsteps and climb the ladder of fame as speedily as he has done they will not sleep on a bed of roses, neither will they spend much time in slumber, but rather they will have to burn the midnight oil. I wish him long life, happiness and prosperity. But, Sir, I hope that he will forsake the big interests and come back to the common, plain people whence he sprung and apply the same energies which he now brings to bear in discharging the duties of his high office.

I notice that when the right hon. the Prime Minister was choosing a new name for his old party he took the word "National" from the platform of the National Progressive party, and I have often wondered why he did not also include the word "Progressive." Then he would have the National Progressives, the Liberals and the Tories all in one fold. How nice that would be! But on second thoughts—which are very often the best—I believe my worthy friend decided to say to his nearest followers: "No, gentlemen, it will not do; water and oil will not mix; leave them out."

I am going to endeavour to show to the House that this Government is allied with the big interests, because the first act of the right hon. the Prime Minister was to nail his protectionist flag to the masthead of his party ship, and that, to my mind, was a friendly signal to the big interests. His banner of protection is also their banner, and he says to them in effect: "Come with us. This is the ship of protection that will protect you and your industries. Come with us. We need you, and you need us. We need your millions of money for our campaign fund to fight the Liberals and the Progressives." And he also says to Labour: "Come with us in this ship. It is big enough for us all, and we will take you in and protect you." But he forgets to tell labour when he is flirting with them that for the protection which he offers he

will exact an equivalent by making them pay more for their boots and shoes and for their clothing, and for all the comforts of life which they now enjoy. I do not know —he may get the labour vote, but I hope not. I hope that labour will keep their eyes open and see the folly of going in my good friend's protectionist ship.

I am going to continue along that line of thought, Mr. Speaker, and try to show to this House that the big interests are behind this Government and allied with it. I shall endeavour to demonstrate that the intermediary of the big interests, Mr. Murray, of the city of Toronto, is conducting a well-organized boycott in an attempt to muzzle the press of this country, and so keep from the people all the facts both pro and con which should be honestly presented to them that they may give an intelligent vote on the public questions of the day. But will the people be able to pass an intelligent verdict if the press is to be dictated to by Mr. Murray? I think not. This attempt by Mr. Murray to control our press is being made on behalf of the manufacturers, who, as I have said before, are allied with this Government; but the attempt, in my opinion, will prove a boomerang to those who are conducting and supporting it.

The people of Canada will not stand for such dictation. They know that this boycott which Mr. Murray is carrying on with a well-organized and expensive staff, is simply along these lines; in effect, he says to the manufacturers by circular letters: "Send in to me your estimates of what you are going to spend for advertising, and I will name the newspapers which shall get your advertising." Then he says to the press: "Unless you will submit to me the control of your editorial pages, you cannot have any of these advertisements." That, in substance, is the system employed, and I defy contradiction of my statement.

I will pass over the subject of protection mentioned in the speech from the Throne and deal with vital matters—matters in my opinion equally as important as protection—which are not mentioned therein. We have had before us for a number of years a project especially dear to Western Canada—the Hudson's Bay railway.

Not one word is in the Address about this project—a project on which we have spent about $20,000,000. There all this material lies to-day, going to waste, and the Government, heedless of the pleadings of the people from the West, do not say one word in regard to what is to be done with the Hudson Bay railway. I shall not tarry on this question; the people of the West will speak for themselves in regard to it when they get the opportunity.

Another matter of very great importance, Mr. Speaker, is our Canadian National Railway system. In this case also not one word appears in the Address as to what is to be done in the direction of an attempt to reduce our railway deficit or even to see that it does not climb higher year after year. And while our railway deficit is piling up, it is a well known fact that, in Western Canada at any rate, the traffic which rightly belongs to the Canadian National Railway system is being hauled away from that railway and being handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why? Well, I will try to explain as briefly as possible.

Last fall in Western Canada we had only about a thirty per cent crop, but in spite of that, our threshing machines, especially in the northern districts of the three Prairie Provinces, had not been in operation more than two weeks until every country elevator was full of grain—and not a box-car in sight to haul the grain out. Now, this is what happened—and what I say here is simply the sentiment of the people in my constituency and in the other three Prairie Provinces, the northern part of which is served by the Canadian National system. The reason was simply the lack of sufficient box-cars to carry the grain out to the market.

Last fall the grain market was dropping very rapidly and the farmers were naturally anxious to get their grain out to market. But they could not get the cars and, therefore, could not sell their product at that time, so that they could not pay their indebtedness and, consequently, the business man could not pay his. When the farmers did get the box-cars to take the grain out, the price had dropped to such an extent that it was impossible for them to pay their debts and come through, and on that account the farmers in Western Canada to-day are in a state of semi-bankruptcy. How long, Mr. Speaker, is this state of things to continue?

I asked the Minister of Railways last year and the previous year about box-cars, and he said that he had ordered two thousand of them. I thought that was a fairly good order, but when I began to think it over quietly I realized that these two thousand box-cars would have to be strung out over 22,000 miles of railway—

a pretty thin sprinkling. I called at the office of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in Winnipeg and had a chat with one of the Canadian Pacific officials. I said to him: "Will you tell me how many box-cars you have ordered for the Canadian Pacific Railway in the last two years?" To my astonishment he told me they had ordered six thousand new box-cars—not replacements—to be used on 14,000 miles of railway; and my good friend the Minister of Railways orders two thousand box-cars to be spread out over 22,000 miles of railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: As a member of this House my hon. friend should know, from the explanations I have given each year, that the Government ordered 18,000 box-cars during the last three or four years, while the Canadian Pacific has not ordered any more than my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I am very much pleased to hear that. But where, oh where, Sir, are the 18,000 box-cars? They are not in the West.

Mr. J. D. REID: Well, they are on the road.

Mr. J. F. REID: Evidently the road is a very long one; they are taking a long time to get there. But if my hon. friend says that that many have been ordered, I take his word for it, and I hope he will speed them up and get them out there. I am told by railway experts that it is the freight train that pays, not the passenger train, so that if we are to reduce our deficit we must increase our freight traffic. That is the opinion of a prominent railway official; it is not merely my own personal view.

The grain blockade of which I speak has had a very serious effect upon the country. It affects not only the farmers, but also the business men, the wholesale men, the retail men, the banks, and the manufacturers. The manufacturer cannot sell his products unless the wholesale man can pay his debts; the wholesale man must go to the retail man, and the retail man to the consumer—who out West is very largely the farmer. If, then, the farmer cannot get his products to the market, he cannot pay his debts; the wheels of business are simply at a standstill; all business is stagnant. I am glad to be informed by the Minister of Railways that he has ordered 18,000 box-cars. I shall be pleased if he will inform me just how soon they are going to reach the West.

I wish now to make a few corrections of statements made last night by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson). The hon. gentleman made a rather bitter and unwarranted attack upon the United Grain Growers, Limited. He was very much mixed up. Some one had informed him that a certain gentleman by the name of Mr. Wood was the vice-president of the company. I do not need to dwell on that; the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) put him right in that regard. But this is what the hon. gentleman says:

> Mr. Speaker, I am ready to admit, that it would be exceedingly difficult for any man to say just who is associated with the United Grain Growers' Company and who is not.

Well, it will not be difficult at all if the hon. gentleman will seek the information in the proper place. I would invite him to go west with me to the headquarters of the company in Winnipeg. I believe, Sir, I can show the hon. gentleman the name of every shareholder of the company, as well as a statement of the moneys which they have put into it. I want to tell my hon. friend that there is not one dollar of watered stock credited to our shareholders—and perhaps from that my hon. friend might learn a lesson. He will, however, have to be very patient, because we have over 36,000 shareholders, and if he also wishes to know the names of the customers who deal with the company, it will take him a very long time to look over all the records of the company. But we have nothing to hide, and my invitation to my hon. friend to accompany me to the West stands good.

The hon. gentleman spoke about the different names which this Progressive party is called; in fact, he tried to make out that we call ourselves the Agrarian party and the Progressive party; we do not; we call ourselves the National Progressive party, and I think that name is very applicable. My hon. friend goes on to say:

> I said a moment ago that you could not suggest a more violent misuse of terms than those titles. What has been their attitude towards the farmers of this country?

I should like to inquire just what the hon. gentleman means by this strong language. As I said before, we do not apply those titles to ourselves, and if hon. members or any other persons apply those terms to us, we cannot help that; we prosper under it; it is cheap advertising to us, and our people rally all the more to the cause.

My hon. friend was entirely misinformed as to the class of goods which the company handles. These are the words he uses in connection with that:

> Feed, clothing, machinery, fuel, and everything else.

That is a very wide order, is it not? We handle many commodities, but we do not handle such a wide range as the hon. member for Algoma East would have people believe. He says:

> The United Grain Growers' Limited—

And he is getting nearer the name all the time. That is the proper name.

> —carry on a sort of letter order business.

I will take it for granted that by "letter order business" he means, perhaps, a mail order business. Then he says:

> They write a letter to some milling company and ask them to forward a car of flour to some farmer or group of farmers with draft attached to bill of lading. In this way they handled, without the cost to them of a single cent, something over a million dollars' worth of flour, and they collected from the farmer between eighty cents and one dollar a barrel as their rake-off for doing it.

I ask hon. members who are business men, who know something about business: Is it possible to have an office with a staff of clerks and stenographers to receive orders from 36,000 shareholders, with a very large number of patrons who are not shareholders, to collect those orders, to attend to the mails, to send the orders on to a large milling company—we deal with more than one milling company—and to conduct all this business without one cent of cost to the company? I am surprised that my hon. friend should make such a statement as that. The other year I had the pleasure of working on a committee of this House with him, and I had a very high estimation of my hon. friend, but, I am afraid I must revise that estimate.

As regards the commission charged on the flour, out West we do not handle flour by the barrel, nor do we speak of it by the barrel. It is handled in bags of
9 p.m. 100 pounds and we speak of it as such. My hon. friend, before making this attack, would have been well advised, knowing me so well, to have come to myself, and I could have supplied him with this information. I have in my room upstairs several annual reports of the company, showing everything in detail, and my hon. friend is welcome to have those reports at any time. I should like him to be properly informed.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He does not want to know.

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

Mr. J. F. REID: It would seem to me that he is imbued with the faculty of believing without a reason and the faculty of hating without a cause. If he would divest himself of all those passions which cloud his intellect and warp his understanding, he would see things from a higher plane; his perspective would be clearer, and his troubled soul would rest and live in peace.

My hon. friend goes on to befriend Mr. Murray who is conducting this boycott of the press. Again I must say I am sorry my good friend will even for one moment try to defend such an action as the muzzling of the press, which is the medium through which the people in the distant parts of Canada must be informed as to what is being carried on here. That my good friend will support such an action, I am astonished.

Towards the last, my hon. friend changes his mind, and I am very glad for that. He says:

> I said in this House last year, and I repeat to-night, that no honest man has any right in the world to criticize in the least degree the business that the Western Grain Growers are doing. So far as I am able to discern, they are carrying on an honest business; they are the largest commercial organization that ever came into existence in this country; but when they are doing that, what right have they to come down into eastern Canada or to go any other place in their efforts to set class against class in this country or to tell me that I am not carrying on an honest business; that I am extracting undue profits from the people; that I am oppressing the workingman; that the farmers are not getting their rights? I say that the whole thing is a campaign of blatant hypocrisy.

That is very strong language. My hon. friend is very parochial; he thinks the people of Canada must remain within; and not travel beyond the bounds of their respective provinces. Out West we are not as narrow-minded as that; we welcome our friends from theh eastern provinces to come West and hold meetings and talk with us in order to explain to us their point of view on the public questions of to-day. Surely my hon. friend would not deny us a similar privilege to come down East. I do not think he would insist in his objection. I trust therefore, he will not forget my invitation.

I have rather an unpleasant duty to perform. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) appeared before an audience in the city of Toronto. I have here a clipping from the Manitoba Free Press. It is headed:

> Says Farmer Party menace to Canada.
> Guthrie charges it was started in the West by American settlers. Only party the Federal Government need fear, he declares.

The clipping, which is dated Toronto, February 6, reads:

Declaring that free trade would ruin Canada, and intimating that it was not the Liberal party the Federal Government need fear at the next Dominion election, but the Farmer party, Hon. Hugh Guthrie, Minister of Militia and Defence, in the Meighen Government at Ottawa, addressed the South York Conservatives at their annual meeting here Saturday.

On the tariff question Mr. Guthrie said that under no circumstances could Canada afford to have free trade with the U. S. Canada as a nation, and Canadians as a people, would become bankrupt under free trade, he declared, and the next general election would be fought out on the question of protective tariff.

Menace to Canada is Charge.

Mr. Guthrie asserted that the farmer party in the west was started by American settlers, and the organizers of the western farmers were American sympathizers. He produced a catalogue published by the Western Grain Growers to substantiate this charge. In this catalogue, he said, were numerous lines of farm implements listed as "U. G. G. (United Grain Growers) goods" but which were really American-made.

The ploughs listed in the catalogue, Mr. Guthrie said, were made in Wisconsin; harrows, cultivators, mowers, etc., in Illinois; portable engines and washing machines in Pontiac, Ills.; cream separators in Buffalo, N.Y.; and wagons in Iowa. "In the lines of goods which I have mentioned, which are called "U. G. G. goods," Mr. Guthrie said, "there is not a Canadian article catalogued."

Mr. Guthrie declared that the farmer party in western Canada was not only a menace to the present Government at Ottawa, but also to the future of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read an interview given by Mr. Rice-Jones, General Manager of the United Grain Growers, to the Winnipeg Tribune of February 7th, 1921:

The Hon. Hugh Guthrie's statement as reported in a dispatch is incorrect. He states there is not a Canadian article in the machinery litsed in our catalogue as United Grain Growers. Even the list of machinery which he specifically mentions as being manufactured in the United States is incorrect. Mowers and rakes and wagons, for instance, are all purchased in Canada. In fact, we have not purchased a wagon in the United States for three years.

We were forced to buy in the United States in the first place because Canadian manufacturers refused to sell us, and there are still some Canadian manufacturers who absolutely refuse to deal with us.

Of 101 pages in our catalogue only slightly over one-third cover American-made goods. We have always aimed to purchase everything we could purchase in Canada, taking into consideration price and quality. The unfortunate feature from a Canadian standpoint is that even after adding the tariff, some of the American goods we purchase are cheaper than the Canadian and more serviceable.

Mr. Guthrie's statement that the western farmer organizations are controlled by Americans and imbued with American sympathies and ideals is hardly worth referring to, but I may say that of the twelve directors of the United Grain Growers, Ltd., whose purchases of machinery Mr. Guthrie refers to, ten are British or Canadian born, and two American.

I had hoped that the day of the cheap appeal to racial prejudice by party politicians of the old type was past, but apparently it is not; so I might add that we have here in the West some American born citizens, than whom we have no better Canadians in Canada to-day.

To make the matter clearer still, I will now give the names and the places of birth of the twelve directors who guide the affairs of the United Grain Growers' Limited: Hon. T. A. Crerar, President, born in the Province of Ontario; Cecil Rice-Jones, born in England (Wales); John Kennedy, known to many men in Ontario, and born in that province; Roderick McKenzie, born in the province of Ontario; F. Collyer, born in England; John Morrison, born in Ontario; R. A. Parker, born in Winnipeg, Manitoba; J. J. McLellan born in Nova Scotia; Mr. Wingate, born in the United States; Mr. Austin, born in the United States; and myself, born in the Orkney Islands, Scotland.

Now if the Minister of Militia, who wears the gold lace and the ribbon and the sparkling sword, thinks for one minute that these two Yankees, and I say that with all respect can twist the other ten men around their fingers he has another guess coming.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Especially the Scotchman.

Mr. J. F. REID: My good friend the Minister of Militia makes three distinct charges: first, that the Farmers' party in the West was started by American settlers, and that the organizers of the western Farmers are American sympathizers; second, that all the goods branded "U.G.G." in the catalogue are made in the United States and that not a Canadian-made article is catalogued. That is absolutely incorrect. Thirdly, he charges that the Farmers' party in Western Canada is a menance to the present Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is true.

Mr. J. F. REID: Yes, I have not much to say against that, because my hon. friend the Minister of the Militia says that we are the party which the Government must fear. We will let that charge pass, but he goes on to say that the Farmers party in Wectern Canada is a menace to the future of Canada, and that all this is brought about by American settlers who are American sympathizers. If that is the case, it is time for us to stop encouraging immigration from the

United States, and we should bring home our immigration officers over there. You cannot ride both horses. They are either good or bad, and I want to tell this House, as Mr. Rice-Jones said in his interview in the press, that we have American settlers in Western Canada who are just as good citizens as myself or the Minister of Militia. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it is time that this cheap talk was stopped.

Mr. MAHARG: Just clap-trap.

Mr. J. F. REID: And cheap clap-trap at that. What is behind it all? It is an endeavour to drive a wedge of distrust between the East and the West. The aim is to set the East and the West against each other and, if possible, to breed suspicion in the minds of our eastern people against the western Progressives. I want to tell the House that this Progressive movement is not confined to Western Canada; it is spreading all over the Dominion, and neither the Minister of Militia nor this Government, nor all this House, can stop that movement. It is a popular movement. It is the movement of the great common people, and it is going to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore that a Minister of the Crown, one of Canada's foremost statesmen, an adviser to the King's representative in Canada, the Governor General, and therefore an adviser to His Majesty King George, should stoop to such low political tactics for the purpose of causing distrust between the East and the West. It is beneath the dignity of the hon. gentleman's position. It is beneath the dignity of any member of this House.

Mr. HOWARD H. HALLADAY (Bow River): I want to add my congratulations to what has been said regarding the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), and the mover and seconder of the Address. We have before us an amendment which will in a short time precipitate a division in the House. At that time every hon. member who votes on the amendment must have some good and sufficient reason for the way in which he votes. I propose to vote against that amendment, and my first reason is that I have no confidence in the party from which it emanates.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That will not worry us much.

Mr. HALLADAY: Two reasons have been given why we should support the amendment; one is that the Government has no mandate, and the other, that there is a demand in this country for an election.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

Mr. HALLADAY: I endorse the hon. gentleman's "hear, hear." There is a demand for an election, Mr. Speaker, but it comes from your left and from the people who supported the Opposition in the last election. I believe that the men who are crying for an election in this country to-day, if they had had the nerve, would have made the same cry on the 18th day of December, 1917. Why? I had a resolution sent to me two months after the first session of this Parliament by an organization which strenuously opposed me in that election and which asked for my resignation, the reason given being that I had supported a certain Bill in this House, which Bill, Mr. Speaker, did not at that session and has not at any subsequent session, appeared on the Order Paper.

It is simply a cry of the ins and the outs; and so far as the question of mandate is concerned, I can only speak for my own constituency. During my campaign in the fall of 1917 I took particular pains to say on every platform on which I appeared that I would support this Government on every war measure. I have done so. I also told them that after the war was over I reserved the right to use my own judgment, and that judgment in this instance is to vote against the amendment.

The same party from which this amendment comes is the party that was in power in 1910 and 1911, when they brought about a snap verdict from the people as a result of which western Canada was robbed of thirteen representatives in this House, and we went along for six years short of representation to that extent. They come to us again to-day clamouring for an election. If they had their way we would be robbed of from thirteen to twenty seats on this occasion. But I want to warn the leader of the semi-official Opposition that the people of western Canada will not gracefully heed this cry. I want to warn him that there are a number of people in Canada who are quite convinced that this Parliament can give us as honest a redistribution as any other Parliament that may follow. This redistribution will not be made by the Cabinet themselves; it will have to come before this House, at which time every hon. member will have something to say.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have been very well advised by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) when he suggests a commission to look into the wheat business of western Canada. We had in the corridors of this House last year for two long months a representative

from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. He flirted with the members of the Opposition, he flirted with the members sitting behind the Government on this side, and he flirted particularly with the members of the semi-official Opposition. He told us that the United States would practically consume their total crop of last year; he told us that Australia was short from seven to eleven million acres in wheat; he told us that Central Europe would not produce any wheat, and as a consequence if we would allow the wheat to revert back to the old system of handling we would receive not less than $3 and possibly $5 per bushel. We know what happened; and I think that the Government would be wise, in appointing a commission. But for goodness sake do not appoint a committee from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

I believe that one of the finest reports that have been placed on the table of this House was that tabled this week, wherein we are told that the farmers of Canada received a great deal more per bushel for wheat than did the farmers of the United States; and at the same time that the working-men of this country bought flour at a smaller price than the working-men of the United States. That was done through Government handling. I would therefore heartily second the proposal of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders) that the Government appoint a committee to investigate the whole wheat condition of Western Canada and see if it is not possible to go back to Government control in the handling of wheat.

We have another industry in Western Canada which is going down hill, and I am afraid that unless something definite is done by this Government in the near future that industry will cease to exist. I refer to the cattle business. We have in Saskatchewan something like 4,000,000 acres, in the province of Alberta about 4,000,000. and in British Columbia, I believe, some 400,000 acres of land leased to cattle raisers. This land is not farm land; it has been surveyed and re-surveyed and the farming land taken out. It is keeping above water to-day on industry which is our second in importance in Western Canada. Our meat has found its way to the best tables of the world; and is in demand in the best of the world's markets. This is probably due to our climatic conditions, but it is no doubt attributable mostly to the food the cattle get. Our prairie grass grows up until the middle of July as a rule and then starts to ripen and as it stands on the stubble ripened it is really hay. In each blade is found meat similar to that of the oat, and on this the cattle feed and fatten. Now, all that our ranchers ask is that they be given something definite as to what is to be done with these leases. They are to expire in two, three, four and five years, and if the ranchers do not know within a short time what is to be done, they will start to spay their heifers. That will deplete the cattle business.

It has been suggested that these grazing lands be turned over to community grazing. That sounds feasible; but in southern Alberta and Saskatchewan when the grass is eaten off to the first of July it does not grow again, and as in community grazing our cattle do not leave the land, therefore have no crop except in the Spring of the year and no hay at all. Your hay can only be cut once every two years.

What these gentlemen ask is that they should be informed as to what is going to be done and that the information should be definite. It is said that these natural resources may be handed over to the provinces. This may or may not be contemplated. If it is I believe the provinces would prefer to have an industry handed over with those resources, than that they should receive them without that industry.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House for any great length of time to-night but while the thought is still fresh in my mind I will comment for a moment or two on the speech of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Scott). He quoted from an address made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I could not exactly gather the reason for making the quotation because I am sure all of us will agree that the expressions used by the member for Red Deer constitute the best compliment that could be paid to him; they show his absolute consistency from the date of the delivery of the speech in question up to the present time.

The statement that the Premier of Ontario had not given any preferential legislation to agriculture is a compliment to Hon. Mr. Drury also. Does it not demonstrate beyond all question that the members of our party, put our professions into practice when such evidence as this of adherence to principle comes from those diametrically opposed to us? My hon. friend from South Waterloo expressed the opinion that there was no demand in the country that the Government should dissolve Far-

liament and hold an election. It is a well known adage Sir, that a man will frequently know more about the immediate business of his neighbour than he does about his own. I wonder whether the hon. member for South Waterloo has received information from a point very close to his own constituency? To my mind circumstances point to the fact that he has. I understand the hon. gentleman was elected by a majority of some two thousand, not counting the soldiers' vote. I am also advised that in the provincial elections in Ontario a Liberal and Labour member was returned for that constituency by a majority of some four thousand. Does my hon. friend interpret that turnover as an expression of feeling favourable to the retention in office of the present administration? If he does my hon. friend must have an imagination of an unusual kind. I cannot understand why he should express such sentiments as uttered here to-night in view of the feeling with respect to the Government which seems to prevail in his own riding.

I have heard it said many times that when the first dozen speeches upon any subject have been made in this Chamber everything has been said that it is possible to say. That, doubtless, is frequently true but we must admit that there are exceptions. The fine address that was given by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) yesterday, for example, was evidence to the contrary. It was a compliment to the hon. gentleman himself, it was a compliment to our party, it was a compliment to the House, that while the hon. gentleman occupied the floor there was a larger attendance of members than has been customary during the present session and the public galleries were crowded. Throughout his speech the hon. gentleman held the interest of his entire audience until he resumed his seat. That I regard as a well merited compliment. I interpret it to mean that the people, even our legislators, are very anxious to hear the pronouncements of our policy as they are delivered from time to time, and as they were very specifically delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Marquette.

I wish to associate myself with those who have extended their congratulations to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) upon his elevation to his present high office. I cannot but admire the man who through sheer business ability and devotion to work and to a conception of what he believes to be right has exacted recognition from his party to the extent that they have proclaimed him to be their leader and have advanced him to his present exalted state. His promotion is undoubtedly a compliment to the right hon. gentleman and I recognize that he is to-day a mighty man, but I believe that he will be a still mightier man when he sits in the cold shades of Opposition and feels the pulse of the people —the people who are asking for things from him although their appeals seem to fall upon deaf ears. In saying that I am not uttering anything derogatory to the Prime Minister. I am only expressing my honest desire that he may become a mightier man in the future than he is at the present time.

I also wish to compliment those members of the Government who have been raised to Cabinet rank since last session. I do not suppose there is any member in the House but is pleased when some of our fellows are advanced to higher rank. If newspaper reports are to be believed one of these gentlemen, the hon. Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore) speaking in the city of St. John during the contest which followed his entrance to the Cabinet, said that the city of St. John came first in his estimation, the province of New Brunswick next, and Canada third. I do not agree with such a sentiment as that, and when we bear in mind the laudatory flag-waving speeches which are indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite one would imagine that they ought to have a stronger sense of national pride and a broader outlook on public affairs. That is my idea at any rate.. We all profess to be speaking for Canada, and when a man's interests become narrowed down as they seem to have become with my hon. friend, that is not big Canadianism. If we are ever going to become Canadians in the best and broadest sense of the term we have to get rid of sectionalism and not strive to advance merely local interests. The welfare of the country as a whole should be kept in mind and advanced, even if it sometimes involves the sacrifice of local and petty interests.

When the name of the mover of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne was announced we all realized that the House would be favoured with a great literary treat, and the anticipation was realized. I must also say that the seconder performed his duty well. He really merited the compliments which were paid to him, and yet perhaps he may pardon me for addressing to him a word of caution. I advise the hon. gentleman not to pay too much attention to the compliments he has received. It does not necessarily follow

that because he was given the honour of seconding the Address, a portfolio is lying around loose awaiting his acceptance.

Then I wish to refer to the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey), who spoke of extending the hand of good fellowship across the Rocky Mountains and grasping the hands of the Prairie farmers at the same time asserting that the farmers of the province by the western sea would not have anything to do with the policies of the people of the western plains, as enunicated in the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, but that they wished to retain their thirty cents a box or ninety cents a barrel duty on their apples. Is that big Canadianism? I would say that while the British Columbia farmer has the one hand engaged he might extend the other across to the Atlantic seaboard to grasp the hand of the hon. Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore). If his interpretation of things political is what we are to understand as being things national, I am here to-night to say that the conception of the people who advocate and stand upon the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture is bigger and broader and greater than the sentiments expressed by this hon. gentleman.

In the speech from the Throne, likewise in the many addresses that were delivered throughout the length and breadth of our land by the right hon. the Prime Minister, the gauntlet was thrown down in regard to the tariff policy as proposed to be carried out by his party. In that respect, Sir, we know exactly where they are. Likewise by the admission of hon. gentlemen on the Government side who have spoken repeatedly and have directed their remarks to our Progressive group here, they confess that they know also where we stand. Therefore, the issue is clearly defined as between the Government and our party. We accept battle upon that issue as laid down by our Prime Minister in his addresses and also in the speech from the Throne. We will and do accept battle upon these terms, let it come sooner or later, and I honestly believe that the sentiment of the people who are governed by our laws will respond to the appeal, the newer and stronger appeal, that is being made at this time on the great national issue on the tariff.

We believe, Sir, that our cause is just, and we believe that to-day the people are studying economic questions more and more. The question of economics has been very pertinent to our people during the war period. The people are becoming enlightened, and they really believe that more enlightenment should be given to them by those who, they believe, are the beneficiaries of the system. Until evidence has been produced and the people are satisfied that they have not been mulcted in the deal, they will not be content, and upon every occasion they will vote to have the tariff further reduced.

The Commission that was appointed by the Government travelled throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion taking evidence regarding the tariff. I did not have an opportunity of appearing before that Commission, but I watched very closely the newspaper reports of the evidence that was adduced, and I came to the conclusion long ago that if the desire was to procure real evidence and pass final judgment on that evidence, instead of being a Government Commission, it should have been a Commission appointed from Parliament. We have three groups in this House, and it was easy and would have struck a reassuring note in the minds of the people had a parliamentary committee been appointed to take that evidence rather than a committee composed entirely of Government members.

Why, Sir, it seems to me that the case is prejudiced before it starts by the Government, which, while the Tariff Commission is taking evidence, nails its protection flag to the masthead. The people of Canada cannot have faith that the findings of that Commission are going to be wholly in their favour. I do not quote this as a positive fact, but I was told that even while the Commission was taking evidence the sittings were suspended to enable one of the commissioners to proceed to East Elgin, and there proclaim the beauties of protection. To me, Mr. Speaker, such action does prejudice the case, and I am not prepared to admit that new evidence was necessary along the lines that the Commission sought. It does appear to me that the evidence should have been started lower down than that. I believe that our Canadian interests that claim a continuance of protection should show just how much it is costing the people for that protection. It seems to me that if there are a million dollars of watered stock in our companies we should not be mulcted in tariff duties to pay dividends on it. It would be easy for the Commission to ascertain how matters stand and to find out which of our companies, if any, are worthy of protec-

tion. Until that evidence is produced I do not think the people need expect or can believe that such evidence as was taken by the Commission last fall will be satisfactory, nor will it end in remedying the evils which we believe to exist now.

In the amendment tendered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and in all the addresses that have been made thereon, the constitutional aspect of the case has been presented by the various speakers. It is not my wish or intention to delay the House to-night with any feeble endeavour to enter into the constitutional question, but I have in my own mind some reasons which I will adduce in a few minutes as to why this Government should appeal to the electorate. There is, Sir, not much to be said in my estimation about the want of confidence sentiment. There is the human element, and it seems to me that that element has entered into the appeal which has emanated from the official Liberal party. There is a question as to whether if they were in power, for instance, they would do any better. Human nature is very much the same wherever you find it, and I do not think our people are much concerned as to whether the Government as constituted to-day is less capable perhaps than would be the hon. members who sit on this side of the House if they were in power. I can quite belive, Sir, that precedents could be cited to prove that likewise those who call themselves Liberals have sometimes in the past been in a similar position and acted very much the same as the hon. members who occupy the treasury benches to-day. So I say that any vote of want of confidence in the Government does not enter very largely into the decision which I have arrived at as to why the Government should go to the country.

There is, however, particularly in our western country, Sir, a feeling that faith has been broken with the people. I know for a fact, speaking as an individual who has taken more or less interest in political affairs for a number of years in our western country and who attended the Liberal conventions and took a more or less active part in the nominations, that when the appeals were being made all over the country to 'back Unionists, I, as an Englishman born in the Mother Country, feeling that English blood animating my veins, and knowing that my Mother Country was in danger, threw up my political party allegiance and gave all the support I was capable of to the cause of Unionism to win the war, as we all thought. But I believed, along with millions of other electors, that after the war was won there would be an immediate appeal to the country upon the war record of the Government. We feel, Sir, that that sentiment is abroad in the land, and that the people are waiting for the opportunity, whether it comes sooner or later, to charge this Government with what they believe at least to be broken faith. The people really believe that faith was broken with them.

If I may use a Scriptural phrase, I would say that false prophets have arisen who prophesy that there will be a fusion of this party and the Liberal party, and the assertion has been made that the probability is not denied. Standing here in my place to-night, Sir, I will make at least a feeble effort to explain to the House why such fusion has not been and is not being considered, and why I do not anticipate that it will be considered. Incidentally I hope that hon. gentlemen will appreciate the effort I am putting forth to offer a little enlightenment upon this question, and that they will in the future treat the question as if they had received an answer.

In 1916 the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture was drafted, not with the object of forming a new political party, but for presentation to the Government of the day as a platform the working out of which would be in the best interests of the people of Canada as a whole. That is why my platform was framed. In August, 1919, when our Liberal friends met in Ottawa and commenced to build the Liberal platform, our Canadian Council of Agriculture forwarded to the men in Ottawa at that time a memorandum along the lines of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. It is quite evident when you compare the two platforms, that the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture was the guiding principle that actuated the minds of those men who met in convention in August, 1919, with the object of building a platform for the Liberal party. I do not need to reiterate the statement that it has been frequently alleged in the House, and that speakers of the Liberal party have proclaimed throughout many parts of this country that the two platforms are identical. I know the statement has been made, though I am not going to say it has been made with any real authority from the Liberal party. So far as our group is concerned, and so far as the Canadian Council of Agriculture is concerned, it has never been recognized as having been made with authority. However,

it is my purpose to cite a few special instances to-night in order to show that a difference does exist between the two platforms.

The memorandum, then, forwarded by the Canadian Council of Agriculture to those who gathered in the City of Ottawa at that time pointed out why this platform upon which we stood should be a national platform and should be adopted by them, as it had been refused by the party then in power. I might say here that the "Farmers' platform" about which some people talk so glibly is a misnomer; it is the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, a platform that has been recognized by great statesmen of this country as the best ever offered the people. That, of course, is a tribute to those who framed the platform—and the platform itself is the result of thousands of meetings that had been held all over the country, during the course of which the facts and conditions had been boiled down in an effort to find the kernels, the real essence of things as essential to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Canada.

We find, then, that the platform which I advocate and stand upon asked for free wheat, wheat flour, agricultural implements, fertilizers, cement, illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils. In that respect the Liberals followed absolutely and entirely the suggestion of our memorandum and our platform. They added, fishermen's equipment, such as nets, etc. So far the platforms are quite identical. The sentiment seemed to pervade that convention that they had satisfied the full demands of agriculture and that from that time on they could proceed to satisfy all the other interests of the Dominion of Canada. Let us see, for a moment, how they proceeded to do it. The platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture asked for free soft coal for the industries of Canada, for the home of the artisan and the hearth of the workingman and the home of the man upon the prairie. The Liberals did not ask for that. I have myself, Sir, not once but winter after winter, driven thirty-seven miles in one direction to get a load of wood and to bring it back—two long days in the cold, biting frost, trying to get wood with which to keep my house warm. We in the West know the value of coal, and know how to appreciate wood when we have it. But I maintain that the Liberal party could not have done a better service, politically or economically, than to have included in their platform free soft coal, in the interests, as I say, of the industries of Canada, of the artisan, of the workingman, of the man on the prairie who is miles and miles from anything in the shape of fuel.

We asked for free lumber so that the workingman could build his home, and for the benefit of the artisan, again, and the man on the prairie. The Liberals in their platform, asked only for free rough and partly dressed lumber. There is a discrepancy there.

Mr. HENDERS: It is already free.

Mr. GOULD: I am dealing with the principles of the platform laid down in the Liberal Convention in August, 1919. Our platform called for free food; the Liberal platform asked that the principal articles of food be made duty free. We asked for an immediate all-round reduction in the tariff; the Liberals asked that the duties on clothing and footwear be cut in two. There is another vast and very vital difference, because these things deal directly with the necessaries of life in the cold western winter climate of the West. That is one of the principles that guided those who built the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture—the desirability of making the necessities of life, the needs of the people in this country, as inexpensive and as free from duty as possible. I am sure that all men will recognize that that was a good, guiding national principle that actuated those people when they framed that platform. As I studied and compared these platforms, it seemed to me that after the needs of agriculture had apparently been satisfied by those who comprised the convention, possibly some of our Liberal friends who live in the peninsula down by the Atlantic ocean, where large coal deposits are to be found, intervened and perhaps persuaded the convention that free coal was not necessary nor needful. I heard an hon. gentleman once make this remark, which illustrates the point very well: "They were quite satisfied to sacrifice their wives' relations, but not any of their own." The people of Western Canada in particular, after studying and comparing these platforms, do not believe the claim that the platforms are the same. I tell the House to-night that there is in the West no sentiment looking towards fusion. To the Government I would say: the statements I am giving you here to-night I want you to accept, because the country has already accepted them. Do not be alarmed any longer concerning that idea. I do not wish to labour the point any further.

10 p.m.

At the outset of my remarks I mentioned other things in regard to which the people were going to be concerned whether the Government should go to the country or not. When this House prorogued last July enabling legislation had been passed whereby the Wheat Board would again function. Shortly after I reached my home, I was dumfounded to read in the newspapers that the Government had taken away those powers, and that the Wheat Board had been disbanded. One of the reasons why we in our group voted unanimously for the re-establishment of the Wheat Board was that we recognized that purchasing agencies were going to continue in the markets of the old country and on the continent of Europe and we believed that if organized purchasing agencies existed we should have organized selling agencies to meet that condition. That is, however, not so much the point.

In our organizations in the West we passed thousands and thousands of resolutions, of which I believe hundreds were forwarded to Ottawa. The press was filled with reasons why we wanted the re-establishment of our Wheat Board, and to each and every request the Government turned a deaf ear. Nothing apparently could be done for the plain people and we went forth selling our grain on street or on track and a difference of twenty to twenty-six cents a bushel existed all through the early part of the fall in our country between street and track prices, on account of the difference between the unit under which we are selling now and the one under which we have been accustomed to sell, under the Wheat Board. The country holds this Government responsible for the fact that they did not hearken to the pleadings of the people whose whole and sole support was wheat, who watched the markets, decline, decline, decline, with all the human vultures that could possibly gather, picking upon the product of the Western farmer, while not one finger was raised by the Government in support of the farmer in his pleadings and requests.

Mr. MYERS: Will the hon. member kindly inform the House if the leader of the Progressive party was in favour of the Wheat Board?

Mr. GOULD: If the hon. gentleman will look up the vote of last year, he will find that we all voted in favour of it.

Mr. MYERS: There was no vote.

Mr. COWAN: Is it not true that at the election in which the hon. member was elected, he and every part of his constituency were opposed to the existence of a Wheat Board: that he fought it from beginning to end and that he was elected as an opponent of the Wheat Board?

Mr. GOULD: That is another bugaboo. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find in Assiniboia any sentiment whatever in that direction. I will give to the House this evidence—

Mr. COWAN: That is not the point at all. The point is that my hon. friend was elected straight on that platform and nothing else.

Mr. MAHARG: There was no Wheat Board in existence then.

Mr. COWAN: Yes there was.

Mr. MAHARG: Not on your life.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. gentleman is mixed as to his facts. I might tell the House that not on any of the many platforms on which I stood during my whole election was the Wheat Board mentioned. I say that to-night as an hon. member of this House.

Mr. SHAW: Did my hon. friend not censure the Wheat Board in the first speech which he made in this House?

Mr. GOULD: I will say to the hon. gentleman that he can call that a censure of the Wheat Board, but an hon. gentleman who immediately followed me said that I was very impartial in my remarks regarding the Wheat Board. I think if my hon. friend will look up the address that immediately followed mine, he will find that to be the case. His own side has made that statement.

Referring further to the Wheat Board, we wanted the Wheat Board in the West and to show that we did want it and that I supported the Wheat Board in every place where I had an opportunity to do so, not because I knew any more than hon. gentlemen opposite, but because I believed it would work out all right, I have this evidence to offer and I could give the names of many men in the West who did not have the same faith in the Wheat Board and who applied to me time and time again, offering me their participation certificates at three, five, seven cents and more per bushel. In my office upstairs I could show hon. gentlemen carbon copies of letters that I sent back to men who wrote me asking me what participation certificates were worth. I gave them my belief that they should be worth at least twenty-five cents a bushel.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Did the hon. gentleman in the speech which he made last session not tell the House that he threw his participation certificates in the waste paper basket? I certainly understood so.

Mr. GOULD: I did not. I suppose copies of Hansard of that session are available, and the evidence can be produced.

Mr. COWAN: We will get the evidence. We are not through with the hon. gentleman yet.

Mr. GOULD: I am too good a business man to do such a foolish thing, and I should like the hon. gentleman to have that conception of me also, because while I did see in the West one man who might have applied his participation certificates in that way none that I possessed were used in that manner. In fact I collected my full forty-eight cents a bushel on every one of them. I was very pleased and I was very surprised because I did not ask——

Mr. COWAN: How did the hon. member have those participation certificates if the Wheat Board was not in existence at the last election?

Mr. M. CLARK: He got them at a later date.

Mr. COWAN: Oh, no.

Mr. GOULD: That is beside the point.

Mr. COWAN: The hon. gentleman is all tied up.

Mr. GOULD: I am producing evidence to prove that I was consistent; that I told those people, a good many of whom were Conservatives, in my electoral district, who did not believe the participation certificates would be any good, that they would be worth something—I was unable to say what. As I got more information, I kept every one of my own. That shows the faith which I had in them. I always advised those Conservatives who wanted to get rid of their certificates that they would be worth something if they kept them long enough. The point I want to bring out is this: We wanted the Wheat Board last year, and we appealed to the Government to give us the Wheat Board. Enabling legislation had been passed, but no attention was paid to our cry.

Then in connection with freight rates, particularly as they effect the West, and this is the question that was raised the other day by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), the three men comprising the Railway Commission seemed to have the power to bring an indictment against the country that was more important at that time than our whole tariff inquiry. Inside of a week they imposed upon this country a heavy burden, and it rested more heavily on Western Canada than on any other part, because at that time thousands and thousands of tons of freight, representing our export of wheat were moving along the railways. We said that it was inequitable and unfair to us. The question was raised in our associations and we passed resolutions, and pleaded with the powers that be to suspend the order, but no attention was paid to our appeals. The result was that the West paid approximately a million dollars a day extra in freight rates because of that order. The people of the West were fined that amount, and our Government stood by and let the Railway Commission take this money from us. No excuse can be offered by the Government for allowing the commission to issue that order. It is no use for the Government to say that the commission has vested powers and rights, because I remember when the Board of Commerce proposed to place an embargo on sugar they were quickly advised by the Government that the embargo must not go into effect and sugar was allowed to come down in price.

I repeat, these are particularly western questions, and the West will call this Government to account because of these things. The hon. member for Centre Vancouver stated the absolute truth very distinctly the other day when he said that an injustice was done to the West in that respect, and I say, Sir, that the West, not in any spirit of revenge, but in the belief that justice should prevail in this country, will record its dissatisfaction with the apathy shown by the Government on these two questions so vitally affecting that part of the country.

I believe, Sir, that the Advisory Council of Scientific Research can do a greater work possibly than it is doing at the present time. It is a well-known fact that on our western plains we have been afflicted with rust for a very long time, and it occurred to me that perhaps the Scientific Research Council, if money were voted for the purpose, could bend their energies towards finding a remedy for this rust evil, because all who come from the West know that in areas where rust prevails, inside of a week crop can be cut down from a twenty-bushel to a ten-bushel crop by this disease. That is a national loss, and I would be most willing to support a vote of money to the council for the purpose of

investigating this disease and trying to find a remedy for it.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the address which was made in the House the other day by the hon. member for St. Hyancinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier). He said he could not join the Progressive group, because he feared there was communism in our platform. There might be some excuse for the hon. gentleman arriving at that conclusion if he had not studied our platform, but if he had studied it he could not possibly have arrived at that conclusion. He speaks of there being 63 per cent of alien population in the West. Why should he charge the West with that? Did he not support a Government that for fifteen years was largely responsible for the influx of immigration to the West? Why did he wait till this hour to proclaim this fact? I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada are big enough to assimilate the immigrants that have come in there, and I think hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House will bear me out in saying that Western Canada does not feel that there is any evil in having these alien immigrants within her borders. On the contrary, we feel we are making good citizens out of them. Even if it were true that we had 63 per cent of alien population, we of the West did formulate and build the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, which constituted the guiding principle of the great Liberal party at their convention here in August, 1919.

Mr. NORMAN LANG (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, before discussing any of the more important matters, I should like to refer briefly to the amendment that is now before the House. I can well remember that on many occasions when legislation has been brought down in the House, the people of Canada have disapproved. For instance, at the time the Drug Act was being amended, I recall, although it seemed a minor matter compared with a general election, how the telegraph boys were going about here with armfuls of telegrams. The same thing has happened on many occasions, both when the House was in session and during the recess. When the price of sugar was liable to be affected, I believe the Government was bombarded with telegrams from every nook and corner of Canada, although I would think a few cents a pound on sugar a minor affair compared with a general election in this country.

We know that the people of this country express their views in this way, but although we have been discussing this amendment for nearly two weeks, I have failed to see any evidence that the supporters of this amendment have received much encouragement from outside the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, I think the desire for a general election at this time is pretty well confined to one side of the House. I believe the people of this country are not very much concerned about it, or they would have availed themselves of the opportunity to advise us as to their views. I would like to assure the right hon. Prime Minister, the Chief Whip, and all the other whips, that so far as I am concerned they need not worry about me for I shall try and be in my seat when the bell rings, ready to vote against the amendment that is now before the House.

I want to mention briefly a few things that, very properly, I think, interest the people of the West particularly. I think the members from the eastern part of Canada are quite capable of looking after the interests of the East, so I shall try and confine my remarks to matters that affect our western country, and affect it very, very seriously. In the first place, I want to endorse most strongly the remarks of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in regard to the necessity of the Government's appointing a commission to thoroughly investigate the wheat trade.

I think that it is the most important question that has been discussed in this House this session. It has been a subject of complaint in the West to my knowledge for over thirty years. I think the investigation has been delayed too long now and that the Government should take means at once to enquire thoroughly into the entire grain trade, from the time the grain leaves the farmers' wagon until it arrives on the markets of Europe or elsewhere.

I do not wish to convey the idea that I am a pessimist. I have great faith in the West, and I do not think that there is a place in the world where development has been so rapid as it has been in the province of Saskatchewan during the last fifteen years. In the summer of 1903 you could travel from Saskatoon to Yorkton and see nothing but foxes and antelopes, but now the country is entirely settled and the virgin prairie has been converted into productive farms. Thousands upon thousands of farmers have done well out there. They arrived in this country with

very little capital and now have comfortable homes, very good buildings, farms well cultivated and fenced; but they would have been much better off if the conditions for the marketing of their grain had been such as to give them a fair return for their product.

As in every other country in the world, it is not all sunshine on the prairies. Some districts have wonderful luck for several years, and then comes a series of bad years. In a great many districts in Saskatchewan we have bad luck now for five years. I can briefly describe what actually occurred. In 1915 we had a bumper crop in all the three provinces. In 1916, however, we had a tremendous amount of hail. Indeed, the hail storms were so severe that the Municipal Hail Insurance Company were only able to pay 40 cents on the dollar; the balance has never been paid and never will be. The following year was somewhat better but there was not a heavy crop. In 1918 we had an unusually severe frost on the morning of July 24th, and it destroyed the grain in patches which meant that the whole field had to be cut, stooked and threshed at a very great expense and many farmers operated at a loss that year. In 1919 the season was very dry, with the result that there was crop failure in a great many places. Last year there was a similar condition in a number of districts. Therefore, I think it is very necessary that the Government should do everything they possibly can to improve marketing conditions.

Possibly some hon. gentlemen will think that a great deal of this trouble has been due to poor farming. I will admit that there is still room for improvement, and there always will be; but I must say that there has been a wonderful advance in the last few years. The land has been much better cultivated; in fact, some of the farmers have over-cultivated, with the result that the soil has drifted badly. However, considering the shortage of suitable help and all the adverse conditions, the people have struggled manfully to meet their obligations and to develop the country.

But the prospects are not good at present. Spring is rapidly approaching, and what is the outlook? We are told by the implement dealers that prices are going to be higher. We do not know what wages are going to be, and with the exchange situation as it is, we do not feel that there is very much prospect of a market for our 1921 crop in Europe. With the German mark at about one cent and a half, only the millionaire classes can possibly buy grain from us. The United States farmers complain that their markets are flooded. Now, I always try to look on the bright side of things, and while I do not desire to be charged with being pessimistic, really at present conditions are not very good, and I think that the Government should get busy at once and try to improve the situation.

There is no room for gamblers between the producer and the consumer. We have far too many middlemen in all lines of trade as well as the gamblers on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. We all know that the Wheat Board was not appreciated at the start. However, every one realizes now that it was the best method of disposing of our surplus wheat, and I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) corroborate my statement that the Wheat Board is very much appreciated at the present time. Indeed, it has been appreciated ever since it became known that it was going to be a success. I feel that the best solution of the difficulty is to re-appoint the Wheat Board on a slightly different basis. The organized farmers are trying to decide on a wheat pool. I do not want to discourage them in any way, but I doubt if any scheme could be a succes that was not endorsed by the Federal Government and the banks. If a wheat pool is the best scheme, let us all get behind it; but if it is not workable, then I should like the Canadian Council of Agriculture and the organized farmers to announce that they are not able to go ahead with it, so that we might have time to formulate some other plan to take care of the 1921 crop. I have had very little news recently regarding what has been done by the organized farmers and the Canadian Council of Agriculture, but I noticed a paragraph touching this matter in the press this morning which is of some interest, and I would like to read it to the House:

Delay Obtaining Wheat Pool Charter.

Winnipeg, Man., Feb. 24.—No application will be made this session to the Manitoba legislature for a charter in connection with the formation of the Wheat Pool Association, according to George Langley, minister of municipal affairs for Saskatchewan, who is in the city to-day.

In explaining the delay, Mr. Langley said the formation of such an association, to which thousands of farmers belong, constituted an undertaking of gigantic magnitude meriting

mature consideration. Another matter which would have to be dealt with at some length was the question of determining the status of farmers in the association, who, though possessing no financial interest in the organization were entitled to consideration in its direction.

I must say that this does not look very promising. For my part I would like to see the Government appoint what I would call an "Improved Wheat Board" on a voluntary basis. We all object to compulsory legislation but I think if the Wheat Board were re-appointed and authorized to handle not only wheat but oats, barley and flax as well, and if it were optional whether a man shipped his wheat through the Board, got his advance and waited for the balance, or sold it to the elevators, it would be to the advantage of the farmer. It is not easy at the present time for the Government to do anything until the organized farmers agree on what they are going to do. As I have already said I do not want to do anything myself to discourage them. If their plan appears to be the best, let us all get behind them. If it is not, then we want the Government to take immediate action, in order to see what can be done in regard to the 1921 crop.

Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence in the West. The West is all right. The people of the West are all right. What is needed is a better understanding between the East and the West. You in the East need us as much as we need you. I blame the newspapers a great deal for the mistaken impressions existing, caused by the misleading reports published every day. A great many eastern people have an idea that western people spend the summer riding about in automobiles and spend the winter in California, and many western people imagine that the Federal Government and eastern people are not at all concerned as to whether they sink or swim. If anything can be done to improve conditions for any class of people in Canada it is our duty to do it. If nothing can be done, the facts should be made known. Most of our people are reasonable and will be perfectly satisfied if this course is adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I should like to mention, briefly, one or two other matters which affect my constituency as well as other parts of the prairie. We realize more and more, as the years go by, the necessity of raising more stock and the importance of good stock, but at present a large proportion of the cattle thrown on the market are in poor condition. This is partly due to the fact that the farmers have not had sufficient experience in stall feeding steers before the stock is marketed. Very often they are sold for a trifle simply because it is imperative that the owner should get a few dollars and the manager of the local bank refuses to lend him any money. I do not know if removing the embargo in England would help matters or not. I would certainly like to see the embargo removed, but I have more faith in refrigerator cars and ships than I have in shipping live cattle. If the steers are properly finished on grain and roots before they are slaughtered in Canada the beef will be in first class condition when it arrives on the market in London or Paris. Prices are low at present, but raising good beef and pork is going to be profitable in the future.

I would also like to mention the fact that we will need extra help in harvest, and I think we should encourage people to put in their winter supply of coal in summer. In that way we might get a great many of the miners to help with the harvest. This would also increase the number of cars available for wheat. We have the same experience each year; there is a great rush to haul coal, lumber and everything else just when the cars are needed for wheat, with the result that many of the farmers are forced to be on the road hauling wheat when it is not fit for a dog to be out.

Just while I am on this subject I wish to address a word to my friend the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid). I do not want to say anything unkind, because I realize that both he and the contractors have had difficulty in getting any construction work done during the last few years. Nevertheless, I want to remind him that we have some short pieces of line the construction of which has been dragging for the last fifteen years, and which must be completed this year. I think it would do a lot of good if the Minister would come out to Saskatchewan with me and make one trip in winter on a load of wheat, from Kelvington to Wadena. He would then realize that such a trip is not only hard on the men but hard on the horses as well. I certainly hope the Minister will make a desperate effort this year to complete some of these branch lines. If we cannot secure men in Canada to do this work, we will have to import a few ship loads of labourers from China, or some other country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must again point out to the Government the absolute necessity of doing everything possible to improve marketing conditions in both grain and stock. What we want is some action. With us actions speak louder than words, and if the Government get busy and prove that they are anxious and willing to help us, they will find that they have more friends out on the prairies than they think, especially if they carry on and maintain a stable Government until after the census has been taken and the redistribution Bill, which will entitle the West to about twenty more members, has been passed.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, if I do not take the same time in congratulating the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) upon his accession to office at so early a period in life as other speakers have, I trust he will not consider it any reflection upon him. I hope he will permit me to say that the remarks that have been made with respect to him by gentlemen of the group angularly opposite, as he calls it, are very heartily reciprocated by me. We are very pleased indeed that the right hon. gentleman has scored such a success in public life, and we wish him a happy future whether it be as leader of the Government or leader of the Opposition. It is customary in this debate to refer to various subjects, and I trust I may be excused if I make reference very briefly to a few matters that have not been dwelt upon by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I want to refer first to a subject that has been frequently discussed in this House in the past and which will undoubtedly be frequently discussed in the future until it is settled in a different way from what we have attempted so far; that is the question of our obligations to our citizen soldiers who served so well in the great war. No other body of Canadians at any time in our history have done so much to bring honour to Canada or to raise her name so high in the esteem of the world. We paid our privates in the trenches considerably less than we paid inexperienced labourers at home. This cannot be allowed to be the final disposition of this matter, and it will never be settled until it is settled in the right way.

In discussing this matter with one man and another, I find that the financial position of the country is always raised as an objection to doing anything further for our returned men. Well, I am glad to say that Canada is able to pay her debts, and there is at least a moral debt due in this case, and we will have to settle it some time or other, the sooner the better. I noticed that when hon. members asked for an increased indemnity last session the financial situation of the country was not allowed to stand in the way of granting their request. I think there was an obligation on the country to increase the sessional indemnity, but I think there was and still is a greater moral obligation to give something further to our returned men than they have yet received.

Fortunately they have a strong and active organization in the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada. The sanity and reasonableness of our returned men generally—I do not speak of a few exceptional cases—is well exemplified by the style of men that they send here as central officers. I believe that some settlement must be made with our returned men that will be satisfactory to the Great War Veterans' Association, and it seems to me that in any settlement the association should be consulted, and an arrangement concluded which will be final and satisfactory.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) when he speaks on this question, seems to think it necessary to make some very offensive remarks to those hon. members who looked on the question of conscription in a different way from what he and I regarded it. I had as much interest as my hon. friend from East Algoma in the conscription issue and I sacrificed quite as much, I thought as he did in my desire to see that the men at the front were supported to the utmost. But I cannot forget that many others who took a different view of the question were just as conscientious and just as much interested as I was. For instance, the hon. gentleman who used to represent a constituency in Quebec—I refer to Mr. Power—opposed conscription as strongly as I supported it. But he had three sons fighting in the battle line. I have no right to say that he was not as sincere in his desire to help the men in the trenches as I was, and neither has the hon. member for East Algoma any right to pass such reflections. The sooner we drop that sort of talk the better it will be for the credit and honour of this House and the country at large.

The hon. member dealt generally with another matter which was more particularly discussed by the hon. member for Centre

Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). It seems that some hon. gentlemen deem it their duty to sling all the mud they can at the United Grain Growers, Limited; but if he and other hon. gentlemen would stop to consider what is influencing certain people to urge hon. members to make these ridiculous charges they would soon drop them unless they were the paid agents of the big interests which have been interfered with by that organization.

Mr. BLAKE: I would like to know what charges the hon. member refers to.

Mr. THOMSON: We are hearing them all the time, and my hon. friend cannot fail to have heard them. I refer to the slurs that have been cast at the United Grain Growers, Limited. Now, what is the offence of that organization? Its offence is that it stepped in when conditions were all wrong, when we believed that we were being robbed on all sides in connection with the marketing of our grain. That organization stepped in and handled the grain business so well and so economically that to-day it has secured a very large portion of the business. No new organization can get the business of the country unless it does that business better than the older organizations did. That is the reason for the success of the United Grain Growers, Limited. I have grown grain long enough to know what the conditions were before we had that organization, and even before we had the Manitoba Grain Act. I have sold first class wheat at 35 cents a bushel, and I have no doubt the middlemen got more out of the transaction than I did. Those conditions have been changed, and the people who used to get those big profits do not get them now, and consequently they are stirring up this terrible row. That is the reason why they are so anxious to get as many hon. members as possible to cast some slurs at the United Grain Growers, Limited. And why do they find fault with the buying and retailing of different kinds of goods by that organization? Simply because the United Grain Growers, Limited are doing that work more cheaply than it was ever done before, and have cut down the profits of the older concerns. The United Grain Growers, Limited, handle farm implements, and some time ago a very good supporter of the present Government, who has been in the implement business for some years, assured me that since the United Grain Growers, Limited, started into the business they have sold implements on less than half the commission that was previously charged. That is where all the trouble comes in, that is the reason of the noise we hear and of the mud we see slung at the United Grain Growers, Limited. Those other people have had to cut down their profits, and naturally they are very much aggrieved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in the past in this House and in the provincial legislature adhered pretty closely to the two party system, in fact, our whole election machinery and procedure is framed to suit the two party system. That we are getting away from that system is plainly seen in the late elections, not only the by-elections for this House but the recent provincial elections. Whether the group system is right or wrong I shall not discuss at the present time, but we have to face the fact that we are departing from the two party system and getting into the group system Therefore, we should frame our election machinery and our procedure for the conduct of the business of this House with a view to the altered conditions, for it would be folly to attempt to ignore the change that is taking place.

I wish to say a word in this connection with regard to proportional representation. It seems to me that we should arrange at as early a day as possible to have the principle of proportional representation adopted in our cities and other congested areas where its application is practicable and desirable. I agree that in the more scattered settlements the adoption of the principle might be difficult, perhaps unsatisfactory, but there is no reason why in our cities and in our more densely populated agricultural areas the principle of proportional representation should not be put into effect. I think that with the adoption of proportional representation the results of contests in cities would undoubtedly be much fairer. We know that our labouring people are becoming very much alive to the political situation; whether we like it or not, it is the fact. We have extremists among our labourers, although they are a very small proportion of the mass, and it seems to me that for our own safety we should see that every opportunity is given to the labouring classes to be properly represented in this House.

Let me take as an illustration the city of Ottawa. It is quite probable that after the next redistribution the city of Ottawa will have three members. I do not know how the city is divided on party lines, but it is quite possible that Government supporters, supporters of the Liberal party, and supporters of the Labour party may be nearly

equal in numbers. Let us suppose that in Ottawa, entitled to three representatives, there should be 38 per cent of one party, 34 of another, and 28 of another. The most reasonable thing would be that each party should have one representative; that would be the only possible way in which you could have the city fairly represented. But it would be quite possible to cut up the city in such a way that instead of one representative being elected for each of the parties, the party 38 per cent strong would get the whole three representatives. That would be quite likely to happen; but would it be fair that 38 per cent of the electors of the city should have three representatives while the other 62 per cent should have no representative at all? I do not propose to deal with that any further at present.

Another question which might very well be taken up in this connection is that of the transferable vote in single constituencies where there are three-cornered contests, or five-cornered contests, as was the case in West Peterborough. It seems to me that the idea of adopting some such principle is worthy of our consideration if we are to legislate in the best interests of the country. It is not well that we should have minority representation to any greater extent than is absolutely necessary.

There is another thing in connection with this change from the two-party system to the group system that has been referred to on different occasions in this House. Under the present system the Government feel that if there is an adverse vote they are, in most cases at any rate, bound to resign. I think it is in the interests of the country that we should make such arrangements for carrying on the business of the House that every member may feel that he is at all times in a position to vote on any question that comes before the House, on its merits. If the majority in the House, voting on a question on its merits, are obliged to vote in opposition to the Government, and at the same time do not wish to defeat the Government, there is no reason why they should not so vote and the Government still remain in office. I merely refer to these things by way of making suggestions; I shall not dwell upon them to any great extent.

With reference to the amendment, I agree with the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), my leader in this group, when he says that the present ministry are not usurpers in the position they take and that their course is constitutional. I cannot agree, however, with my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders), when he intimates that it is inconsistent on the part of the leader of this group to start out with different premises from those adopted by the leader of the Opposition and still arrive at the same conclusion. I do not think my hon. friend was very logical when he made that suggestion; nor do I think he will be logical if he says that I may not start from different premises than those adopted by the leader of the Opposition and still arrive at the same conclusion.

If my hon. friend reviews his own conduct he will find that he has sometimes started from different premises from those upon which some others with whom he was associated were working, and yet arrived at the same conclusion. If my recollection serves me rightly, when we were discussing the amendment to last year's Budget resolutions, my hon. friend, who has very different fiscal ideas, I think, from those held by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), started from very different premises in considering those questions, yet landed in the same place. When you, Mr. Speaker, uttered those magic words: "Call in the members," and my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) went out to rustle his flock, my hon. friend from Macdonald was rustled in along with the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for Brantford. They came in together and they all slipped down into the same berth. The "bairnies all cuddled doon thagither;" there was no kicking at all, no trouble. They started from very different premises; they had very different views as to what the tariff should really be, but they landed in the same place. I do not see, therefore, why my hon. friend should not accord to the hon. member from Marquette and to myself the privilege that he extends to himself. What is fair for one is fair for another.

While I do not look upon the present Administration as usurpers, and while I agree that they may have the confidence of this House—or, at least, it is quite possible that a majority of this House may feel that they are bound to express confidence in them—and I would not question their sincerity in doing so—it seems to me that when any one in this House says that he believes the present Administration enjoys the confidence of the country, he must intend it as a joke. It would be a reflection on the intelligence of any member of this House to say that he be-

lieved anything of the kind, and I do not like to reflect on the intelligence of hon. members. Anyway, the thing is too absurd; it is utterly impossible.

We have heard a good deal about the by-elections. Apparently some supporters of the Government are able to get some rays of comfort out of those by-elections. Well, I have heard of the time when there was a company formed to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, and it seems to me that that would be a more reasonable task and one more likely of accomplishment than for any supporter of the Government to endeavour to get any comfort from any of the by-elections, even the best of them.

Before I deal further with the question of the by-elections, I wish to remark that some of the hon. gentlemen following the lead of the Prime Minister seem to think the Opposition is just as much on trial as the Government is. I never heard of such a doctrine. If we in this group support the amendment, it does not mean that we are voting confidence in the regular Opposition—not for one moment; we are not doing so. The only question before us is whether we have confidence in this Government or not. That is undoubtedly what this amendment means. By voting for or against this amendment we are voting either want of confidence or confidence in the Government; we have no other course open to us. The supporters of the Government seem very anxious to becloud the issue by reference to what has happened to the opposition in the by-elections. That is not the issue; but if it were, I think they will get very little comfort from that, because the odds are tremendously in favour of the Opposition in comparison with the Government. Since the war there have been sixteen by-elections. Four of these seats were formerly held by the Opposition and they still hold them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What constitutionally must happen if the amendment carries?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I have nothing to do with what happens. My duty is to vote on the question before the House in the way in which I believe I should vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without regard to the consequences?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: My right hon. friend is endeavouring to lead me away from what I was at. I have sometimes preached in this House the doctrine which I have preached amongst the people at home and which has been favourably received there, namely, that when any question comes before this House, we must use our best judgment and vote on that question in the way we believe to be right, and let the consequences take care of themselves. When I voted with my right hon. friend on the question of conscription, I had not the slightest idea what the consequences might be. I believed my right hon. friend was right, and I voted with him regardless of the consequences.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend does not object to my interrupting, I should like to follow this out a little further. Does he not think that he and I were agreed as to the consequences then? Does he not think the consequences of a vote enter into the question whether it is right or wrong?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: To a certain extent they do, but not in all cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they do in all cases.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The consequences of this may be that the Prime Minister may resign.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What happens then?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The consequence then may be that we may have a general election which, I think, will be a God-send to the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There must be a Government.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: True.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Therefore, does not a vote for the amendment mean voting that the Opposition should be in instead of this Government?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There must be a Government whether there is an election or not.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: My right hon. friend could, I presume, advise the Governor General to dissolve Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there must be a Government.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: My right hon. friend would look after that. I do not think he is so very touchy, so thin-skinned, that he would not be willing to continue in office for a little while in order to get things straightened up and until the people

could pronounce on the question whether he was to continue or not. Governments, even after they are defeated in the country, always continue to hold office for a short time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a case of being thin-skinned or thick-skinned; it is a case of proper practice. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to support me in a course of that sort?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I am not supporting my right hon. friend anyway, and I do not purpose allowing him to coax me into supporting him unless he changes his views very much on the financial question, the question of the tariff. Many things might happen. It would be the duty of my right hon. friend, not mine, to decide what the consequences would be. He might, if he saw fit, ask for a dissolution of Parliament and carry on the Government, as he should, until after an election took place. He might, if he saw fit, resign. In that event, the Governor General would, I understand, call on some one else whom the right hon. gentleman would suggest. I think the usual practice is for the Governor General to ask the Prime Minister for a suggestion. My right hon. friend understands these things all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I do, but I was trying to lead the hon. gentleman to understand them too, and not to vote heedless of the consequences, and not to say that he is not voting confidence in someone else when he votes want of confidence in this Government.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I am not voting confidence in anyone else when I vote want of confidence in this Government. The course which I have mentioned is open to my right hon: friend, and he knows it is open to him. He might resign and undoubtedly he would be asked to name his successor. He might name anybody he likes, but that is not of my business. The question then would be whether the man he names would undertake to form a Government, and indeed the matter might again come back to my right hon. friend. So many things might happen that I purpose doing my duty and letting the consequences take care of themselves. My right hon. friend drew me off the track, and I will try to get back to it although I do not think he wants me to deal with the subject.

In the four by-elections in constituencies formerly held by the Opposition, the seats are still held by the Opposition, and I think I am right in saying that the Government had so little confidence in themselves and in their popularity

11 p.m. that they did not dare to put up a candidate in any one of those four constituencies. Twelve other seats were vacated which were formerly held by the Government, having been carried in 1917 by most tremendous majorities. Indeed, if providence had hand-picked them for my right hon. friend, he could not have done better. In four of those twelve constituencies newly-appointed ministers were candidates, and any of us who know anything about election matters know that such by-elections are not real tests of public feeling. There is always a disposition to support a newly-appointed Cabinet minister, and that is a very hard thing to overcome. It is very seldom that a newly-appointed Cabinet minister going back to the country for re-election has been defeated. Another thing that hardly ever happens is that the majority by which such a man was elected in the previous election is reduced, and, indeed, I cannot think of many cases where that has happened. I am sure there is no case on record in any civilized country where the majority has been so tremendously reduced as it has in this case.

As regards these four seats, in the 1917 election, one went to the Government by acclamation and the other three were carried by the Government by a gross majority of between 20,000 and 21,000. This is worth considering for a little while, and I invite my right hon. friend to pay attention to it if he wants to know something about consequences, because it is of a very great consequence. In the by-elections, one of those four seats went by acclamation to the Government. I have not been able to get the official figures, but so far as I can gather, the total majority received in the other three by-elections was somewhere around 7,000 or 8,000, so that the majority in those constituencies, where they were electing newly appointed Cabinet ministers, was reduced by about 12,000 or 13,000. Such a thing has never been heard of before in any civilized country in the world. There never has been so clear an indication to any ministry that ever existed that it was not wanted any longer.

But that is not all. Outside of those, there were eight other by-elections in constituencies formerly held by the Government, formerly carried by tremendous majorities or by acclamation. Of these

eight, three were carried in 1917 by the Government by acclamation, in two others the opposition candidate lost his deposit, and in another he came about as near as he could to losing it without actually doing so. He was saved by only a few votes. In another election the constituency was carried by a majority of 2,157. In only one of these constituencies was there anything in the nature of a normal majority, and in that case the Government candidate had a majority of 308. To sum up, in the by-elections the Government won just one solitary seat out of eight, and in that constituency the Government candidate won by acclamation in 1917 and in the by-election the Government candidate only had a moderate majority. What about the others? In one of them the official Opposition candidate won. What about the other six? Why, the other six candidates are sitting right around me here.

Who has the confidence of the country now? How anyone can deceive himself to the extent of making himself imagine that the present Administration has the confidence of the country is something I cannot comprehend. It must be remembered that in three of these by-elections the Government had the advantage of entering a three or five-cornered fight. That meant that the opposition was divided. In West Peterborough, for instance, there was not a candidate in the field, so far as I know, except the Government candidate, who did not pronounce himself on this question of the Government's mandate. All, except the Government candidate, declared that the Government had exhausted its mandate and should go to the country. In that constituency the Government got about one-fourth or one-fifth of the vote, and 75 or 80 per cent of the people pronounced on the very question we are dealing with here, and declared that the Government should go to the country. I apply the same language to this election that I used in the case of constituencies that ministers were contesting, and say that in this whole civilized world there has never been a case where the people showed so clearly and conclusively that they had no confidence in the Government. I challenge any member on the Government side to quote a single case.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE: What about Ireland?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: My hon. friend can go to Ireland if he wants to. I am not going there just now. I prefer Canada.

Mr. BLAKE: They have declared want of confidence in the Government there?

Mr. THOMSON: I believe that what I have said would fully justify anyone in voting for this amendment, but I am not voting on these grounds alone. So far as I am concerned, the pronouncement on the tariff in the speech from the Throne is such that I, with my views, whether they be right or wrong, could not consistently vote for the Government on the question before us. In fairness to myself, and to what I believe to be the views of the majority of my constituents, I could not possibly vote with the Government on this occasion as, to my mind, it would be a vote in support of the fiscal policy of the present Government. Whether I like it or not, I feel that I am compelled to vote for the amendment. I am not satisfied with it in some particulars, but I had nothing to do with its drafting; none of our group had a word to say with regard to it. We have to take the question as it stands, and in view of what I have said I cannot do otherwise than support the amendment.

On the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

Monday, February 28, 1921.

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year 1920, and Regulations of the Canadian Air Force under the provisions of section 5 of the Air Board Act.—Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

COPYRIGHT ACT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 12 respecting copyright. He said:

This is a Bill that has been before the House during the last two session and its object is substantialy to make our law conform to the provisions of the Berne Convention and similar existing laws in other countries.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF GAS AND GAS METERS

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 13 respecting the inspection of gas and gas meters.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, resumed from Friday, February 25.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to join with other speakers in offering congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Secondly, I desire also, in common with other hon. gentlemen, to congratulate the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen) on his elevation to the highest office in the gift of the Canadian people at an age when most men are only entering public life. I do not intend to take up any time in extolling the great abilities or the unrivalled debating powers of the right hon. gentleman. If I desired to do so, if it were my purpose to sing him a pæan of praise, I should need but to take some of the words uttered in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite who, in their courtesy, were practically all of them kind enough to say very flattering things to the leader of the Government. I admit that there was one speaker on the other side, the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), who publicly declined to congratulate the Prime Minister. I am glad, however, looking at the Prime Minister, to observe that so far he has survived that calamity.

Sir, it had not been originally my intention to participate in this debate when it began, but a number of speakers on the other side,—friends of mine at one time, but at the present moment political opponents,—made remarks about some of the Liberal-Unionists which, I felt, required some reply from us. For example, the hon. member for St. James Division of Montreal (Mr. Rinfret) made the statement that we were a group of weak-kneed reformers trailing behind the leader of the Government; and on other occasions other speakers opposite variously designated us as being servile and subservient. Well, Sir, I think that the aspersion of being weak in the knees or of lacking in courage can easily be proven to be not only discourteous but also untrue; for it will be admitted by any fairminded gentlemen that any man who, for a principle, whether that principle be right or wrong, leaves a political party and its leader and joins forces with another party cannot easily be accused of being weak-kneed or of lacking in courage. We all remember that at the beginning of the late war the right hon. John Morley and Mr. John Burns retired from the British Ministry because they did not agree with the Liberal Ministry then in power on the principle that Britain should assist the French in repelling the aggression of the Germans. I do not think that there is any hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who would endorse the motive that actuated them; but at the same time I do not think there is any gentleman on the other side who will assert that those men lacked the courage of their conviction in doing what they did. Well, Sir, the Liberal-Unionists in Canada who took the step they took in 1917 acted on exactly the same principle. They left political friends with whom they had been associated throughout their public careers; they parted company with a leader whom they all respected and admired, and in many cases, my own included, loved; they left that party and that leader on a certain principle. Now, whether that principle was right or wrong may be open to dispute, according to one's views; but certainly the remark that the Liberal-Unionists were weak-kneed in their action cannot be truthfully made. As to being subservient or servile, Mr. Speaker, I may say that since my advent into this House you have occupied the Chair, and I think you will remember that on many occasions hon. gentlemen on this side attacked the Government, and their attacks were of such frequent occurrence that my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) dubbed them family quarrels; and I remember quite well that some sections of the press described them as sniping from behind. On many occasions that occurred, and it can truthfully be said that a very large proportion of hon. members on this side of the House have at one time or another attacked the Government and voted against their leaders, myself included in the latter

category of conduct. Even that gentleman who is reputed to be the High Priest of Protection in this party, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) on one occasion voted against his leader. Mr. Speaker, if you will look back I do not think you can find any occasion on which my hon. friends on the other side attacked their leader, either the present incumbent of the office or his predecessor. I do not remember an occasion on which the hon. members on the other side voted against their leader, with the exception of that occasion on which the late member for St. James (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) and the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) voted against their leader on the Budget. Of course, last year the indemnity question was the occasion of a free-for-all; and the leader of the opposition took whatever stand he deemed best and his followers voted differently from him. We on this side, Mr. Speaker, have been neither servile nor subservient. On the contrary,— and I say this with no ill intent— if you will look back a little and view fairly the past conduct of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I think you will conclude that subservience and servility have never been characteristic of hon. gentlemen on this side.

On another occasion in this debate one hon. member—I will not give his name—a gentleman whom I respect highly, but whose views I do not endorse, made the statement that the Liberal-Unionists here at the present time had none of the attributes of Liberalism. Well, Sir, there was a time fifty or seventy-five or a hundred years ago, when the terms: 'Liberal" and "Conservative" in Great Britain, whence they came, did signify a great deal of difference in their outlook upon the life of the nation. The word "Tory" for example, was supposed to mean—and I believe did mean perhaps a hundred years ago—that that party was fighting for the interest of the king and the aristocracy, or the classes as they were dubbed; and the Liberal was fighting for the masses. But, Sir, to-day the questions that divide political parties in England are such questions as the tariff, the treatment of Ireland, and Imperialism —those are the questions that the two political parties in England divide upon to-day. I do not think those differences ever did exist in Canada for though an aristocracy exists in England we never had one in this country. We are all working, so far as we can, for the good of the country as a whole; and while the Liberals and the Conservatives in this country take their names from the British political parties they have paid very little attention to the question of fighting for the divine right of kings, or the rights of the aristocracy, so far as my historical reading permits me to say. The other day I read a speech by the Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman who was Liberal premier of Great Britain from, I think, 1904 to 1908, and may say I had the pleasure of being in Scotland when he was elected. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman having been Prime Minister and the leader of Liberalism in the British Parliament is an authority on Liberalism that can hardly be disputed. The speech to which I have reference was delivered nearly twenty years ago but I presume traditions and principles continue in effect. In making what he called a declaration of Liberal principles he dealt with the Irish question, with Imperialism, with Egypt and the Sudan, and with relations with Russia. These were questions which our political parties in Canada were not arguing very much about. Then Sir Henry spoke about matters of domestic policy, and the three subjects to which he paid special attention were old age pensions, better housing, and extending the suffrage. These are three policies which our party on this side have either dealt with or are supporting in the speech from the Trone, and on practically none of the policies he spoke of are we at variance.

Then, Sir, I was reading the other day Winston Churchill's life of his father. At the time of writing Winston Churchill was a Liberal. He had never even crossed the floor of the House to support any other party, he was a bona fide Liberal. Speaking of the Liberal split on the Irish question in 1887 he says:

> The Liberal Unionists denied that they had severed themselves from the principles and traditions of Liberalism,—and there is no doubt that they were perfectly honest. They were not conscious of any abandonment of principle. They remained in political opinion on all great questions exactly where they had been. . . . But in fact, one change had taken place of more practical importance than all the symbols of party, and counting more in political warfare than any change of principles, however sudden or sweeping,—they had changed sides.

Ah, Sir, that is the political crime par excellence. But one is forced to ask if political principles are a matter of House of Commons geography.

Well, Sir, in Canada the same conditions to my mind have prevailed. I am perfectly

honest in this statement and open to the correction of other hon. gentlemen, but I have failed to get that correction on many different occasions. I believe that in regard to most principles it is a matter of tradition, something of the past rather than something of the present. I believe in the past it has been pretty much the case of the "ins" and the "outs". The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said the other day that the Tories look down on the people and the Liberals look up to them. I presume my hon. friend would himself admit that is pretty much of a platitude. It may have been true fifty years ago but I doubt whether there is very much truth in his statement to-day.

Hon. gentlemen opposite claim for themselves that they are a low-tariff party. This question has been sifted and debated to a certain extent in this House, but I have a few figures here—I will be very brief in their recital—which may help to settle their claim in that regard. The figures were given to me by the Chief Statistical Officer of the Customs Department, and I do not think there is any question about them. They are taken from the Trade and Commerce Report showing the average ad valorem rate of duty on total imports from 1878 up to 1919, and he has brought them up to date.

Between 1878 and 1896, before Sir Wilfrid Laurier's party came into power, the average ad valorem rate of duty from 18 per cent up to 22 per cent. From 1896 to 1911, the average ad valorem rate of duty ran from 16 per cent to 19 per cent. For the calendar year 1920—that is from January 1, 1920, to January 1 following—they were only from 15 per cent to 19 per cent. What is still more striking, the war tax was taken off May 19, 1920, and from June 1, 1920, to January 31, of this year, which forms the past eight months, the rate was 13.16 per cent, or nearly three points lower than it was during any year of the Liberal regime from 1896 to 1911. If the low tariff party is the Liberal party these figures would indicate that my friends here are the Liberals and the Conservatives are opposite. But, Sir, I believe that both parties, Liberal and Conservative, have been worshiping merely names. To illustrate how little it takes to make a plank of a political platform I am going to quote from a book entitled Public Men and Public Life in Canada, by Hon. James Young, published in 1912. Mr. Young in his work discusses the reasons why the two political parties of that time came to take their positions on the tariff in 1876. He says that Hon. R. J. Cartwright on February 25, delivered the Budget speech. It was expected he would advise a moderate increase in the tariff, but he did not. The author of this book says:

> Sir John Macdonald and the Honourable Charles Tupper did not disguise their surprise at the Government's action. The latter had to reply to the Finance Minister, but Sir John at a later stage admitted his own surprise. "I came, I confess it, to hear his (Mr. Cartwright's) speech, impressed with the idea that he was going to bring down an alteration of the tariff." According to current report, the Honourable Charles Tupper came to the House loaded up to denounce an increase of the tariff, and to dilate—as he had done before—on the danger of permitting an entrance to the thin end of the protectionist wedge. Such an unexpected change in the situation would have appalled many another man. But in debate, nothing could appal Sir Charles. As usual he rose equal to the occasion. With surprising coolness he turned his guns, took up the opposite line of attack, and probably made a more forcible and effective criticism of the Government's course than if he had been able to use the mental ammunition which he had specially prepared for the occasion.

And he goes on to tell the following incident:—

> When Dr. Tupper concluded his speech about half-past ten o'clock, and shortly before the House adjourned, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie went across the Chamber to the front of the doctor's desk and the two doughty antagonists—the heroes of so many political battles—indulged in what seemed to the onlookers a very friendly and amusing conversation, which at times seemed to verge a little too near the hilarious for a legislative body with the Speaker still in the Chair.

Mackenzie returned, and stopping in front of hon. Mr. Young's chair, he said:

> "What do you think Tupper has just told me?"
>
> "I have no idea," I replied.
>
> "Well," continued Mr. Mackenzie, "I went over to banter him a little on his speech, which I jokingly alleged was a capital one considering he had been loaded up on the other side. He regarded this as a good joke, and frankly admitted to me that he had entered the House under the belief that the Government intended to raise the tariff, and fully prepared to take up the opposite line of attack."

And Mr. Young concludes:

> What the Liberal and Conservative parties did that night, however, was pregnant with importance. They were making history. Had Mr. Mackenzie increased the tariff, the Conservatives would probably have become, as already suggested—the Free Traders instead of the Protectionists of Canada, and our political history would have been quite different during the ensuing twenty years.

Sir Richard Cartwright in his reminiscences confirms this incident, and at page 156, says that up to 1876 it was more than doubtful what policy the Conservatives

would adopt with regard to protection, and apparently the same was true of the Liberals. It may be worth while reminding the House again that it was Sir Robert Peel, a Conservative Premier, and the Conservative party, that brought free-trade into England in 1846. In this House there is a low-tariff party, or a no-tariff party, at the other end of the Chamber, the Farmer or Agrarian party. I must admit that on the other side of the House among the Liberals there are two hon. members who have been out-and-out free traders, my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), and my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). Both are equally strong free traders but I notice that my hon. friend from Brome has lately been soft-pedalling his utterances. I found myself wondering if the hon. member was changing his viewpoint, or whether it was the same sort of subserviency to party with which he is so fond of twitting us.

Then, in his recently delivered speech, the hon. member for Brome repeated Edmund Burke's definition of what he considered was a political party, namely, a group of men banded together to forward the same principles or policies which they hold in common. The hon. member continued commenting on that and said that any man who did not agree with the party with which he was allied had no right to belong to that party. I absolutely agree with him. But I thought, Sir, of asking him, what about himself? The other day he was rather prone to gibe the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Spinney) upon exactly this lack of agreement with his party which applies so well to the hon. member for Brome, and I could not help thinking that no humour is so funny as unconscious humour. Listening to the hon. member one might easily conclude that the stream of Liberalism had its source in the county of Brome, but, if so, his party has not followed him along the banks of that stream. And, as far as the other traditions of both the old parties go, to my mind they could be spoken of in very much the same manner as I have spoken of those which I have discussed. Therefore it seems to me—and I say it with all sincerity—that the logical and proper course for my hon. friends on the other side would be to follow the same leader as I am following in carrying out the policy which is for the benefit of the industrial and agricultural interests of Canada as a whole, but more particularly for the industrial and agricultural interests of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Sir, no one will disagree with me when I say that the agricultural and industrial interests of these two provinces are absolutely similar. I admit that in the past there have been some cries of race and creed, perhaps from both sides of the House, but I do not think that any hon. gentleman on the other side will ever accuse me of having fostered by action or word any cry of race or creed. On that point I believe sincerely that the proper course for the province of Quebec to take would be to support the right hon. the leader of this Government and to co-operate in carrying out those policies and principles which are to the advantage of the agricultural and industrial interests of the Dominion.

I see my hon. friend from East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe) smiling. Well, I do not suppose that any words of mine will have the effect of making my hon. friends on the other side rush across to this side of the House; but at the same time I am saying what I sincerely believe to be correct, and what I think in their hearts a great many of my hon. friends on the other side also believe to be correct.

The usual reason given for an hon. member crossing the floor of the House is that he differs from his party in regard to some great principle or policy. That being so, will my hon. friend from Brome tell me, on what great principle or policy do I differ from my associates on this side of the House? I do not know, and, if I may judge by a great deal of criticisms levelled at the right hon. the Prime Minister, I do not think that most of my hon. friends on the other side of the House really differ with him on any great principle or policy. As a matter of fact, Sir, the majority of the Liberal Unionists still support the party they were elected to support in 1917, because, after all, while the leaders have changed, I admit frankly that there is a continuation of the same party.

My hon. friends on the other side of the House have a habit of saying that the Government and the members behind the Government have no mandate to remain in this House. I will admit that possibly there may be some truth in that; but when they argue that we should cross the floor of the House, I would like to ask, who gave me a mandate to get behind the hon. the leader of the Opposition? He was defeated—I say this with the utmost respect, for I do not wish to offend him—he was defeated in

1917, this Government was elected in the general election of that year, and I was elected behind it. What excuse could I offer to the Liberals and the Conservatives who stood behind me in my constituency if I went before them after crossing the floor of the House? I can understand an hon. member doing as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) did, because he, I believe sincerely, stated that he obligated himself to withdraw. Well, Sir, I do not admit that I obligated myself to withdraw, and I wish to state that never in the election in my constituency was the question of how long I was being elected for discussed; and I venture to say further that I believe that in ninety per cent of the constituencies that question was not brought up. Another point that is worth considering is that this Government or its predecessor was elected by the most overwhelming majority ever given a Government in this country. Supposing that all the allegations regarding the overseas vote are true, the Government was elected in this country. I was elected by something like 2,500 majority, and I got another thousand votes from overseas which I did not need. My old friend the late James Conmee, who sat on the Liberal side for many years, was satisfied with a majority of 300 or 400. It is charged that we were elected only for the duration of the war, but, I repeat, Sir, that on no occasion in my constituency was that question brought up. I believe that the vast majority of the Liberals, Conservatives, Farmers and Laborites and soldiers who were behind me in 1917 are behind me still.

In discussing last year the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that the Government should go to the country, I said that if after the session the Government should look into the question and find that a majority of the people wanted an election, they should go to the country. I think that still, Sir. But, apparently the Government have looked into the question and have come to the conclusion that while the demand for an election may be widely spread it is rather thinly spread, and personally I agree with them in that conclusion. In pointing that out I would like to direct the attention of my hon. friends of the Opposition that the prejudices of the right hon. the leader of the Government are no greater against an election than are the prejudices of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for an election. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not fear an election now or at any other time, but I do not see why any noisy declarations from any group should have any undue weight with those who do not agree with them. It is only the man who has no strength of character of his own who permits all the changing breezes of public sentiment to sway him to and fro like a weather-cock.

In the speeches of my hon. friends opposite there have been practically no criticisms of the right hon. the Prime Minister and his Government or his policies, principles or legislation. That appears to me to be quite a compliment to him and to his Government. I admit that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has claimed that the Government are usurpers. Well, I will admit they are usurpers in the mind of the Opposition, because any Government that ever occupied the treasury benches of this House were usurpers in the minds of the Opposition. Every Opposition knows that, and every Opposition knows that if fair play had been used in the election only the Opposition would have been returned to power. So there is nothing particularly strange in that point of view.

There were some personal criticisms of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, and the reason I take them up is not because he needs my help, because I have noticed that he is always quite capable of defending himself, but a spirit of fair play prompts me to refer to them. My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) is a man whom I admire very much and for whose breadth of view I have a great deal of respect. Like myself my hon. friend usually boasts that he does not raise the cry of race or creed, and I think he is sincere in that boast. I do not wish to be unfair in my criticism, but I think my hon. friend was not quite fair as he went on. He said that the right hon. the leader of the Government had denied that he had spoken against the people or the province of Quebec, and had defied any member of the Opposition to quote any speeches of his which will warrant that description. My hon. friend from Beauce said that actions speak louder than words, and he proceeded to name a number of commissions upon which he said there were no French members: The Canadian National Railway Board, the International Joint Waterways Commission, the Pensions Board, Board of Commerce, and the three gentlemen who represented Canada at the Peace Conference, and those later who attended the first meeting of the Assembly of the League of

Nations. He failed to mention the Dominion Railway Commission and Civil Service Commission, upon which there are French members, but, of course, to make a reference to those would not agree with his argument. However, of the six commissions or bodies which my hon. friend from Beauce mentioned, only one was appointed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, so that my hon. friend, in proving that actions speak louder than words, uses somebody else's actions as the basis for the laying of a charge against the Prime Minister. The representatives that were appointed by my right hon. friend, were the representatives to the Assembly of the League of Nations, held lately, and while I admit—and I am sorry for it—that there were no French Canadians on that representation, the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty), who was a member of the delegation, is a gentleman from Montreal who speaks French and can claim, I think, to be a good friend of the French Canadian people.

Another point I would like to mention is this: my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) recently appointed a new judge to the Supreme Court of Canada. For some years, I believe, there had been only one French-Canadian judge on that body, but my right hon. friend very recently appointed Mr. Mignault to a vacant judgeship there. I understand that it is some years since two French Canadian judges sat on the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada. I simply point this out as a small matter, but one which, after all, shows no such hatred of the French Canadian people as has been charged against the Prime Minister by some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Then, the member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault), made the charge against the right hon. leader of the Government that he was making love to the province of Quebec without a mandate. Well, Sir, making love is an old and much respected custom. I have known our French Canadian friends for many years, and if I may judge by that knowledge and by the natural increase in the population down there I should think that love-making is not such an unpopular pastime as might be inferred from the remarks of my hon. friend. However, Sir, what is the crime? Even supposing my right hon. friend is making love to the province of Quebec, in what respect is it a crime to attempt to bring about a better feeling of friendship between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario and the rest of Canada? The old charge was that my right hon. friend and his associates were trying to isolate the province of Quebec; now it is the reverse, so that one is forced to the conclusion that politics plays ducks and drakes with consistency and logic.

Why, Sir, are these vicious attacks being made on the Prime Minister on the ground of his alleged hatred for Quebec? What has the Prime Minister done? Is it because he, on behalf of the Government of which he was a member, piloted through this House a certain amount of unpopular legislation? In this connection it is worth remembering that, after all, he was only a member of that Government; he was not the Government itself. I am sincere in this; I would like to know what it is that my right hon. friend has done. In what respect has he showed that hatred for the province of Quebec which is attributed to him? Was it the Military Service Act? I do not know, but I sometimes have a suspicion that perhaps it was the Military Service Act. Well, if that is the case, I have only this to say: the Military Service Act did not particularly specify French Canadians as against English-speaking Canadians; it was an Act for the whole of Canada. That being the case, and if the suspicion is correct that it is the Military Service Act which the Opposition hold against my hon. friend, then why do hon. gentlemen opposite not hold it also against the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding); against the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar); against the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), and against all the other gentlemen who have joined my hon. friends on the other side of the House—against, indeed, all those Liberals who came in in 1917 and supported that Act? Sir, I find it difficult to understand the attitude that repels friendly advances and is angered by them; that fosters antagonism and strife; that prefers the gauntlet of battle to the hand of friendship and co-operation in a common cause.

I believe that the sane element in this country to-day do not desire an election, having regard to the unsettled conditions which it would cause, and to the turmoil, uncertainty, and business disturbances which would prevail. And why should they desire an election? This Government and its predecessor brought in a great deal of legislation, which, to my mind, was of a wise and sane character. Let us look at it for a moment—and these are only a few instances which have occurred to me in jotting down these notes. The Government

carried on Canada's part in the war. There may be some criticism of details in that regard, but on the whole I think the people of Canada feel that our part in the war was carried on creditably and courageously. Then, Sir, after that they brought about demobilization in a very able manner. They adopted measures of soldiers' civil re-establishment, and a soldier land settlement scheme that was looked upon by many people as a standard for adoption by many other countries. They have brought in a life insurance scheme for soldiers and a pension system which involves a higher pension scale than that of any other country. They established a Department of Health, and in the speech from the Throne this year they mention the establishment of a Department of Scientific Research. They gave the franchise to women and brought in a Franchise Act which fair-minded people look upon as a very high type of law. They brought Canada through the war from a financial standpoint in such a capable manner that Canada, with the possible exception of the United States, is to-day in a better financial position than any other country that took part in the war. They put on an income tax something which had been talked of on both sides of politics for a long time, but upon which action was never taken until an income tax system was established by the preceding Government. Finally, Sir, they insist and have insisted on Canada taking its place as a nation in the galaxy of the nations of the empire. That, Sir, is laughed at by some of my friends opposite. Well, as a man who is the same type of Canadian as they are, I am proud of the things which have been done to show that Canada is really taking the part of a nation within the Empire. I confess that even as a young boy I used to experience a feeling of disgust when I read of international conferences where Canada did not even have the status of the little negro republics of Central America. I am proud of the fact that at the Peace Conference there were representatives to speak for Canada. The member for Shelburne and Queen's—I say it with the utmost respect, for I have a very great respect for the hon. gentleman—rather made fun of that, and was cheered by his friends on the other side when he did so. Personally I do not understand that attitude.

Then, the appointment of an ambassador from Canada to the United States is certainly a lead towards a high class of Canadianism. Then, there is the matter of the appointment of Canada's representatives at the League of Nations. Should we have been represented by gentlemen from across the water, even if they did come from England? I do not believe so; I like to have the Canadian people speak for themselves. I was proud to read in the press the statement,—I think it was made by Mr. Rowell, one of the representatives at the recent Conference—that the Canadian people handled their own affairs and did not permit any country, even England, to interfere with their domestic policies. I think everybody should be proud of that. All these things —which have been laughed at by hon. gentlemen opposite, largely, I suppose, from the political standpoint—tend to the building up of the right type of Canadianism,—a type of Canadianism which looks after itself.

The member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault) got a great round of applause because he said he stood out for Canada and was always thinking of Canada first. Why, Sir, that is what this Government and its predecessor have been doing all the time. I venture to say that every hon. gentleman on this side agrees with the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères that Canada should come first in Canada's policy. Well, looking over that line of legislation, I ask hon. gentlemen whether it is a type of legislation in respect of which the Government need blush? Is that the type of legislation that this Government should be punished for having put into force in this country? I do not think so.

I was asking why the people should ask for an election. Why should the people of this country demand an election? I gave the first answer—because of wise and sane legislation. The second is that there have been no charges of graft against the ministers of this Government. And the third is that the country generally is prosperous. It is true that there is a certain amount of unemployment, but I made it my business the other day to make inquiries of officials of the Labour Department and I was informed by them that Canada is in no worse position from the unemployment standpoint than it has been in at other times when there have been depressions throughout the country. Indeed, it was pointed out—and I would like to give the Minister of Labour credit for this on the floor of the House—that it had not been the practice to keep any statistics relating to unemployment, but as soon as the Minister of Labour came in he started to keep such statistics; and it is the opinion of the depart-

ment that conditions are no worse now than they had been at other times of depression throughout the country. I wish to give all credit to the Minister of Labour, because, after all, this is another piece of work which is to his credit and to that of the Government.

Finally, I wish to point out that social conditions in Canada are better than social conditions in any other country in the world, with the possible exception of the United States. Let us look at the situation throughout the world. China, although she took no part in the Great War, has 30,000,000 people starving. In Russia Bolshevism reigns supreme. Germany is in a chaotic condition. The Republics of southern Europe are either at war or talking of war. Great Britain has the Irish question, and also unemployment, which is so severe that the British Prime Minister proposed that the unemployed of Great Britain should emigrate to the colonies. Therefore, conditions in all these countries are very much worse than in Canada, because we have little unemployment as compared with unemployment in those other countries, and general conditions in Canada are good.

There is nothing unusual in the Opposition demanding an election; indeed, that is a normal condition; it would not be an Opposition unless it was demanding an election. But the sane voice of Canada is satisfied that there is no particular hurry for an election. Honest men may differ about that, but that is my opinion.

What problem of Canada would be helped by an election at the present time? What are Canada's problems? Let me name a few of them. There is the problem of finance, of raising $400,000,000 annually to pay the vast interest charges upon our national debt, to run the Government, and to pay pension charges. Will a general election help to pay those charges? I do not think so. Second there is the great railway problem. We have in this country 40,000 miles of railway, over one-half of which is owned by the Government. Some people say that Canada is fifty years ahead of its time in railway building, but I will say twenty years. Will a general election solve that problem? I do not know that it will. Then, we have the problem of the need of selected immigration to cut down our debt and to people the millions of fertile acres we possess. Will a general election help to bring these people into the country? The next problem is that of unemployment. Will a general election lessen unemployment? I think any business man in this country will admit that a general election will increase unemployment. Then there is the question of unrest. Will a general election relieve that? I can almost hear my hon. friends say that it will, and, indeed, a number of them have so stated. But Great Britain has had a general election, and the British Prime Minister has suggested that the unemployed emigrate to the colonies. Germany, France, Italy, Greece have had elections, and there are conditions of unrest in those countries. Are the conditions of unrest there better or less marked than in Canada? They are worse. As I have said, social conditions in Canada are better than social conditions in any other country in the world. There is finally the question of the cost of living. Will a general election lower that cost? I see no reason why it will have any effect on the cost of living. In conclusion, taking all these circumstances into account, I have no hesitation in supporting my right hon. leader and in opposing the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address on the admirable way in which they have discharged their duties. I did not have the privilege of listening to the speeches of those hon. gentleman, but I have read them with a great deal of interest. I wish especially, on this occasion, to be permitted to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on his promotion as head of the Government and leader of the party. My right hon. friend, if I remember rightly, came to this House in 1908, and for the last thirteen years I have had the honour of being one of his colleagues in this House. While there have been occasions on which we differed on questions of policy, I have great respect for him personally and great admiration for his ability as a parliamentarian. My right hon. friend has always been courteous to members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition and willing to listen to what they have to say. Let us hope that these good relations will continue. The necessity of reaching a wise conclusion on all questions that come before us should inspire all parties in this House to work together and to be tolerant of one another's views. I take it to be the duty of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to assist the Government whenever they are satisfied that the Government is right. You know, Mr. Speaker, how satisfactory it is

to us on this side, when the Government does anything of which we can cordially approve. That does not, however, mean that the Opposition is to abandon criticism, because an Opposition that abandons criticism abandons its duty. Parliament is a place for plain speaking. A vigilant and efficient parliamentary critic is, a man who will not knowingly say anything that is false and who will not fear to say anything that is true. If an opening appears in the armour of the Government, a good soldier on this side would be expected to strike, provided always that the opening is above the belt. The selection of my right hon. friend as leader has rallied the old Liberal-Conservative party under a new name, and has revived the old battle cry of "Protection". Unionism is dead, and there are very few mourners going about the streets. The old Liberal-Conservative party is on deck again under a new name. During my life-time this party has changed its name about as often as Henry VIII changed his wives—first Tory, then Conservative, next Confederation, then Liberal-Conservative, then Unionist, and now National Liberal and Conservative. But it is the same old party and the policy is substantially the same old policy. The Ethiopian has not changed his skin and the spots of the leopard are easily detected. The old Liberal-Conservative party stood for a high protective tariff; this party does the same. The old party stood for a partisan franchise; this party does likewise. The old party spent in excess of its income; there is no evidence of a change of heart in that respect. The old party promised ports and drydocks and dredging in order to elect Cabinet ministers; it took the promise of port improvements to pave the way for the election of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton); it required the construction of a drydock costing millions to elect the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), and the largest and most powerful suction dredge in the world had to be imported from the United States and actually put to work, pumping mud in Courtenay bay under full steam, to elect the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore). There is now no pretense that any man of Liberal views can any longer support this administration. Shakespeare says that "Misery makes strange bedfellows." So does politics. One would have thought, a few years ago, that a proposal to fuse together permanently the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and the hon. member for Yarmouth and Clare (Mr. Spinney) in the same political party with the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) would be nothing short of flying in the face of the Scriptures by putting new wine into old bottles. But this has actually taken place and nothing serious has happened. The wine may be weak, I do not profess to know, but all I can say is that so far the bottles have not burst. There have been numerous changes in the Cabinet, to which reference has already been made, but that has become the custom. Ever since 1917 the Cabinet has continued to change like a kaleidoscope. It has evidently ceased to have any elements of stability and has become a place where men go in and out to find pasture. Some years ago there was a celebrated cabinet change in these provinces, known as the "double shuffle," but since 1917 we have had what will be known in the future political history of this country as the perpetual Cabinet shuffle.

The financial condition of the country will be discussed when the Budget is brought down, and I trust that the Budget may not be too long delayed. May I also express the hope that detailed information will be given regarding the expenditure of $121,000,000 for which no vouchers were available last year, and further, that the Government will this year respect the provisions of the Audit Act which they violated last year and the year before, and see that the Auditor General's report in complete form is laid on the table of the House within fifteen days of the opening of the session. The sooner Parliament is made acquainted with the facts, the better.

There are rumours of another enormous railway deficit, there are also rumours of new methods of taxation to be proposed; but from no Government source have we any concrete proposal looking towards retrenchment or economy. I would like to hear that the Minister of Finance is doing some concentrated thinking on this question of economy, but economy seems to be a lost art with this Government. I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), who I am sorry is not now in his seat, that the people of this country are wide awake. They are not ignorant of the waste that is going on. They are not ignorant of the lack of efficiency and business ability on the part

of this Government. They have known what it has cost in good money and bad service for this Government to assume control of 20,000 miles of railway. The high freights and the big deficits tell their own story. The people have been taking notice. They have seen the civil servants increase like the army worm, and the public debt grow like rolling up a snowball.

If you would like me to make some practical suggestions in the direction of economy I am willing to do so. Here are a few modest proposals. Reduce the force of the Northwest Mounted Police and confine their operations to the unorganized territories and the Yukon, and thereby save a very large sum of money every year. Cut down the army and navy expenditure. Reduce the cost of administration. Reduce the number of portfolios. Practice economy in every department of Government. Stop squandering money on ships that are not required. Make economy the watchward. Establish a blacklist in which the names of all the wasters in the public service will be recorded. Reduce the present army of civil servants and stop making further appointments except where absolutely necessary. No more dredging in Courtenay bay. No more play grounds in Toronto harbour. No more elevators at Halifax until the grain trade of the port will warrant the expenditure. No more drill halls anywhere. No more political dry docks in British Columbia. No more News Bureau in New York or anywhere else, costing $30,000 a year to puff the Government and write headlines about eminent mediocrities. No more Griffinhagens at $10,000 a month to struggle with the hopeless task of reforming the Civil Service for a Government that does not seem to want reformation. Give the farmers, fishermen and other producers a chance. Do not spend too much time listening to the clamour of the Manufacturers' Association. Be vigilant in the collection of the income tax and see that no wealthy shirker escapes. Let the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance adopt these suggestions and they will earn the gratitude of the people of this country, and it will not be necessary for them to come before Parliament with deficits or with new methods of taxation to harass the people.

Mr. Speaker, if we could bargain with the Government to pay them by results, we would save an enormous sum of money.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

One proposal, and to my mind a practical one, is that we should ration this Government. Their late leader when in Opposition stated that an expenditure of $85,000,000 on all ordinary services was so enormous a sum as to be in itself evidence of corruption. When he made that statement he was loudly cheered by his supporters, many of whom are still in the house supporting the present Administration. The expenditure arising out of the war must, of course, be provided for; I am not now referring to war expenditure; but instead of voting $230,000,000 for ordinary expenditure on Consolidated Revenue account apart from the war, suppose we take hon. gentlemen opposite at their word and confine them strictly to the $85,000,000 that their late leader said was altogether too much, and then let them cut their coat according to their cloth.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister during the recess had been making speeches in Ontario and the West. One speech in particular has been brought to my attention. It was delivered in the county of Hastings, and in that speech he undertook to divide the people of this country into two classes. He is reported as follows:

> I see only two classes, only two divisions, in the country. On the one side are those who hold their heads steady and walk firmly and erectly in the midle of the road, who learn from experience, who believe in industry, order and liberty, who still have faith in British institutions and principles, that have made us what we are to-day. And on the other side I see those who have surrendered to prejudice and class consciousness, to passion for change and experiment, whose minds are occupied in nurturing suspicion and hostility against other classes of the State. On the one side I see the builders of this country's foundations tried and true. On the other side those engaged in the cheerful occupation of tearing down. I put the question to you. Are you going to be a nation-builder, or a nation-wrecker?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was certainly complimentary to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Our minds "occupied in nurturing suspicion and hostility against other classes in the States." Surely we are not so bad as that. I fear my right hon. friend has been looking at us through such distorted party spectacles that he has failed to see our good points. He divides the people into two classes: the nation-builders and the nation-wreckers. The nation-builders, I suppose, are the men who follow him and do his bidding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those who do, and those who ought to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are very few of the latter.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): And the wreckers, I suppose, are those who venture to oppose him. The "wreckers" are the men who stand for freeing the necessaries of life and the implements of production from their present burdens, who stand for a 50 per cent preference to Great Britain, reciprocity on natural products with the United States, honest government, a free Parliament, economy in administration, a decent franchise, and recognition of the rights of labour.

Mr. Speaker, there was once a King in England, by the name of Charles the First, who believed in the high Tory principles of my right hon. friend. He would tolerate no change and no reform. He, too, held his head high, and he occupied so much space in the middle of the road that the common people were crowded into the gutter. In the end, the people of England found it necessary, in order to save themselves and to save the State, to chop off his head.

Now, Sir, I hope nothing of that kind, except in a figurative sense, will ever happen to my right hon. friend. These "wreckers," the Cromwells and the Hampdens and the Pyms and the Elliotts at once were transformed into nation builders; and, history now asserts that they were the genuine nation builders. Mr. Speaker, you cannot build a nation out of sugar magnates and pork barons and profiteers, or even out of the Manufacturers' Association. Nor can you build a nation by substituting secret Orders in Council for Acts of Parliament and ignoring the rights of the common people and elevating protection into a dogma. Just think of a man talking about British principles of justice who was the author of the War-time Elections Act! Our representative system in this country is based on the franchise. If the franchise can be manipulated for partisan purposes, then the system is rotten at its very core. This proposition will be accepted by every honest man, that absolute fairness in the use of the ballot is the only safety and the first requisite of a decent democracy. When we think of the flagrant injustice of the Franchise Act of last session, by which tens of thousands of partisan enumerators at every election are to be selected by the Government, under the vicious methods of the old partisan system, to strike the jury to try themselves, the less said about principles of justice the better. We had examples of this brand of justice in the by-elections during the recess, in which the dice were so heavily loaded that resistance was futile. The mode of procedure is something like this: His Honour the Speaker issues a writ for a by-election, and the minister of elections then gets busy. The general returning officer is instructed to select his deputy, whose chief qualification is that he must be a partisan of the Government. The sheriff is passed over, because, being a responsible public official, he cannot be depended upon to serve the ends of the party. The result is that the general returning officer, not being acquainted in the riding, is practically forced to accept the recommendation of the Government candidate. The deputy returning Officer, himself a partisan, forthwith appoints one hundred additional partisans, one for each polling sub-division in the riding, and they in turn call in scores of other partisan heelers to assist; and among the whole force there is not a single representative of the Opposition. The result is a partisan list of the most approved type. Patronage, we are told, has been abolished; but this system is built from top to bottom of patronage and partisanship. It begins at the top and works downwards. It reminds one of the method in the old nursery rhyme in which the cat began to kill the rat, and the rat began to gnaw the rope, the rope began to beat the dog, and the dog began to bite the pig, so with the help of them all the old woman and her pig got safely over the stile. The strange thing about it is that the men who invented this system and made it a law of the country pose as champions of British justice and British fair-play. Hon. gentlemen in their speeches during the recess, have persisted in calling us on this side the remnant of a once great party. May I suggest that they look for a moment at their own decimated ranks? The holders of Cabinet positions in the present Administration do not claim to represent the once powerful Union party nor even the old Liberal-Conservative party. As a matter of fact, they have no mandate from any party, but, if I may be permitted to use the language of our mutual friend, Mr. Hampden Burnham, they are simply Mexican buccaneers who have seized the treasury and are clinging to office on the record of the old Union government. It will not be denied that the men of standing and influence have withdrawn themselves from this Government—in Nova Scotia, the men that gave respectability to the Government, were the late Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and Hon. A. K. Maclean; in New Brunswick, Hon. Frank Carvell; in Ontario, the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr.

Mewburn), the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White), the hon. and gallant member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell); in the Prairie Provinces, the present leader of the Farmers' party (Mr. Crerar); and in British Columbia (Mr. Burrell). These gentlemen have all withdrawn from the Government. By far the strongest and most influential half of the Union Cabinet has deserted the bridge and refused any longer to be responsible for steering the ship. The remnant, to use the expression hon. gentlemen opposite apply to us, still remain. They never had the confidence of the country and appear to have lost the confidence of a great many of their own associates. Still, hon. gentlemen opposite persist in describing us on this side as a "remnant."

I have said that the tariff issue is again being forced to the front: It is quite obvious, if we are to judge by the Government press, that a determined effort is to be made to confuse and becloud that issue. It is not at the present time an issue between free trade on the one hand and protection on the other; there is no such conflict. The speeches of my right hon. friend were directed against a situation that does not exist. The issue is between a tariff framed with a special eye to the demands, or rather the commands, of powerful special interests and a tariff whose object will be to secure the required amount of revenue with the least possible burden on the tax-bearer. I am well aware that this question of the tariff is one of difficulty on which honest men differ. The principles underlying the doctrine of a tariff for revenue are right principles. The right does not always win, but I have an abiding faith that the right will win in the end. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right in his naval policy, as he was also right in reciprocity. In both cases, however, he lost; but he has already been vindicated, and time has proven that he saw further into the future than the noisy flag-flappers and demagogues who opposed him. The flag, Mr. Speaker, is a powerful political weapon when men are prosperous as they were in 1911; but when the flour barrel is empty and the snow is on the ground, and the head of the house is out of work, there is not much comfort in hoisting the old flag on the school-house. The purpose of a tariff should be to secure revenue for the state, and not to put money into the pockets of special interests. Public opinion will demand that our taxation policy be framed with an eye to its effect on the great mass of the people. There can be no doubt about the policy of the Liberal party. It was cleverly defined at the great Liberal convention of 1919. But, let me ask, what is the policy of the Government on this vital question? As no popular convention of its party has been held, we have to look for the policy in the speeches of Government leaders. According to a report which appeared in the Montreal Gazette, my right hon. friend, at his meeting at Sherbrooke, Quebec, declared with great force that he had fought and would fight the free trade movement to the end of his political life. He is represented by the Gazette as saying that he believes in the principle of protection and will maintain that principle to the end of his political life. Now, I submit, with all due deference, that that language is reactionary. Progress means that civilization is moving in a desirable direction, and it is not desirable that the nations of this world should always be at war in matters relating to trade. With my right hon. friend it is not a question of securing revenue for the State, that is a mere incident. I have known public men who supported protection because they considered it necessary to temporarily assist weak industries, and also to raise a revenue. Sir John Macdonald was of that class. But we have produced very few public men who have regarded protection an an ideal and permanent condition. So far as I know, no country has ever yet placed all articles on the free list. Great Britain has always maintained a tariff, but it has been a tariff for revenue. The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) repudiates that idea and declares his adherance to a tariff not for revenue but for protection. If my right hon. friend's ideals prevail, then the future is without hope for the consumer: protection of special interests will go on from age to age world without end. In other words when Macaulay's New Zealander, in the midst of vast solitude, takes his stand on a broken arch of London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's, even then the special interests will be gathering in the shekels that they have not earned and digging deep into the pockets of the helpless consumer.

But probably the men who have made the strongest statements on this tariff question are the new converts. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) spoke at Montreal on November 15, and a report of his speech appeared in the Mon-

treal Gazette. The item is headed "Closed Factories."

Let me point out to you what disastrous results would happen to our flourishing and great industrial province if the Liberals came into power, notwithstanding that when some of their prominent members are speaking in this province they talk strongly for protection. The Liberals are pledged, as I have pointed out to you, to increase the British preference to 50 per cent. I ask you what would happen to our great cotton and woollen mills, and many of our other industries, if we were thrown into competition to this extent with the cheap labour of the United Kingdom, and their old established industries that are dong a world-wide trade?

My hon. friend, who is accustomed to waving the Old Flag vigorously, when it does not affect his dividends, draws the line at the proposal to give a fifty per cent preference to Great Britain. He employs the same old scarecrow that did duty in 1911. He asks: what would happen to our industries? Let me remind my hon. friend that in 1897 he supported a party that gave a twenty-five per cent preference to Great Britain and nothing serious happened—our industries never were so prosperous as they were after that preference had been granted. At that time Sir Charles Tupper, the then leader of the Opposition, raised the same cry that my hon. friend is raising now. He said that the Fielding preference would ruin the industries of Canada. But Sir Charles was mistaken; the wolf did not come. It looks foolish to drag this aged and imaginary wolf out from its hiding place a second time after our experience after 1897.

The Minister of Marine did us the honour to visit Nova Scotia during the last parliamentary recess. On that occasion he called a meeting of the faithful in Halifax, and delivered one of his sounding-brass speeches. Here is an extract taken from his own special organ, the Montreal Gazette:

Mr. Ballantyne presented Premier Meighen's personal congratulations to the Liberal-Conservative Club, together with the Premier's promise to visit it personally in January. He brought a "word of cheer to Unionists" regarding the next election, declaring that the party was sound in wind and limb. He criticised the tariff policy of the Liberals, "the remnant of a once great party," he called them, and believed that, even were the Government defeated it would be by the Free Trade radicals. He prophesied that Mackenzie King would never be Premier of Canada.

"Sound in wind and limb." My hon. friend was probably quite right about the wind. "The remnant of a once great party." Now that characterization is easily explained. The party was great when my hon. friend belonged to it, and when he left it was a mere remnant. I might be permitted to point out to my hon. friend that at the last general election this "remnant" elected to this House, if I remember rightly, sixty-two out of sixty-five members from his own province, and I am told that there is a fair chance that the "remnant" may elect the whole sixty-five the next time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most extraordinary and, I might say, ludicrous things in the whole history of public life in this country has been the spectacle of the late Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister travelling like itinerant pedlars over the province of Quebec looking among two millions of people for some one who would accept a portfolio in the Government, and failing to find a single man willing to undertake the risk involved in the venture. Still we are told "the party is sound in wind and limb." Let me read the last sentence from the paragraph which I just quoted:

He prophesied that Mackenzie King would never be Premier of Canada.

No doubt the wish was father to the prophecy. The trouble with my hon. friend is that he assumes to practise the gift of prophecy without being possessed of the infallibility necessary for a prophet. When a man resorts to prophecy all discussion has to stop. You can argue with an ordinary man but you cannot argue with a prophet.

One of the most startling incidents of the recess was the public admission of a change of heart on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder). At Medicine Hat, according to the Montreal Gazette, he struck right out from the shoulder. Let me quote a short extract from his speech on that occasion:

Mr. Calder in opening his remarks told the audience that for years past he had been fooling the West and fooling himself with free-trade talk, but that more mature reflection had brought him to the fiscal views of his new leader.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all that I can say is that a public man, holding a position of trust as a representative of the people, should not attempt to fool anybody. This is a sorry admission on the part of the hon. gentleman. This trade question is no joke; it is a matter of grave concern, especially to the man who has to provide the necessaries of life for his family. Again, at Moosejaw, on October 26, my hon. friend occupied the same platform with the Prime Minister. The report of his speech states:

During his speech Mr. Calder said: It has been claimed that I have become a Tory. Well, I have not, and don't intend to.

What are you? shouted someone in the audience. There is one thing I am not, and that is a Mackenzie-King Liberal. I am a Liberal and as good a Liberal as I ever was.

Mr. Speaker, when Artemus Ward was asked about his principles he frankly admitted that he hadn't any—to use his own language—"nary a principle." Now that is peculiar, but it is not as peculiar as a man claiming to have two kinds of principles at the same time, and those two kinds diametrically opposed to one another. My hon. friend for many years was closely identified with the Liberal party in Western Canada. He was one of the apostles of free trade in that country. He was a sort of political Gamaliel. The people of the West sat at his feet and they thought they were learning the lessons of commercial freedom. They looked upon him as a thorough low-tariff man, and I understand that he made many converts. Now we are told he was fooling the West and fooling himself.

The extraordinary thing about the attitude of my hon. friend is that he still claims to be a Liberal, and he tells us at the same time that he has adopted the fiscal views of his new leader—and everybody knows that there is nothing Liberal about the fiscal views of the Prime Minister. There is a character, Mr. Speaker, in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, with which you will be familiar, called Mr. Facing-Both-Ways. When any question came up for decision during his pilgrimage, Mr. Facing-Both-Ways tried to be on both sides. The extraordinary thing about my hon. friend is that he is trying to face both ways at the same time. He is posing as a sort of political contortionist who can perform the extraordinary acrobatic trick of planting his feet firmly in one direction and turning his face just as firmly in the opposite direction. If I may be permitted to do I would like to warn my hon. friend. If I remember Bunyan's story correctly, Mr. Facing-Both-Ways never reached the Celestial City. Take another extract from the hon. gentleman's speeches:

When I entered the Government I found that men in the Cabinet whom I had looked upon as Liberals, were what we had called Tories, and I found men whom we had thought were old crusted Tories were as Liberal in their sentiment as I was.

This was a startling discovery. He found that the Tories in the Union cabinet were Liberals, and the Liberals were Tories. During twenty years of association with these gentlemen he had never suspected this; he thought that the Liberals were Liberals, and that the Tories were Tories. It was only when he took his seat at the Council board and saw the inside of his colleagues, so to speak, that the actual truth dawned upon him. He then found for the first time that the real Simon-pure hidebound Tories were such men as the hon. leader of the Farmers' party (Mr. Crerar), the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), and the ex-Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Carvell; these hon. gentlemen were real old crusted Tories. They had been masquerading in sheep's clothing for the last twenty years until my hon. friend's discovery and exposure. On the other hand, the men of advanced Liberal views were my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid). These, Mr. Speaker, are the shining lights of Liberalism who are now to stand shoulder to shoulder with my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization in his gallant fight for the triumph of Liberal principles. My hon. friend says that he has changed his views on this vital question of the tariff. He is an honourable man and I accept his word. At the same time there are two distinct ideals; one is tariff for revenue, and the other tariff for protection. I can understand how a man can modify his views to suit the circumstances of trade and the needs of revenue, but I find it difficult to understand how a man sincerely searching for the right course can, without any new evidence, change his ideals.

The Government press is now claiming that the Government has a fighting chance at the next election on this tariff issue. Much depends on the attitude of those opposed to the present administration. Among the rank and file of the voters the Government at this moment is in a hopeless minority. The recent election in West Peterborough is an indication of the state of public feeling. If the Government has a fighting chance it is by dividing its opponents into two or three camps. If the Liberal party and the Farmers' party can reach a working agreement, I venture to make the forecast that the days of this Government are numbered. The Liberal party and the Farmers' party working together would be invicible; and, after all, the farmer is only a liberal in a hurry. Why should they not work together? Both stand for a large measure of commercial

freedom; both stand for reciprocity with the United States in natural products; both stand for increasing the British preference. While there are differences in the platforms of the two parties, there are sufficient similarities to raise a strong presumption that those parties might pull together.

Mr. DAVIDSON: May I ask my hon. friend a question? He intimates that the policies of the two parties are the same. Does he agree with the Farmers' policy in regard to free coal?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): What is that policy?

Mr. DAVIDSON: May I inform my hon. friend that it was explained by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) last week when he plainly stated that one of the planks of the Farmers' party was free coal. Will my hon. friend's party go that far?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): My hon. friend will note that I said there were differences between the two platforms, but that they were not so material but what the two parties might form a working agreement. The question raised by my hon. friend is one of the matters to be adjusted. I was just about to say that in 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier risked everything to give the farmers wider and better markets for their produce and lost. What the Liberal party did in 1911 it is ready to do again in 1921. I question if there is a single thing that the Farmers' party can do for themselves that the Liberal party would not do for them.

There are certain political farmers in my own province, I am told, who have gone so far as to say that if they had control of the Government they could regulate the price of farm products so that the farmer would not be subject to losses by fluctuations of the market. No class deserves more consideration at the hands of a Government than the farmers. The farmer's business is regarded by many people as a safe and profitable business, but every man who has had actual experience, as I have had for I was brought up on a farm, knows that there is a large element of hazard in farming. The late spring frosts, the early frosts in the autumn, the drought of summer, the hail storms, the rust, the weeds, the weevil, the blight, the potato bug, the army worm, and the tax collector, including the custom house officer, have all to be reckoned with, and if the farmer can come out at the end of the year with a whole skin and something to spare he is a lucky man. During the last few years when prices were good, the average farmer had a margin over, and no man ever deserved a margin better. If it was within the power of the Government to regulate the prices of produce so that the farmer would always get a fair reward for his hard work, no fairminded man could object. I submit, however, that in so far as the exportable surplus is concerned, no Government has ever yet been successful in fixing prices by legislation, and any attempt to do so has not only been futile but mischievous. There are certain laws of commerce with which an experienced law maker will not attempt to interfere. When less of an article is produced than is consumed, the very scarcity will make the price high enough and no legislation will be necessary. When a country produces more than is consumed at home, and there is a surplus for export, the price at home is controlled by the price abroad, and legislation can have no effect whatever on prices. When the price of hides went down last year directly affecting the profits of Canadian farmers, the cause arose not in Canada, but in countries outside of Canada, such as the United States and the Argentine Republic. When the price of wool tumbled, you had to go to Australia to seek the cause. How, let me ask, could the business of these countries be controlled by legislation in Canada? The case only needs to be mentioned to show that the proposal to fix the prices of our exportable surplus by legislation is absurd. We have a recent example of an attempt at price-fixing in the neighbouring colony of Newfoundland. The price of fish was falling, and the people appealed to the Government to avert the impending calamity. The Government stepped in and fixed the price at $8 per quintal and forbade all purchases or sales below that price. The merchants bought the fish from the fisherman at the price fixed by the Government, and for a few months all went well. But the fish had to be sold abroad, and customers in the West Indies, Europe and the United States refused to pay the price fixed by the Newfoundland Government. The consequence was that the merchants could not dispose of the fish. The warehouses were soon filled. The merchants kept on buying as long as they could. They

used up all their own capital and then borrowed from the banks. But they could not dispose of their fish, the banks then demanded payment, the result was a financial crash involving the fishermen as well as the merchants, so that the attempt of the Newfoundland Government to fix the price of fish really did more harm than good. What happened in Newfoundland is bound to happen anywhere else should a similar attempt be made. In the commerce of the world the law of supply and demand is just as inexorable as the tides or gravitation, and the public man who tells the people that he can successfully fix the price of our exportable surplus by legislation is either not well informed or is trying to work a green goods game on the farmer.

The suggestion has been made that the Government, through a commission, might purchase the crop and stabilize the price. But in buying and selling, risks must be taken and losses are inevitable. If the Government is to be responsible for the farmers' losses, then it must do the same for the fisherman, the lumberman, the miner, and the manufacturer. It would not in the end be to the advantage of the farmer if the Government were to assume a share of all the business risks of the nation. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the Government can do nothing to promote agriculture. I am only throwing out a word of warning against the nostrums of certain political agitators who are promising more than they can perform. The Government can do much by education; by improving transportation facilities; by regulating immigration so as to furnish a supply of farm labour; by lightening the farmers' burdens; by opening up wider and better markets for farm produce; by encouraging co-operation, and in many other ways. But the farmer, if he gets a fair chance, can always do more for himself than the Government can do for him—and, after all, the most important thing the Government can do for the farmer at the present time is to get off his back.

Too much cannot be said in favour of co-operation, but co-operation has nothing to do with politics. Marketing produce is business, and the experience is that the most expensive and inefficient concern in the world to do business is the Government. Mr. Speaker, if there is any proposal by which the interests of our great basic industry can be advanced, it is bound to meet with a sympathetic response from the great Liberal party. But as I have said, the forces of progress, if they are to succeed, must show a united front. Our opponents are united. They have the prestige of the old Liberal-Conservative party. They have the patronage, and in these days of hard times and lavish expenditure the patronage in the hands of unscrupulous men counts for much. They have a Franchise Act which will be run on strictly party lines and administered by partisan officers. The Government party is composed of men entrenched in special privileges who will fight desperately to maintain those privileges. They have also the sinews of war. Where do you find the wealth of the country? Do you find it in the Liberal party? Do you find it among the farmers, or in the ranks of labour? Who are the railway magnates in this country? Are they Liberals? The manufacturers of Canada, according to the last Year Book, are said to control a capital investment of $2,786,649,727. Some of these are Liberals, but the great mass of them are the old type of high-tariff Conservatives, and some of those who were once Liberals are falling, I am sorry to say, into the procession. Who are the great bankers and the heads of the big trust companies? Do you find them crowding into the Liberal party and endorsing the platform built at Ottawa in 1919? Take the House of Commons itself. Glance among the supporters of the Government, and I supose you can count a dozen millionaires grouped around and behind the Prime Minister. Look along the benches to your left, Mr. Speaker. Do you find wealthy men? There may be one or two, but they are as scarce as the righteous men were in Sodom in the olden days. My point is this: that with the big business and the wealth and the Franchise Act and the patronage all ranged on one side, it is absolutely essential that the common people should stand together and show a united front. The Allies smashed the Germans because they stood firmly together. Each had special questions to be dealt with, but they kept these in the background until they broke the power of the common enemy. Here is a lesson for the forces of Liberalism in Canada. Let us all unite for the coming struggle, and after we break down the oligarchy that is now in control it will be time enough to adjust any differences that may exist between the two great wings of progressive thought in this country. It is very desirable, of course, that in a great agricultural country like Canada we should have as many farmers as possible in Parliament, but they should come here as representatives of all

the people, and not of one class. It is even more desirable that the forces of progress should show a united front. The ordinary man does not care one jot from what class his representative comes; he demands only that he represent his views and that he be fearless, honest and efficient—and it will not be contended that fearlessness, honest and efficiency are the exclusive possession of any one class.

Permit me to say Mr. Speaker, that we on this side are not downhearted. We have a captain on the bridge whom we all admire and trust. We have a policy that commends itself to the common people; all that we require to do is to put up a determined and energetic campaign, standing firmly on the platform of 1919. If we can win a Tory stronghold like West Peterborough against the combined force of the Government machine in a by-election, why should we not win scores of similar seats at the general election? The amendment of my leader is a challenge that the Government cannot afford to ignore, and I submit that no speaker on the Government side has met the challenge fairly. It is not denied that the members of this House supporting the Administration were elected in 1917 by the votes of both the old political parties. Tens of thousands of Liberals voted for candidates of the Government in 1917 on the distinct understanding that it was to be a war Administration and that faith would be kept in regard to other matters. The question before us is a moral question rather than a question of policy. The amendment of my leader may be voted down here but that will not settle anything. The decision that does count will be the decision that will be given by the men and the women of Canada at the polls when the boxes are opened and the ballots counted. That decision, hon. gentlemen opposite will be bound to respect. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. IRA E. ARGUE (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister on his elevation to the highest position in the gift of the people of this nation. Secondly, I want to congratulate him on the impression that he left in Western Canada on the occasion of his late tour. We always expect members on the Government side to gather round the right hon. gentleman and support him in the addresses which they make on an occasion such as this. But it is very gratifying when you find the Opposition, men who are opposed politically to my right hon. friend, stating frankly that, although they cannot agree with his political views, they must admire the frank and fearless manner in which he discusses the political issues before the country to-day. I did not intend to take part in this debate at the present time, but hon. members opposite have been rather strong in their criticism of the attitude of some of the supporters of this Government. We have been told that the Government has no mandate to carry on; that we are usurpers; some hon. members have gone even so far as to say that some of us have betrayed the trust placed in us by our constituents. I want to make my position plain in this House. Ever since I have taken any part whatever in politics, I have been a Liberal. I was nominated as a Liberal supporter of the Union Government in the election campaign of 1917. On every platform on which I appeared in my constituency, I told my constituents my position; I told them that if I were elected to support them in the House at Ottawa, I would support the Union Government in seeing that men, munitions and money were supplied to our soldiers until the last gun was fired, and after that I proposed to take my own course and use my judgment with reference to what I would support in this House; but that if the day ever came when I could not follow this Government, I would come back and hand my resignation to my electors. I was elected that day; I got my mandate that day from my constituents, backed by a majority of 3,700, and to those people alone am I responsible for my actions. When the time comes I am prepared to go back to them and to abide by their decision.

I want to look into the position of some other hon. members who tell us that we have no mandate, and that they are going to vote for a motion of want of confidence in this Government because it has no mandate. When Sir Robert Borden went to the country in 1917, he issued a manifesto in which, if my memory serves me aright, there were twelve planks. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was chosen as one of the supporters of that Government and he was elected on that platform. He stood in Winnipeg side by side with the present Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), and he never made any reservation as to any plank or any time; he supported that manifesto. When he came to Ottawa he took a Cabinet position with this Government, and for a year and

a half he carried on as Minister of Agriculture. Then he resigned his portfolio and crossed the floor of the House, seven or eight of his friends from Western Canada crossing with him. With the exception of two, every one of those hon. members, who sit around him, was elected on that manifesto. One of those two is the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid), who was elected as an Independent and who, therefore, has a perfect right to choose where he will sit in this House, and the other is the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), who was elected at a by-election in October, 1919, and who, as admitted by himself, sits in this House today as an instructed delegate of fifteen men who hold his signed resignation. I want to know where these hon. gentlemen, who are going to vote on this amendment, got their mandate. Has ever one of them gone back to his constituents and asked for an endorsation of the position he holds in this House? Not one of them, not even their leader, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), has done so. They have no mandate for the position they hold; yet, they expect to vote for this amendment, to vote a want of confidence in this Government and to say, that we who are supporting this Government have no mandate from our constituents to do so.

During the last two years we in Western Canada have been looking for redistribution. If we get redistribution, the four western provinces will likely be represented in this House by twenty more members. Saskatchewan should have five new members, and I know the people in my constituency want redistribution. I do not know what the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), whose constituency is next to mine, thinks on the subject, but I know a very large number of the people in his constituency want redistribution, because his constituency is very large and unwieldy. I was surprised the other day when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), speaking about redistribution, said that he would be afraid to leave that matter to this Government to handle; that there would be gerrymandering. That is an old political party cry that we have heard for years and years, and I thought this new party was above all that; that it was blazing a new trail in this country and dropping all the old party cries, and that we would hear no more of them. I believe this Government is quite as capable of giving us redistribution as any other Government that could be elected in Canada.

The other night the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) discussed the question of freight rates. The people of the West have no objection to paying their way, of paying their fair share of whatever it costs to run our railways, but we object to paying more than our share. I believe the sooner we can have a readjustment of those rates, the better it will be for the whole country and much better for the western provinces.

Let me now take up the question of the much-abused Wheat Board, and let me say right here that if any Government in Canada has ever passed a piece of legislation that has been of benefit to the farmers of Western Canada, it is the legislation constituting the Wheat Board. But when the Wheat Board was appointed, it was not accepted in that way. I will not say that our papers in Western Canada were unanimous in condemning, but the great majority of them condemned this Government from Monday morning until Saturday night for constituting the Wheat Board. They even went so far as to say that, in regard to those participation certificates—"anticipation certificates" they called them—they advised the farmer to get rid of them, dispose of them, sell them at anything he could get for them; that after this Government got rid of the Wheat Board, all the money that went into the farmers' pockets would never enrich them. The sad part of the matter is that many farmers disposed of their participation certificates at five, seven, ten cents a bushel to speculators, who reaped fortunes by buying them out. The other night, when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) was speaking, he was asked what his attitude was during his election campaign with reference to the Wheat Board. He said that the Wheat Board was not in existence during his campaign, and he was supported in that by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg).

Mr. GOULD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not make the statement the hon. gentleman alleges.

Mr. ARGUE: All I have to do is to turn up Hansard. Here it is:

> Mr. Cowan: Is it not true that at the election in which the hon. member was elected he and every part of his constituency were opposed to the existence of a Wheat Board; that he fought it from beginning to end and that he was elected as an opponent of the Wheat Board?
>
> Mr. Gould: That is another bugaboo. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find in Assiniboia any sentiment whatever in that direction. I will give to the House this evidence—

Mr. Cowan: That is not the point at all. The point is that my hon. friend was elected straight on that platform and nothing else.

Mr. Maharg: There was no Wheat Board in existence then.

Mr. Cowan: Yes, there was.

Mr. Maharg: Not on your life.

Mr. GOULD: My point of order was that the hon. gentleman alleged I said there was no Wheat Board in existence. I made no such statement, and Hansard proves it.

Mr. ARGUE: I will continue the quotation:

Mr. Gould: The hon. gentleman is mixed as to his facts. I might tell the House that not on any of the many platforms on which I stood during my whole election was the Wheat Board mentioned—

Mr. GOULD: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARGUE (reading):

I say that to-night as an hon. member of this House.

Mr. ARGUE: When we look up the records of that election we find that the Wheat Board was one of the burning questions before the people of that constituency. They were told that this Government had appointed the Wheat Board and that the farmers were losing in consequence anywhere from ten to forty cents a bushel on their wheat. That was in October, 1919. What were they saying in 1920 about the Wheat Board? All hands were up for a Wheat Board in 1920, after the Board had gone out of existence. As my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) used to say, it was a case of "You're damned if you do, and damned if you don't."

Mr. GOULD: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he can produce any evidence to support his statement that the Wheat Board was made an election issue in my campaign? I absolutely deny it.

Mr. ARGUE: I am not prepared to say whether, had the Wheat Board been in existence this year, it would have made any difference in the price of wheat at the terminal elevators. But one thing I do know, and that is it would have stabilized the price at the country elevators. When the Wheat Board was in existence, after the farmer had done this threshing he knew how many bushels of wheat he had, knew what grade it was, and knew to a cent what it was worth at his station. He could go to his banker and say: I have so many bushels of wheat out on my farm, and I want so much money to carry it till the ground freezes, so that I can get on with my fall work; when I market my wheat I will pay you off. But how could that be done this year? There was no Wheat Board in existence this year. Take my own little city of Swift Current. Nine miles west of us is Beverley with two elevators. Now I have seen farmers haul their wheat past Beverley into Swift Current and make fifteen cents a bushel. Then nine miles south is Dunelm on the Vanguard line. I have seen farmers haul their wheat past Dunelm into Swift Current, and make eighteen cents a bushel on the same grade of wheat.

Then, there is the question of trackage price and street price. When I sold my wheat there was eleven cents difference between the trackage price and the street price. Now all the elevator man had to do when a man came in with a load of wheat was to pay eleven cents less for it than it was worth on the track. The farmer must sell his wheat, because he must have money to buy coal and provisions for his family. The elevator man would pay him eleven cents less than it was worth on the track, and the next day he would put it through the elevator and load it on the car and sell it for eleven cents more than he paid for it. These are the things which are disturbing the farmers of the West. We are not satisfied with our grain handling system, and we are asking that the Government appoint a commission to investigate the whole matter and take control not only of the terminal elevators but of all the individual elevators up and down the line. We want to know how many hundreds of thousands of bushels of No. 1 Northern the elevators buy, and how many they sell. We want to know that with respect also to No. 2, No. 3, No. 4 and No. 5. We want to know how much they make out of what they call the promotion of grade. We want to know how many thousands of bushels they have left in their elevators at the end of the season, and what becomes of it. If you take up any of the reports of the elevator companies, you will not find the overages mentioned, and there is nothing to show what they have made by the promotion of grade. What we are asking the Government to do is to appoint a commission to make a thorough investigation of the wheat handling system, and ascertain the best system of handling wheat from the time it leaves the producer until it gets to the consumer.

Mr. JOHN A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, before I commence my re-

marks on the Address I wish to extend, as others have done before me, my very sincere personal congratulations to the Prime Minister in having attained the highest office in the gift of the people. In some respects I may differ from him in matters of policy, but personally I sincerely congratulate him and wish him every success. I also wish to extend my felicitations to the mover and the seconder of the Address. I had not the pleasure of listening to their remarks, but according to statements made regarding them their speeches were not only a credit to themselves, but did honour to their constituencies.

I have listened to a number of the speeches on both sides of the House in this debate, and have read some others, and I have been struck by the fact that there has been very little in the way of enunciation of party policies in any of the speeches so far delivered. That applies not only to the speeches of the leaders, but to those of their followers. The speech from the Throne contained a clause, outlining the Government's policy on the tariff question. For what purpose that was inserted I do not know. However, I do not think it was a bad idea. Probably the Government thought they might get some idea of where the members of the House stood on this question before they brought down their policy in connection with the Budget. If that was the idea, they must have been disappointed for there has been very little definite statement of tariff views so far. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. King), followed the seconder of the Address, and ignored the tariff problem, in fact, ignored practically everything that was in the speech from the Throne. He raised the question of a great constitutional crisis, and claimed the Government had no mandate to continue in office. The Prime Minister, in reply, devoted his attention entirely to rebutting and refuting, in his opinion at any rate, the statements made by his opponent. Shortly afterwards, the leader of the Progressive party discussed the points already raised, and to some extent outlined his policy and that of his party. Up to that time his speech was the only one in which the policy of any of the parties had been outlined to any extent. The followers of the different parties naturally took their cue from their leaders, and the result is that the definite laying down of party policies has hitherto been notable by its absence.

I gather from the speeches already delivered that there were in the main two questions raised; first, the question of confidence or otherwise in the Government, and secondly, the tariff question. Before discussing these questions, I should like to direct attention of the House for a moment or two to my position in this House.

It may possibly not have escaped your attention, Sir, that since last session I have crossed the green carpet and now occupy a position on the side opposite the Government. I do not know that that fact is of any particular significance. I have not changed my policy nor my ideas politically by doing so. It may be simply a question of expediency or form. For the first year of the term I occupied a position directly in front of you, Sir. I chose what subsequently became known as the cross benches, in the first instance, for physical reasons, because it was a position from which I could both see and hear better than I could from any other part of the floor available, for neither my sight nor my hearing is particularly good. During that session the work of the Government was entirely or almost entirely concerned with carrying on the war, and I supported it throughout. Before the second year commenced the war had fortunately ended, and during that year not only was the Government concerned with questions arising out of the war, but it took up some matters which might be considered as having no direct connection with the war. That may be a matter of opinion. However, one such matter was the tariff and another the question of taking over certain railways. In this connection I found that it was necessary for me to differ from the Government, because I did not approve of their policy so far as the tariff was concerned. And subsequently, in the second session when the matter of railway legislation came up and we were considering the taking over of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, while I approved of the policy—there seemed to be nothing else to do under the circumstances—still I felt compelled to differ from the Government in one respect, namely, as to certain of the terms of the agreement, in which connection I moved an amendment. I am satisfied that my atitude was right, and I have every reason to believe that some at least of the members of the Government were thoroughly in accord with me. It was during that time that the cross benches began to take on political significance. Some of those who held similar

views to mine were there, and others of like mind joined us, while some of those who did not share our opinions moved away. Then we came to this Chamber, where the seats are differently arranged and last year I occupied a seat on the other side. So far as I can recollect the only question of moment on which I really differed from the Government was the question of policy involved in the Budget; I found that I was not in accord and had to vote against them. So this year, on coming to the House I decided that it was but fair not only to myself but to the Government that I should take up a position somewhat apart and act in such a way as I thought would be advisable in the interests of the country.

This does not mean that I differ from the Government now any more than I did in the past. It is quite probable however that my ideas will be found to be at variance with those of the Government in connection with the tariff. It may be that in the Budget to be brought down certain amendments may be made which will enable me to vote for the proposals. I can only say that I shall give them the benefit of any doubt. I am quite unrepentant so far as votes I have given are concerned. I am satisfied that they were right, and in some cases my stand will be shown to have been right. In other instances there is and always will be room for debate. I have no desire to see a change in government just at the present moment that would produce unnecessarily chaotic conditions.

As I mentioned before, the question of the tariff has been introduced in a clause in the Address. This, I understand, is somewhat unusual. It was intended, presumably, that the matter should thereby be open for discussion and it was a case of the Government's nailing its colours to the mast. I am not in favour of the principle of protection; I do not mind making that statement strongly and emphatically. It might be argued from that assertion that it would be necessary for me to oppose the Government and support the amendment to the motion which is now before the House. What I shall do remains to be seen; but I do not think that such is a necessary inference from my statement. At this particular time it is proper for us all to get away as far as possible from terminology and technicalities and try to get at the heart of things; and so far as I can make out the terms in connection with the tariff are not well defined, and people may and do think alike who are under different banners and call themselves by different names. The principle of protection, is not the main question before the House at this time; I make that statement, although I may be misunderstood in doing so. I had almost said it was not an issue; I am not prepared to go so far, but it is not an issue of immediate concern. I do not wish to be misunderstood and I shall therefore try to make my position perfectly clear. When the debate on the railway question was in progress, I had the temerity to state that the question of public ownership was not an issue at that time. I thought so then and I think so now. I am satisfied that there were members on the Government side who all supported the Government's stand in that respect who were absolutely opposed to the principle of public ownership. That was a case where of necessity the Government had to do something; they had to become public owners whether they wished to do so or not; and therefore I say that the fundamental principle was not really at stake. I was satisfied at that time that if members of the Government had had placed before them any kind of reasonable offer from any private concern to take over those railways, that offer would have been accepted with celerity. And I think so yet.

In this case I am not prepared to go so far; but I say that the main business of the House at the present time is not to decide the principle of protection, but to deal with the tariff as it stands with a view to simplifying it, removing certain irregularities and passing upon certain matters in connection therewith regarding which, I think, not only those opposed to the principal of protection but those who are in favor of it are agreed. There are on the other side of the House and on the Opposition side to my right, members who, I think, have policies in this connection ranging all the way from free trade to moderate protection if that is a proper term. I do not know that there are any absolute free traders in the House, though theoretically there may be; but there are some who come pretty near it; so, eliminating the high protectionists, of whom there are some on both sides of the House, the remainder go all the way from free trade to moderate protection. I have been talking to some recently who have been known as strong protectionists all their days, and I was surprised to learn that they thoroughly agree with me, or I with them as the case may be, as to what is necessary

and advisable, in the interests of the country, to do with the tariff at the present time; and there are many things upon which this House can agree in regard to the tariff before we come to the question of disposing of the absolute principle. For instance, we might direct our attention to the elimination of the duties in connection with industries that do not really need the benefit of any tariff at the present time; and there are such in Canada.

There are other industries which, even from their own standpoint, do not need as much protection as they are receiving at the present time, a fact that is well known.

Then comes the question of reducing the tariff on necessities and on the instruments of production to the minimum and, in some cases, the elimination altogether of the existing duties. This involves the question of giving the most encouragement to those industries which are indigenous to Canada, as against those of an adventitious nature, thus helping to develop the natural resources of which we hear so much.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is where does the House stand in respect to these matters? The position of the Prime Minister is clear and distinct—he is emphatically out for protection presumably similar to what we now have. The leader of the Opposition has not, this year, stated what his policy is; but one of his followers this afternoon announced that the Liberal party was standing on the platform of 1919. It is pretty clear what that platform is, but there is sometimes a question in my mind whether all the members of the Opposition to my right are supporting it in its entirety. The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) has enunciated his platform on the tariff and I think that it is also clear and distinct. In connection with the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) on the tariff, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) took the ground that the leader of the Progressive party had not clearly stated his position. Well, that is a matter of opinion. Personally, I am inclined to think that my hon. friend from Marquette made a very clear-cut statement. At any rate, I am satisfied that I know where he stands, just as well as I know what the policy of the Prime Minister is on this question. But I must say that my hon. friend from Macdonald did not state his own views on this particular problem. Now I have been informed that the hon. member for Macdonald had some part to play in the formation of the platform on which the leader of the Progressive party now stands. That being so, I presumed that my hon. friend was thoroughly familiar with the Progressive platform; in fact that he supported it himself; but that appears not to be the case. If I am mistaken in this assumption, my hon. friend from Macdonald will correct me.

As I stated previously, some of the members of this House who are pronounced protectionists have intimated to me that the tariff is running amuck; that the present schedules are not really operating in the interest of those Canadian industries which it is intended to protect and foster. I am inclined to agree with these hon. gentlemen in that respect.

In connection with amendments proposed consideration should first be given to duties on the necessities of life. As already pointed out, there is not much difference of opinion as to the desirability of doing this, and there should be none. The duties on these necessities should be reduced to a minimum and in many respects eliminated altogether. The duties on textiles have often been discussed in this Chamber. I will not do more, at the present time, than refer to the enormous profits which the Dominion Textile Company has been able to make during the last few years. That company should need no assistance from the people.

A couple of days ago a memorandum was given to me with respect to an industry in Canada, the product of which might properly be classed as a necessity. I refer to the paint industry. The memo in question was given to me by a strong protectionist, a Conservative. I will only read part of it:

Sherwin-Williams Co. Optimistic about Paint Industry.

The sales of Sherwin-Williams Co. for the fiscal year ended Aug. 31 show a total of $75,952,000 which is a gain of $22,000,000 over the banner year of 1919. Comparison of the sales of $51,817,000 for the American Companies alone with the $36,992,000 of the previous year shows a gain of 40 per cent.

According to the balance sheet the company has current assets of $27,679,859 compared with current liabilities of $6,636,738. It has $992,855 in the cash account, and inventory of $15,814,260. During the year a stock dividend of 50 per cent was declared so that the surplus account shows $4,481,667 this year compared with $7,175,311 a year ago.

Attached to the memo is a clipping from a newspaper. It contains a New York despatch intimating that there is a combine between the white lead men in connection with the output of paint.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Is the hon. gentleman quoting the figures of the

Sherwin-Williams Paint Company of United States, or the Sherwin-Williams Paint Company of Canada? They are of course two different companies.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The figures I have given from the quotation seem to include both companies. The point I wish to make——

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend must know that the two companies are quite different, and I hope he will have the justice to say, when he is quoting such figures, whether they relate to the American or the Canadian company. As my hon. friend quoted the figures, the House would be led to believe that they had reference to the Canadian company.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I did not know, Mr. Speaker, that the two companies are entirely and distinctly separate. I understood they were affiliated companies, and that one was merely a branch of the other.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, no.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understood in quoting the figures of the business done that they related not only to the American but also to the Canadian company. However, the point I wish to make is this: The paint industry seems to be very prosperous both in the United States and in Canada, and this particular company is doing a very large and extensive business, and realizing excellent profits, in both fields of activity. In my opinion, as well as in the opinion of the well informed gentleman who handed me this memo, the protection which is afforded to this company is beyond all bounds and a great deal more than what is necessary to fully protect the industry even if such protection were advisable.

There remains for me to deal with the question of the removal of the duties, or at any rate a very material reduction in the duties, on the instruments of production. I shall confine my attention at the present time merely to those required for the agricultural and mining industries. It was mentioned in a speech the other day that the average tariff on agricultural implements is very low. Again in this House this afternoon it was stated that generally speaking the average tariff is very much lower than it has been.

I am not concerned very much, Mr. Speaker, regarding average tariffs; I do not think that is a fair way of arriving at their incidence. To my mind the better way is to take specific instances, and then we know exactly where we are at. Regarding agriculture, notwithstanding the statement that the average tariff is very low—I forget the figures quoted—I find that some implements used in connection with agriculture are taxed as follows: Harvesters, partly complete, 12½ per cent; ploughs, cultivators and drills, 20 per cent; grain crushers and fanning mills, 25 per cent; gasoline engines, 27 or 30 per cent—I am not quite sure which; the humble wheel-barrow pays a duty of about 30 per cent; Ford cars and carriages are subject to a duty of 35 per cent. With respect to the Ford car, I do not think any hon. member will say that it is a luxury; at any rate, it has not hitherto been looked upon as such; but the duty of 35 per cent is certainly excessive and should be materially reduced, if not eliminated altogether. Agricultural producers have the above handicaps to contend with.

Contrary to what has been ferquently stated, mining machinery and utensils intimately connected with mining are not free. It is true that mining machinery and such utensils as I have mentioned are free when they are used in connection with iron and steel and associated industries. But why they should be admitted free when used by any particular industry and be subject to duty when not so used passes my comprehension. This is a matter which I simply wish to draw to the attention of the Government. In some cases machinery is admitted free. For instance, machinery for dredging gold is on the free list, as are also briquetting machinery, machinery for the manufacture of rifles, machinery for the manufacture of ship plates, and other kinds of machinery; but when we come down to the tools of the prospectors who make the original discoveries of our natural resources, we find there is a duty ranging from 22½ to 30 per cent. This duty, it is true, is not exacted when machinery and tools in connection with mining are imported for universities, endowed or otherwise, but when the ordinary prospector, who is not by any means a man of means, desires to buy tools for his work he has to pay the duties I have mentioned. Then I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the rates of duty on complicated and newly invented machinery, and I will mention only two or three varieties: Gyrating crushers, 27½ per cent; machinery for removing the overburden in connection with

mineral deposits, very important in mining, 27½ per cent; gasoline locomotives, also very important instruments in mining development, 35 per cent. I submit to the Government that if they are anxious to relieve the burdens on the people at the present time, and to encourage that development of our natural resources about which we hear so much, such duties as I have named should be either removed altogether or reduced to the very minimum.

The other question to which the attention of this House has been directed for some time is that of the confidence or otherwise which this Parliament and the country have in the Government. I may not be a constitutional authority, but so far as I can see this Government, constitutionally, cannot be called usurpers; they are not in the position of overholding tenants by any means. Constitutionally, they are entitled to hold office just as long as they have a majority in this House, which will be put to the test shortly. However, there are two other points involved; one is as to the agreement or understanding reached by the members of the Government at the time the Coalition Government was formed in 1917, and the other is the present attitude and feeling of the people towards the Government.

I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean)—a former member of this Government—who spoke a few days ago. The hon. gentleman was on the inside in connection with the formation of the Coalition Government; I was very much on the outside. He knew exactly what transpired, and he has given his report in respect to that, and his opinion as to what should be done, and I see no reason why I should take issue with him thereon. As to my position, there was no contest in the constituency of Nelson, and with the exception of a few speeches of a semi-political nature at the time of nomination we heard none in the constituency during the period of the campaign, and I did not take part in the campaign in any other constituencies. However, I gained the impression at that time that the Government was formed for the period of the war and for such time thereafter as would be necessary to clear up matters particularly pertaining to the war, and I think my constituents had the same idea. It is true that, technically, the Coalition Government did come to an end when the new Government headed by the right. hon. the new Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) was formed, but I can only consider his Government as the direct successor of the Coalition Government.

However, in my opinion, the question is larger than that presented by speakers who have preceded me. I am inclined to think that it is not simply a question of whether the Government should give up office at the present time or not, but whether the whole Parliament should come to an end. We see statements in the papers that this Parliament—I do not refer to one side or the other, but to both sides of the House—is unrepresentative, unresponsive, moribund and stale. These expressions may be somewhat exaggerated, but nevertheless there is an element of truth in them. Any election within the near future would mean a great change not only on the Government side, but on this side of the House. Many hon. members who were elected in 1917 were urged to give their services solely on account of the fact that a peculiar situation had arisen, and that it was necessary to get a certain type of men to take office. These hon. members now think their mandate has expired. Certain other hon. members who were then elected have been referred to as "compromise" candidates and were placed in the position which they now occupy by their electors with the distinct idea that when the term mentioned had elapsed political conditions would revert to normal.

In another respect, however, I differ very materially with the argument and statements made by my hon. friend from Halifax, in that I contend that redistribution is a very important matter to be considered at the present time. While I am of opinion that there should be an election, not immediately, but before another session of the House, this should not be held until redistribution has taken place. There should be an election soon, but there should be redistribution sooner. The hon. member for Halifax gave his case away—perhaps inadvertently—when he said that the question of redistribution involved an increase of representation in certain parts of the country, and it necessarily followed that the representation would decrease in other parts of the country. I do not know that that necessarily follows, but in all probability it will be the result of increased representation in any one part of the country.

Without redistribution there will not be proper representation. For instance, let us assume that there are two constituencies of equal population, and that within ten years one half of one of those constituencies

should move into another: If there were no redistribution, it would necessarily follow that the votes of the electors left in the first constituency would have three times the value of the votes of the electors in the second constituency. Of course, that may be a far-fetched case, but there are instances where such results obtain in Canada. I know constituencies which have fifty thousand or sixty thousand electors and others with only twenty thousand or thirty thousand.

It is generally the case, Mr. Speaker, that when changes are suggested, hon. members look for precedents. If we are to look for precedents for the holding of an election on or about the time of the taking of the census —the decennial period—we find that during the last three decades elections have taken place without such redistribution, very close to the times at which the census returns were made. I refer to the following elections: March 5, 1891; November 7, 1900; September 21, 1911. These precedents, perhaps, are against my contention, but the fact is they are such that we do not wish to follow them at the present time or at any time in the future. They are precedents that it is a good thing to get away from; I cite them merely to point out that they should not be followed. In these instances a great injustice was perpetrated on certain parts of the country by the holding of elections at these particular times.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is a local reason why I think there should be redistribution before an election. The constituency of Nelson is very large. It is approximately 200,000 miles in extent, being about four times as large as all the rest of Manitoba put together. It is in two separate and distinct parts: the southern part, by far the smaller portion, namely, the Swan River Valley, is composed almost entirely of fertile agricultural lands and settled by prosperous farmers, and the northern part, the great stretch of the northland, where almost every industry but farming is carried on. I might say here that this district has capabilities for farming, but these have not yet been brought into operation. Between the centre of the Swan River District and the southern edge or gateway to the great north, between the town of Swan River and The Pas, there is a stretch of railway of two hundred miles—we have to go out into Saskatchewan and back into Manitoba. The electors in the different ends of the constituency think they have no community of interest; they think that in the interests of the whole constituency they should be placed in different ridings. I am here to represent the views, as far as possible, of those who sent me here. I simply place this matter before the House, not as the main reason, but as an incidental and important reason why I think as I do in this connection.

Now, I propose to place before this House a concrete proposal. I think there is a way whereby we can have both a redistribution and an election. The last speaker intimated that the electors in his district were very strong for redistribution. I think that is a feeling which prevails throughout the whole of the West, also, that the West is pretty strongly in favour of an election; I can come to no other conclusion, notwithstanding statements made here to the contrary, and I am now inclined to think that the East largely entertains the same view. What I suggest, then, is that this House proceed with the necessary business of the session; that it pass whatever legislation may be in the interests of the country at this time; that an adjournment be then made until early fall, and that in the meantime the census be expedited, especially in respect to such returns as are absolutely necessary for the Redistribution Bill. When the House meets in the fall the Redistribution Bill could then be put through, and, as soon as might be thereafter, an election should be held. This would cover the objections raised by various parties to an election without redistribution. With this whole scheme in view, I shall take up the different suggestions in a little more detail.

I say that the House should proceed with the business of the session; by this I mean not only the extremely urgent business, but such business as may be necessary at this time in the interests of the country. I would not exclude the amendments to the tariff which the Government, I understand, intend to bring down. In fact, I think that it is very important that these tariff proposals should be submitted. If they are brought down—and that is another reason why I wish things to continue as they are for the time being, at any rate—we shall have something definite and concrete in the way of a tariff placed before the House; we shall get a definite idea as to where the different members on both sides really stand. I am not afraid of the issue, and I do not know that any other hon. member is afraid of it. It has been suggested that some are not travelling exactly under the right colours. However, if certain definite proposals are placed before us we shall

know absolutely where the different parties stand; the House and the country will know the policy of the Government, of the Opposition, and of the Progressive party.

I have suggested that after the necessary legislation is put through there should be an adjournment until early fall, not another session. There are precedents for that also. Long adjournments of the Canadian House are mentioned in Bourinot as follows: 1867 to 1868, from the 21st December to the 12th of March, to enable the Government to consider and complete measures. No more important issues were at stake then than are before us at the present time. There was an adjournment in 1873, from the 23rd of May to the 13th of August, to receive the report of the Royal Commission on the Canadian Pacific Railway scandal. The fact is that the House prorogued on the 13th of August without receiving the report; but that does not alter the precedent in any way. The House adjourned from the 23rd of December, 1880, to the 4th of January, 1881, in connection with certain issues relating to the Canadian Pacific contract. In 1911 there was an adjournment from the 19th of May to the 18th of July to enable Sir Wilfrid Laurier to attend the Imperial Conference and the coronation. Notwithstanding the fact that the question of reciprocity was very strongly before the people at that time, the House adjourned for two months. These precedents are very much to the point, and I think it is fair to say that the issue before the House at present is fully as important as the issues which gave occasion for any of these adjournments. There is in connection with the last adjournment mentioned another degree of similarity, namely, that the Prime Minister and his associates wish to attend the Imperial Conference very shortly. In order that this session may continue at the time I have mentioned, it may be necessary to expedite to some extent the compiling of such portions of the census returns as are necessary for the purpose of bringing down a Redistribution Bill, not generally speaking to quicken up the returns. I am advised by the census authorities that by September sufficient data can be gathered to allow of a Redistribution Bill being drafted, and by the time that this House will need to meet all the returns will be ready. At a reasonable time after the redistribution Bill has been dealt with and passed, a dissolution of Parliament may take place and an election be held before another session. In his speech the other day the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) accepted the challenge of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) saying in effect: "We are not afraid of an election we desire it as much as you, but we want redistribution first." In fact, I think the general tenor of the remarks of hon. gentlement opposite was that they would be glad to have an election, to meet the party to my right or my left, at any time provided redistribution comes first. My proposition would thus appear to be a solution of the difficulties of hon. members on all sides of the House; it is sound, sane, feasible, and, if I may use a word which is somewhat overworked, constructive, and also it is what the country is looking for just now. In order, therefore, to put the matter into definite shape before this House, so that the House will have an opportunity to pass upon it, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis), an amendment to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition as follows:

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

Existing political conditions call for redistribution, and a general election at an early date thereafter, and that this Parliament should proceed forthwith to pass such legislation as may be necessary, at this time, in the interests of the country and then be adjourned to the earliest date at which the census returns will be available, for the purpose of making the necessary changes in the Representation Act; and that a general election be held as soon thereafter as possible; and, further, that the work of taking the census and completing such returns as may be necessary for the redistribution for the representation be expedited so far as practicable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not call in question the form of the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member (Mr. Campbell), but put it to the House subject to more careful inquiry during the dinner hour.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHN BLAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House in further congratulating the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on his elevation to that high office. I have already done that personally. I would, however, like to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address on the able manner in which they performed their duty.

My intention in taking part in this debate is to touch upon two matters, both of which

are of political importance to Western Canada. The first to which I wish to refer is the matter of bringing on a general election at this time. In the year 1911 an election was sprung upon us just as the census figures were being completed, and for six years, from 1911 to 1917, the province from which I come was represented in this House by seven members instead of twelve, and a similar condition would no doubt arise again if an election were held before redistribution took place. The mover of the amendment (Mr. Mackenzie King) has been recently through the West, and I think he will agree with me when I say that, as leader of his party, he has very little to hope for from the West. To bring on an election at this time would be taking an unfair advantage of particularly the four western provinces. Of recent months, I have been through my constituency a number of times, and I must admit there has been a demand for an election, but only from those who were opposed to this Government in the first place, and particularly from those who were opposed to this Government's war policy. I have not heard of a demand for an election from the Liberals who supported me and who were many; I have not heard of it from the Conservatives who supported me, and there were many of them too. The fact of the matter is that the people in the province of Alberta are not wasting very much time in thinking about party politics; they are attending to their business and going ahead as best they may.

The question which I want to deal with particularly and which seems to me of greater importance to the three Prairie Provinces than anything that has as yet been discussed in this House, is the matter of handling the farmer's grain. I need not state that agriculture is now and probably always will be the great industry of those three provinces, and grain growing is the most important branch of agriculture. At the outset I want to say that I agree with the remarks and the suggestions made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in the latter part of the speech which he made in this House the other day. Everything he said in connection with that subject is the truth, but I want to remind the hon. member that he did not, by any means, tell the whole truth. Indeed, I do not know that there is in this House a member who is fully and well-enough informed upon the subject of handling grain and the disabilities under which the farmers operate to be capable of telling the whole story. We get small threads of it here and there; we hear rumours, many of which are no doubt true; but they have not been established, and they have not been referred to particularly in this House. Of course, any disability under which the farmer suffers pertains somewhat also to the consumer; but, as is most other lines, the man who is at the primary point of production is the first man to suffer from those injustices. I regret many of those who represent constituencies in the eastern provinces are not more fully acquainted with the methods by which grain is handled in Western Canada.

I would like to speak particularly on how completely the farmer is at the mercy of the grain dealer. When you consider that his grain is threshed and harvested and marketed, sometimes as far east as Fort William, in the course of a very few weeks, you can see that a good deal of the work that is done cannot be closely supervised, and the first opportunity the grain dealer has to "get" the farmer is the minute he drives his wagon load of wheat upon the scales of the country elevator. These scales are owned and controlled by the grain dealer, and are operated by one of his employees. A few days before I left my home, my nearest neighbour drove off the scales of a well-known elevator company in our town to the scales of another elevator company, and found there was a difference of eight bushels between the time he left the one company and got to the other. Now that eight-bushel loss means that the farmer was losing from ten to twenty per cent of his wheat, and at this point there will probably be marketed this year $1,500,000 of grain. So if all the companies are as dishonest as the one to which I refer attempted to be, there will be a loss of anywhere from $100,000 to $300,000 for the farmers in that way alone, at that one point; and that is only one of thirty-five shipping points in the constituency I represent.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

—

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BLAIR (resuming): When the House rose at six o'clock I was referring to the methods of some of the grain companies that are operating at country points in the Prairie Provinces. I had mentioned the fact that it had been reported to me that a farmer had driven his load of grain

from one elevator to another and found in doing so that it had increased some eight bushels in weight. That meant probably from 10 to 20 per cent of the value of the whole load of grain, and at the point where I live and market my grain it would mean from $100,000 to $300,000 per year that would be taken out of the farmers of that immediate district. There are in the riding in which I represent some 35 shipping points on the different lines of railway; so that it will be seen that if the Government proposes to do anything towards investigating this condition, the place at which to begin is the beginning, at the country elevators.

It would seem to me that a method could be easily devised to take the weighing away from the elevator companies and place the handling of it under the control and direction of Government officials. In addition to the weighing of the grain at the country elevators, the operator of the local elevator is also charged with the grading of grain under certain conditions, and this is where the small farmer particularly is squeezed. The small farmer who has less than a car-load of grain to ship drives up to the country elevator and is at the mercy of the operator, not only as regards the weighing of the grain, but so far as the grading as well is concerned. Grain sold in this way is refered to as street wheat, and as stated by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Argue), there is no reason why there should be much difference between street wheat and track wheat offered on the market at Fort William. But at one point on one of the lines of railway in my riding there was a difference of as much as 47 cents a bushel between the street wheat and track wheat on one particular day this fall, and at a point within 35 miles of this very place on another line of railway some of the same companies were operating and paying for street wheat only about 20 or 22 cents less than track wheat. There was a combine undoubtedly amongst the elevators operating at the first point—there can be no question in the world about that—and that combine existed for the purpose of killing competitive buying. At the other point the ordinary methods of competitive buying were practised, and the farmers there were coming from greater distances, delivering their wheat and getting a square deal.

There is another phase of the question to which I want to refer, and that is the position in which the operator of the country elevator finds himself. He is an employee of these large companies, some of them very large indeed, and he is engaged on a salary and put under heavy bonds. He is charged with the responsibility of taking in the grain, weighing it out and grading it, and in many instances paying for it. If there is a bank, payment is made by cheque, and if there is not he has to pay in currency. He loads his wheat or other grain into the cars; it is delivered at Fort William and weighed from the cars into the terminal elevators. It is never made known to him during the whole operating season how the cars weigh out. They may be short or over, but the facts are never made known to him, and frequently at the end of the year, after everything is closed up, a representative of the elevator company comes along and without giving particulars, without telling him how these things happened, informs him that he is short, two, or three, or five hundred bushels, as the case may be, and the operator is ordered to make good the shortage. You can see the temptation that is placed in the way of an operator of a country elevator. If he desires to be honest he has the knowledge that this club may be continuously swung over his head.

I might remind the House that during past sessions we have heard about screenings or dockage, and we got some rather interesting information a session or two ago before a special committee of this House known as the Cost of Living Committee. I would like to explain that if these screenings are under three per cent at Fort William they become the absolute property of the terminal elevator. If they are over three per cent they become the property of the farmer. Now the farmer pays for the threshing of the wheat that he delivers to the country elevator and he pays there a cent and three quarters a bushel for handling it. He also pays the elevator a commission and he pays the freight. Yet at Fort William, when the screenings are three per cent or under the terminal elevator gobbles the whole thing without having paid one cent in the matter of production, transportation or anything else.

Mr. J. F. REID: Who pays for the cleaning of the screenings?

Mr. BLAIR: The terminal elevator, but I would be very glad to go into the terminal elevator business myself if I could get such a concession as I have described. As I say, the farmer pays every other charge, and in two crop years during the war the.

price at the terminal elevator of these screenings was $35 a ton. That is a higher price than is being paid on the market to-day for No. 2 C.W. oats.

Mr. MAHARG: Who regulates the screenings; who makes the recommendations in connection with that matter?

Mr. BLAIR: It is perfectly legal, as I understand, for the terminal elevator to take the three per cent.

Mr. MAHARG: My question was, who makes the recommendation?

Mr. BLAIR: I do not know that that matters. The point is that we want the whole thing investigated in order to bring out the facts. Now as to the matter of overages. That has been fully dealt with by the member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), and I do not propose to say much upon the subject. I have heard it argued that the terminal elevator should get the overages because it must pay for the shortages. Now I do not know of any more convincing way to answer that argument than to say that such a contention amounts to this: Because the terminal elevators pay for what they are caught stealing they should be allowed to get away with what they are not detected in stealing.

A great deal has been said with respect to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Properly and honestly conducted, a grain exchange cannot be objected to. It is a legitimate place for buyers and for sellers, just as in the case of other commodities. But the Winnipeg Grain Exchange has become practically the whole channel through which our western wheat reaches the eastern miller and the buyer overseas. One rule that I believe exists with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange is objectionable. The member for Macdonald explained how the prices are fixed at country places. These prices are sent out by the North West Grain Dealers' Association each day, after having been fixed by an officer of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and the rule to which I refer declares that any member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange who is found paying a higher price than that authorized by its officer is doomed to expulsion from the organization.

I have had personal experience in this matter. On one occasion I sold three carloads of oats to a member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. He signed a contract on a certain date and I had the privilege of shipping these oats later on. When I was ready to ship the oats the price had dropped. They were loaded through the elevator of a well-known grain company and immediately these oats were shipped they wrote and asked me why I had not sold my oats to them. I replied that I had been able to get a higher price than they were willing to pay me. I immediately got a request for all papers and documents in connection with this transaction, but I refused to comply with the request and, so far as I know, the matter was dropped. But the point I want to make is that if these people are able to penalize the man who goes out into the open competitive market and buys from the farmer at a higher price than the price authorized at Winnipeg, they will do so if they can find a way.

I now want to say a word or two with reference to the Wheat Board. Like every other public institution that Board at one stage of its existence was extremely unpopular, and at another stage it became extremely popular. I am quite sure that if I had been in the hands of fifteen committee men in my riding in the year 1919 they would have enforced my resignation from this House. I am just as sure that if my resignation had then taken place, my successor would also have been re-called last fall because the Wheat Board was not re-established. The fact of the matter is that the unpopularity of the Wheat Board was the result of the persistent and systematic agitation carried out by men who wanted to knock this Government by any means they could employ for the purpose. These men went about the country and told the people that the participation certificates or the "anticipation" certificates were next to valueless, and I know one man in my own neighbourhood who, as a result of the agitation, took his certificates home and threw them into the stove. Other men sold them in great numbers for a price not greater than twenty-one cents a bushel. Eventually these certificates were redeemed by the Wheat Board at forty-eight cents a bushel. These agitators—and some of them were paid agitators—who went through the country working up this agitation for the sole purpose of knocking the present Government, through the Wheat Board, caused a loss to the farmers which aggregated hundreds and thousands and perhaps millions of dollars. They told the farmers that this Government was their enemy, but they awakened one day to find out that their real enemy was to be found right in their own organization. The Wheat Board rendered efficient and valuable service to the farmers of Western Canada, and I have

here a testimonial which I think ought to bear some weight with the members of this House. This testimonial was given by a member of the Wheat Board, it was given by the man who is the President of the United Farmers of Alberta, Mr. H. W. Wood; it was given at a public meeting attended by some two thousand farmers and the report of the proceedings appeared in a paper which is not always friendly to the present Government, the Edmonton Bulletin. This is a verbatim report from the Edmonton Morning Bulletin:

> The Canadian Wheat Board during its existence saved the Canadian farmer 50 millions of dollars and I am certain that if it continues to sell their grain along the same lines as before its abolition by the Government that it would save the farmers of this country several millions more.
>
> The Wheat Board in the past has rendered efficient service and there is no reason why it cannot be continued along efficient operative lines providing you get the right kind of men on the Board. But let me tell you this, just as soon as you get politics and inefficiency mixed up with it then give me the open market.

Now, I want hon. members to note the significance of Mr. Woods' statement. He stated that in handling the wheat crop alone $50,000,000 was saved to the farmers of Western Canada in one year. If the same efficiency and the same good results had been secured from handling all the other grain, that is, the oats, flax, barley and rye, another $50,000,000 would have been saved; that would be $100,000,000, according to the testimony of Mr. H. W. Wood, who is not politically a friend of this Government. I want to emphasize that the ordinary charges made by the Wheat Board for commission, handling, freight, storage and insurance were not less than those under ordinary conditions. So it follows that, if the statement is correct, the farmers of Western Canada this year might have been saved an equal amount, and that in other years they were deprived of this amount of money by the grain dealers.

I think it would be well for the Government to investigate the means of marketing the Western grain when the saving may be so great as $100,000,000 a year. We have got into the habit of thinking in big figures, but let us consider for one minute what $100,000,000 would do. It would pay almost the interest on the national debt; it would build 400,000 miles of rural telephone line—that is worth considering—it would build 2,000 miles of railway; it would put under cultivation 10,000,000 acres of raw prairie land; it is more money than has already been loaned by the Soldiers Settlement Board and it would pay the duty on all the agricultural implements imported into the Dominion in a period of sixty years.

I have referred to the spread between the street and track wheat and other grain. I have talked to some of those who are of the type I referred to at the beginning of my remarks, and who want an election. They will say that there was not much spread at points on the Canadian Pacific Railway—and they are not altogether wrong in saying so—but that generally speaking the spread was greater on the Grand Trunk Pacific and at Canadian Northern points. But I have the word of the president of one of the largest grain firms in Winnipeg to the effect that both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National handled the western grain this last year better than it had ever been handled before, considering the volume of wheat that was going out. And again I am afraid that there is a little touch of politics in this criticism. It is a curious thing that the men who are to-day damning the Canadian National system are the men who damned the Canadian Pacific for forty years. They have at last come to the conclusion that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a pretty good institution and that the Canadian National is all wrong.

I want to urge most strongly on the Government that they investigate every phase of the marketing of wheat and other grains from the time the farmer drives his wagon on the scales at the country elevator point to the time the grain reaches Liverpool or until it is handed into the mills in Eastern Canada. I have heard more complaint about the way our grain has been handled this last year, and especially since the farmers got acquainted with the efficiency of the Wheat Board, than I have heard concerning any other phase of the economic life of Western Canada, and I feel sure that if the Government conducts a thorough investigation to find out where the abuses are, and the remedy for those abuses, it will do a greater service to the grain growers of Western Canada than any other action that this Government has taken or can take or that any Government in the past has taken. Certainly the Government will render a greater service to the farmers of these three provinces than anything that has been suggested by our friends in either Opposition party. I hope that such an investigation as was proposed by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) will be proceeded with and that it will have concluded its labours in time to have the

results formulated before the next season's crop is harvested and ready for the market.

Mr. FRANCOIS JEAN PELLETIER (Matane): Mr. Speaker, this being the eleventh day of the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address and the amendment offered by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), I feel that so much has been said in support of the amendment that there remains but very little for me to add unless I repeat the arguments already advocated. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition asked by what authority my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and the members of his Ministry presumed to carry on the Government. No reason has as yet been given by the Government and its supporters. It is unnecessary for me to repeat certain points at issue, they having been so well put before this House by my hon. friends the leader of the Opposition and the hon. members for Beauce (Mr. Béland), Gaspé and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), Brome (Mr. McMaster), St. James (Mr. Rinfret), Wright (Mr. Devlin), Rimouski, (Mr. D'Anjou), Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier), and Halifax (Mr. Maclean), who have thoroughly explained every phase of the situation. I merely wish to state that I fully endorse all that these gentlemen have said, and I will therefore direct my remarks to other questions.

For a number of years past we have been told by social agitators from their soap boxes and even by so-called statesmen from their places in Parliament or on the public platforms that public ownership of utilities was the panacea for all the ills that affect the body politic. This theory was held up to us as being the greatest advance made in generations by a democratic government towards the full enjoyment by the people of their rights and privileges under the constitution. It may be, Sir, that public ownership in certain countries has increased the control of the people over their natural heritage, but I submit that in this country we have found that the taking over of the railways by the Government has had the contrary effect. In practice, instead of being for the benefit of democracy, public ownership has immeasurably increased the powers of autocracy. We have had a board appointed by the Government, without consultation of the people, and clothed with powers higher and more formidable than those enjoyed by the ministers themselves, answerable to no one, and in the present instance not only incapable of understanding the public mind but of taking part in the progressive ideas of the people. We cannot insist that one of its members be removed for incompetency; we cannot urge upon it that large sections of the country are being badly served by the national railway; we are not permitted to show that it is inefficient in organization and extravagant in operation. It can be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that contracts are given to favorites of the directors, to the detriment of the railway; that certain sections of the country are granted privileges denied to other sections where the traffic receipts are higher; that in the only province wherein, as a matter of fact, the Government railroads can and do earn more than the cost of maintenance, we are treated with a total disregard of the convenience of the population with respect to returns and service. I shall touch upon this point a little later, Mr. Speaker.

I say that a Government controlled by a body such as this is not democratic, because we have placed ourselves in the hands of a body of men who are not now answerable and, if the intention of the Government is to be followed, never will be answerable to the people,—who may if they will, and do as a matter of fact, carry on the administration of this most important of our national undertakings with inefficiency, incompetency, extravagance and neglect, and that even though the people be groaning under the weight of repeated deficits. It is impossible for us to remove these gentlemen and so in some degree alleviate our financial embarrassment.

May I refer to Mr. Hanna's order preventing railway employees from becoming candidates in elections or taking any part in politics? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that order is absolutely unfair to the railway employees. These men were compelled by the Government to become its employees when it took over the different railways; therefore it is through no fault of theirs if they are now in the employ of the Government, or of the Canadian National Railways. I fail to see why they should be now disfranchised by the Government or its creatures—and you will admit, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Hanna and other officials of the

National Railways are the Government's own creatures.

I said a few moments ago that certain sections of this country were granted privileges denied to other sections where the income is great. I shall refer to one division in particular, take the Montreal and Mont Joli division of the Intercolonial Railway; that division is showing a surplus while the other divisions on the same road are showing deficits. I may say that I repeatedly asked the construction of three subways under railway crossings at very dangerous places in my riding, and was refused all three—one at St. Octave, at a sharp curve; one at Little Metis Station, and one at Ste. Florence. If the officials would only take the trouble to have these places inspected, they would immediately see the justice of my requests.

Further, I asked certain officials of the Intercolonial Railway to prevent certain lumber merchants from piling lumber in the railway yards immediately east of the railway station at Amqui. My reason for making the request was because there were quite a number of residences in the immediate vicinity, the owners of which had to pay premiums for the insurance on their buildings at the same rate as that applicable to the lumber yards. That request also, was refused. Then, on the Montreal and Mont Joli division, why should we not have some men on the dining cars who can speak the French language? We are being asked repeatedly by travelling salesmen and others why we as members of the House cannot have this condition remedied.

The taking over of the railways was forced through this House by the Unionist Government and against the will of the Liberals comprising His Majesty's loyal Opposition. We contended that Canada was practically bankrupt as a result of our participation in the Great War—and I will say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's participation in the war did not create such a great national financial liability as did the railway policy involved in the creation of a national railway system. The war cost Canada about $1,800,000,000, while the outstanding indebtedness of the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific is admitted to be $1,000,000,000, but is really much more. To this must be added $300,000,000 for the National Transcontinental, and $150,000,000 for the Intercolonial, and then there are such other systems as the Hudson Bay Railway and the smaller non-paying roads. If interest on investment was computed and added, the total cost of the National system to Canada would equal Canada's expenditure in the Great War. Canada has certainly paid for its railway debauch, but the worst is yet to come. Within three years the capital expenditure necessary for connecting links, replacements and equipment will absorb another hundred million dollars, adding six million more to the annual sixty million dollar deficit which the country must pay for its Government ownership fad. It is costing more to pay railway deficits than it did to run the whole government twenty-five years ago. No one has suggested a feasible solution. The Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk and Intercolonial as one system with a capital not exceeding $250,000,000 might, under efficient management, be made a self-sustaining organization, but load them with the Grand Trunk Pacific and other roads, and the result would be immediate bankruptcy.

To-day, Mr. Speaker, if the truth was known, I believe it would be found that the Government is seeking to unload its pet system of public ownership of railways which was imposed on the Canadian people through the exercise of closure in the House of Commons, as I predicted on the floor of this House in 1919. Such a government is not giving the public justice, particularly a government which refuses to dissolve Parliament and give the country an opportunity to select a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

In figurative language we say that we liquidate a situation when we set things back in order, when all is arranged for the best and we come back to normal conditions. The war, which had brought about a disorganization of the economic, social and national life of the nation, is over. The treaties have been signed, and even though peace has not altogether been restored, the nations are all doing their best towards effecting a reconstruction of the political as well as the general domestic conditions. We have thus seen England, France, Italy and the United States renew their Parliaments and governments. Peace brought on a new state of affairs and new men were called upon to establish it .

Let us consider what is going on in the economic world and in the social domain. Industry liquidates; commerce liquidates; groupes replace one another and take their pre-war positions; and while, of course, all this does not take place without some contradiction and friction, this reconstruction is for the best, because it is only in this way that in those domains normal con-

ditions will reappear. Why should conditions be different in the political domain? In Canada, the political situation will not be improved until after liquidation, that is to say, when things and men shall have taken their pre-war places, and, Mr. Speaker, it is only by a dissolution of Parliament and a general election that the necessary liquidation will be accomplished. It is known throughout the world to-day, except by a few non-believers, that the Prime Minister is in the position of what "Le Maître de la Theologie Catholique" calls a usurper, "qui per ambitionem et proceumque illicito modo potestatem adipiscitur"—"a man who came into power through ambition and by illicit means."

My right hon. friend does not hold his "would-be" mandate from any national group or from any political party except his own self-constituted party, namely, the "National-Liberal Conservative Party," if I may call it such. Therefore, it behooves my right hon. friend, in order to do justice to the people of this country, to dissolve Parliament and to give the electors an opportunity of either ratifying or rejecting his self appropriated mandate.

Mr. HUGH MURRAY SHAW (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks in this debate; but since the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) has brought forward a request asking that the Government appoint a commission to make a thorough investigation into the handling of grain from the time it leaves the farmers' hands until it reaches its final destination, I feel that I would be negligent in my duty to my constituents if I did not say something regarding it. I am not going to relate any incidents that have come to my knowledge whereby the farmers have not been getting a fair deal. We have heard several incidents cited by former speakers, and what is common at one point occurs throughout the West.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. Speaker, in this chamber about the discontent and unrest that exists among the farmers of Canada. I believe the key to this unrest and discontent which at present exists, will, if an investigation is made, be found in large measure within the operations of the Canada Grain Act. I know the farmers of my constituency, and they are, in my opinion, reasonable; they are willing to live and let live; all they want is a square deal; but under the conditions under which the grain is at present handled, they know, if I may be pardoned for using a slang expression, that they are being "trimmed at every turn."

We have also heard in this chamber statements made as to the money paid in duties to this Government by farmers of the West. I believe the money paid in duties by the farmers of the West, in comparison with the money lost through the present method of handling grain, is a mere bagatelle. I would strongly endorse the request of the hon. member for Macdonald, that this Government appoint a commission to investigate the grain trade, and do it at the earliest possible moment, so that the farmers of the West may be able to take advantage of it during the coming year.

There is another matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the Government, Mr. Speaker, and that is winter grazing on the forest reserves. At the present time ranchers living in the vicinity of these reserves have the privilege of getting a permit to graze cattles or horses on them, these permits being good for six months, from May 1 to October 31. I believe the rate charged is seven cents per head per month, and is charged for the six months. In the past this six months' regulation was not rigidly enforced, and ranchers who lived on the edge of the reserve and those who were surrounded by it and who had secured their land before the reserve was set aside, let their cattle graze on these lands later than October 31. Last summer the department issued strict instructions that winter grazing was not to be permitted, with the result that these ranchers who lived on land adjoining the reserve or within its boundaries found themselves in the position that they had nowhere to run their cattle during the winter months. I believe the regulations were changed in the early months of the winter, allowing ranchers who were in this position to obtain special permits to run their cattle as in former years, but they were informed that in future these special winter permits would not be continued.

What I ask is that the Government allow winter grazing on these forest reserves. The ranchers are willing to pay the additional fees, if any, and I am sure that the Government will find use for the money so collected. If there was a lack of grass on these reserves, I could see the wisdom of not allowing winter grazing, but there is plenty of grass at present; in fact, I do not think there are fifty per cent of the cattle in this district that there were two

years ago. On account of the dry year and the high prices for cattle in 1919, the ranchers sold everything that was salable; the winter of 1919-20 was very severe, and the loss to the ranchers was from 10 to 30 per cent. I am not speaking from hearsay; I was over parts of the reserve last fall, and I may say that I never saw more grass on it, at that time of the year, than I did then. I have received from the ranchers several letters regarding winter grazing, one of which contains certain statements that I would like to put on Hansard. It is from George Porter, of Maycroft, Alberta:

In taking up this question of winter grazing upon the Forest Reserves you will understand that we are not discussing the reserves as a whole, but just that section in which ourselves and a few other ranchers are interested, namely the Porcupine Hills and part of the Rocky Mountain Reserves.

Ourselves and a few others have been running stock in this district for close on to twenty years, some much longer. We realize other reserves have different conditions. Some have no ranchers located within their boundaries, others are only used as summer grazing ground, as, for instance, the Gap Country behind the Livingstone range. On account of the depth of snow and the different quality of the grass, all the average winter cattle would perish if left there. With us in the foothills conditions are entirely different, as, on account of the grass curing and open water, cattle and horses do well in the winter.

We, along with a few others, are located in practically the middle of the reserve, and in our case we have leaseholds scattered throughout the reserve which were acquired before there was any reserve. Since the reserve was formed we have been surrounded, and if you deprive us of winter grazing you force us to discontinue as we have no place else to run our stock, our leases being so mixed up with the grazing on the reserve that it is impossible to use one without the other. Considering the state of the stock industry to-day, we feel sure once you are aware of the facts in connection with our case it would not be the policy of the Government to close us out.

Unlike the farmer and the man residing on the outside of the reserve who have other lands upon which to run their stock in the winter, and other interests, such as grain farming, our sole business is the raising of live stock.

We settled here many years ago when very few people would think of living this far away from civilization; in fact, it is still considered about the jumping off place.

This part of the reserve is an exceedingly rough country, broken up by high ridges and deep ravines; also a big percentage is not available for grazing on account of being covered with poplar and willow brush, as the topographical map of this district will show. The coulees running up towards the ridges have numerous poisonous plants growing in them, such as larkspur, water hemlock, wild parsnip, etc., etc., so the stock has to be kept out of these places in the spring, but as the plants are harmless in the fall and winter we use that grass then, also the high ridges up toward the timber, for in the summer the bull-dog and black flies are so bad there that it is impossible to keep stock there, and they stay on the flats. From this you will see that there are only parts of the country available for summer use. It is a kind of law of nature where she reserves certain parts for fresh grass during the fall and winter. A peculiar thing about these poisonous plants is that they are not found to any extent further west of us in the Gap Country behind the Livingstone Range but seem confined to the foothills. Some years the poison is much worse than others, but any stock that are not kept out of these places in the spring and early summer have a big percentage of their number die.

The grass is there, and we are willing to pay for it; so why deprive the rancher within the reserve and who has leaseholds upon the same of the right to use it? On account of the preceding summer being so dry that no feed would grow, and the very severe winter last year, most of us lost about fifty per cent of our cattle. Why cripple the industry further? It looks to most of us like the proverbial last straw. We run about two hundred horses here, and have spent a lot of time and money in buying pure bred stallions, and otherwise improving the herd. If this regulation goes into effect it is all time and money wasted, as we have no place else to run them, and with the state the horse market is in at present it is impossible to sell them. Another thing; we have invested here in ranch equipment, etc., several thousand dollars, also have spent a lot of money in fencing the boundaries of the reserve and putting up different drift fences to handle the stock better. You will realize that we are in a much different position from the man outside the reserve who has not a cent invested and no interest at all within the reserve.

Do not be under the impression that the rancher runs his cattle out all winter without any feed. We put up all the green feed we can raise and what wild hay is available; as the cattle go down in flesh they are taken in and fed, and as the spring draws close a rancher is feeding everything except horses and big steers. If he had to take his stock in off these grazing areas all at once they would soon eat up his supply of feed, also it would be a useless waste of feed as stock stay in good shape until spring. At the present time we have cattle that are in beef condition running on the range.

The letter in which the above was enclosed was dated January 28, 1921. I have known the writer since he came to Alberta some twenty years ago, and I know that the statements he makes there are correct.

We have heard a great deal from the other side of the House on the question of the Government's mandate. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that this Government has no mandate from the people to continue in office, and that they should resign and go to the country. In this connection I wish to say that during my campaign there was nothing said about the Government, if returned, remaining in power only for the duration of the war; in fact, the late Secretary of State, the

Rt. Hon. A. L. Sifton, when speaking in behalf of the Government at Macleod and High River, in my constituency, said that if the Government was returned it would, in all probabilty, remain until after redistribution, and that at the next election, instead of the West having, as at present, fifty-five members representing them, they would have seventy or seventy-five. This will show, Mr. Speaker, that it was expected that Parliament would run its full term. These statements of Mr. Sifton's will be found in the Calgary and other papers that quoted his speeches at different points in Alberta.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have the interests of the farmers of the West just as much at heart as any of the hon. members who belong to the Agrarian party. I have never been asked to resign, nor have I ever heard that it was even intimated that I should resign. But, Mr. Speaker, if I had crossed the floor of the House, I would have expected those of my constituents who voted for me to ask me for my resignation.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) for bringing to the attention of the Government and the members of this House the necessity of having an investigation into the grain trade.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is proper that now and then a French speech be heard in this House, if only to recall to those who forget, that the two languages have equal rights, not only in the House of Commons and in the Senate, but in all the departments and in all the other administrative services in Canada. Therefore, I purpose after the example set by my hon. colleagues from Nicolet (Mr. Trahan), from Hull (Mr. Fontaine), from Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) and others, to say in my maternal tongue, so beautiful, so expressive and so sweet to the ears of whoever can understand and appreciate it, what I think of the present Governement, of its policy in general, and of the amendment proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. MacKenzie King).

Before going over the three points I have first mentioned, I protest in the name of the province of Quebec and of the county which I have represented in this House for the last twenty-four years, against the intended and premeditated insult offered us in not having the Address in response to the Speech from the Throne moved or seconded in the French language. Let it not be said that it is the fault of the Province of Quebec, because we have sent to this House no member of the party in office. This answer does not hold good. The member for Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) speaks French as we all do, and I am sure that if he had been asked to second the Address in French, he would have considered this request as an honour to him, and the old custom would not have been disregarded. It would have been the same thing if the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) had been chosen. I accuse the hon. minister of Justice with not having done his duty as representative of Montreal in the French province of Quebec, in neglecting to take the means of preserving the traditions of this House in the choise of the mover and seconder of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. He, especially, who represents the Irish Catholic minority of this country in the Cabinet, should have thought of the other minority which comprises one third of the whole population of the country, and seen to it that equal justice be rendered on this occasion.

This being said for the satisfaction of my conscience and of my legitimate pride in the rights of the French language in this House, I now ask myself: Does the Government really possess the confidence of the country? I hasten to reply, No; and I am going to try and furnish as to that the best possible evidence. How is the voice of the people to be heard if not through the medium of the press and through the by-elections which circumstances bring about either in one province or another.

Let us take the great newspapers of the different provinces. Is there not to be found in them every day the evidence that the Government have ceased to command a majority in the country? Is not the Toronto "Globe" which for several years supported the Government, the first now to declare that the time has come for the Cabinet to go before the people? Did not the Montreal "Gazette", the pillar of Conservatism in this country, advise the Government, after the by-election in Peterborough, to have a general election immediately, and not wait till the vote of the Chambers compel them to go and face the electors? What is to be said now of the "Standard" of St. John, New Brunswick? There is not in the whole country a single newspaper more devoted to tory principles, more subservient to the interests of the Conservative party; and

yet when you read this paper nowadays you ask yourself how can such a metamorphosis have taken place? There we have three Conservative newspapers, in the three great provinces of Confederation. And we could continue the list indefinitely; but this much is enough to show that the Canadian press has withdrawn its confidence in the present Government.

What is now to be said of the by-elections? Are they not the most eloquent voices to proclaim the truth of our contentions? Apart from two ministers returned in constituencies carefully selected all the by-elections save one have been humiliating defeats for the Government.

And even in the election of St John, N.B., and of Colchester, has the result been of such a nature that the Government should feel reassured about what it may expect at the polls. The hon. minister of Customs (Mr. Wigmore) has seen his majority of 1917 considerably reduced, and, as an hon. member was saying this afternoon, it was necessary to order from the United States an immense dredge to be kept at work in the Bay of Courtenay during the election. With regard to the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy), he has been returned, not by the county of Colchester, but by the manufacturing town of Truro. And if you ask me why the town of Truro has given such a compact vote to the hon. minister, I will say: Go and ask the hon. Mr. Stanfield, formerly divorced from the Government, and now seated on the senatorial benches. That was, no doubt, the reward of his devotion to the new minister.

But we have not only the newspapers and the by-elections to prove that this Government has lost the confidence of the country. There are also the Veterans of the Great War, whose voice has been heard in the resolutions which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), has been forced to admit as existing and as having been sent to the prime minister of this country.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand the degree of unpopularity which the present Government brought upon itself, all there is to do is to walk out of this House and go through some of the parishes, towns and cities of this country. The workmen in the cities, the farmers on their lands, the returned soldiers, the servants in the civil service, the women organized into associations, all have only one voice to exclaim: When will we have elections, so that we may return to the years of peace, of concord, of prosperity of the liberal reign of Sir Wilfrid Laurier? But there is a discordant voice crying out in the desert: it is the voice of the big financial interests who are in holy terror of finding themselves orphaned on the day that this Government will have the courage to face the country in order to receive the adverse verdict which is in store for them.

The hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) was saying the other day in this House that the present Government had unsurped power, and was the first Government of the kind since Confederation and, with that great eloquence which we all know of has proven his say with uncontrovertible proofs. But, Mr. Speaker, if any doubts could still remain on that subject, after the speech of the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville, every vestige of doubt disappears after the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), who was formerly a colleague of those honourable gentlemen of the cabinet.

Having got into power under false pretenses, although under well known colours, those so-called unionist, to maintain themselves in office by the most scandalous debauch of soldiers' votes ever resorted to in Europe or Canada; having associated only for the duration of the war, the time has arrived to put an end to that comedy of unionism, disguised under new colours: national-liberal-conservative, and that is what is asked by the amendement of the hon. leader of the opposition.

The hon. prime minister, whose brilliant qualities of leader of men I am not here to discuss, has seen fit to change his views and to tender the olive branch to the province of Quebec. But is he sincere in his declaration of love, now that he has attained the supreme honour of being the prime minister of this Country? He is accused, in this House and outside of this House, of having insulted the province of Quebec. He has energetically protested that such was not the case, and has asked for proofs of those accusations. He has not, then, had the courage to read the speech of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan), delivered on the 22nd of the present month. If he had read that speech, he would have seen there the proof that, not very long ago, when an election was held, he had seen his way to insult in this House the whole French deputation, which follows in the steps of the hon. leader of the opposition. Could he have believed that because he was on the other side of the Rocky Mountains no echo of his words could have reached us? He reckoned without the newspapers,

as the *Vancouver Sun* and the *Montreal Gazette* have reported as follows:

Again, at Summerland, he has spoken of the leader of the opposition and the opponents of the Government as being "those whose idea of liberty was to let others go to fight for them".

Some hon. MEMBERS: (Translation.) Shame!

Mr. GAUVREAU (Translation): Now, those who know the promoter of the War Time Elections Act, and of the other nefarious act of conscription, those who know that the sordid idea which was at the base of the elaboration of that last act, had not so much for object to send reinforcements to our soldiers in the trenches as hopes to see the province of Quebec rise in revolt against its application, and then raise the English provinces against us: all those who know the promoter of the famous Closure Act, of which our poor and revered chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was the first victim, will understand what he had in mind when he was so discoursing at the time of the elections of Yale.

That was the old and vile insult hurled anew against us, citizens of the province of Quebec; under another form, it was a new edition of the story about the slackers, the cowards and the traitors of Quebec.

Confronted with those statements, the Prime Minister cannot answer that we are unable to prove our contention, and it ill becomes him to hold out his hand to us when there is nothing in his bosom but disguised hostility. If his fondness for Quebec was such why did he turn to this side of the House in search of some one for his cabinet when there are in Montreal and elsewhere in the province so many Conservatives who would be only too willing to take the chance? He hoped to disintegrate the liberal block in Quebec. He failed in his attempt or rather he only succeeded in rendering it more compact than ever by withdrawing from our midst a unit which was already loosened. I think the honourable member from St. Hyacinthe and Rouville will long regret that mistaken stroke of the oar of which the honourable member from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) spoke, and the remarks he made in this House about his former friends, far from enhancing his reputation will be considered as the song of the swan leaving the sunny shores where he led a happy life for the cold regions whence there is no coming back.

If the honourable Prime Minister intended to prove his sympathy for the province of Quebec and its religious convictions, why did he not oblige the Civil Service Commission to keep the pledge given by the former Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Sir R. L. Borden, who had stated in this House that Catholic public servants would not have to work on holidays which according to our creed must be kept as Sundays, the Lord's days. He refused to do so and for that he is still open to censure for this lack of sympathy toward us, citizens of the province of Quebec.

I would like to refer in passing to the policy as ruinous as it is blamable concerning the national railway. In two years, a magnificent policy, that of state railways, has been turned into an utter failure to which is added a deficit of over $100,000,000. And what is the treatment meted out to the old pension employees of the Intercolonial? During the war and the most acute period of the high cost of living, they were, together with their wives and children, left to suffer greatly, only receiving a meagre minimum pension of $15 a month. Have they acted fairly and decently toward these old and faithful servants of the country? I pleaded for them to the best of my ability. I entreated the Minister of Railways to have mercy upon those men who have given thirty or forty years of their lives to the service of their country. The honourable Minister—I must praise him for it—was well intentioned, but the officers in charge of the pension fund were not as well intentioned and were guarding the treasury as if it were their own. I again beseech the Government to have mercy upon those old servants and I ask for an increase of their pensions so that they may enjoy in their old age a certain amount of comfort which is not denied even by the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that this Government does not enjoy any more the confidence of the country, because they have usurped power by treading under foot its constitutional liberties; that the time has come for an appeal to the people who are eager to pass judgment upon those who have bungled what we hold most dear: our democratic system.

There is but one way to carry out the designs of the people who are clamouring for a general election; it is to vote for the amendment of my leader—the authorised, avowed and admired leader of the liberal party.

I know beforehand those who will vote against this amendment. First, the whole

Government, because they do not want to get out, then Liberals who disowned their leader and their party and who are not courageous enough to let go such a fat portfolio. Then, again, those who will never be returned to this House and who are over anxious to lay hold of their $4,000 indemnity for a session or two longer; also, those craving for power or sponging upon the government, who are counting on senator—or judgeships and—the last but not the least—the high priests of protection, the pillars of the big interests who well know that, on the day when the Government vanishes, they will no longer be the masters of the new administration.

The Government may have a majority, but it will be neither real nor disinterested and, consequently, it will be impossible for it to last long, for the day is not far distant when Canada will witness in the place of honourable gentlemen opposite a new administration truly liberal and national, and anxious to put an end to the great crisis we are going through at the present time.

Mr. EDWARD THOMAS WORDON MYERS (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gauvreau) are correct, and from the intelligence of the gentleman and the able manner in which he seemed to deliver his speech I take it for granted that he was supporting the Government.

Mr. JACOBS: You should take a few lessons in French.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: You had better carry a dictionary around with you.

Mr. MYERS: I desire to say just a few words in regard to the amendment to the amendment introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell.) From what I could glean, its import is that redistribution in his mind, is of such importance that it is the duty of this Government to adjourn the House after supply is voted and certain urgent business is concluded, let the census be taken in the month of June, let the statistics be compiled by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and after the data are ready let us again meet here and pass a redistribution bill and then go to the country and get the verdict of the people as to who should govern this nation at the present time. Well, I do not agree with the amendment, because I do not think that, if we adjourned the House in May or June it would be possible to meet again, as suggested by the hon. member, before December or January; and this would make it absolutely infeasible. Therefore, on that ground I cannot support the amendment to the amendment.

It was not my intention to participate in this debate, but a very important question indeed has been interjected, a question that is agitating the minds of the western farmers, and that is the grain trade. I shall not deal with the various irrelevant arguments that have been put forward in regard to the want of confidence amendment introduced by the leader of the Opposition. I should not like to pass, however, without concurring in the many expressions of congratulation and words of commendation already uttered in reference to the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac), who moved the address, and the newly elected Government supporter from Yale in British Columbia (Mr. MacKelvie). Nor can I let this opportunity pass without extending my congratulations to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen). To my mind, a man of his intellect, ability, sagacity and honesty of purpose well merits the high honour which has been bestowed upon him, and I have no doubt if he is given an opportunity he will guide Canada's destinies in safe, sane and successful channels. I do not want to be accused of any lack of courtesy towards the leaders of the dual Opposition, and I will say that they have my very best wishes. They are both very estimable gentlemen, and though, in my opinion, they are mistaken in their firm conviction of what is right and wrong so far as certain policies are concerned, yet I believe they have a duty to perform, and in that duty as leaders of the Opposition they have my best wishes that they may remain in that capacity for years to come.

An hon. MEMBER: That is a chestnut.

Mr. MYERS: I will not touch the tariff. When the Budget proposals are brought down there will be ample opportunity to deal with matter affecting the tariff. The country has been put to a great expense in connection with tariff revision, a commission having travelled from coast to coast to obtain information regarding the fiscal needs of Canada, and when the Budget proposals of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) are brought down, based upon his findings, there will be ample opportunity for every hon. member to voice his sentiments and record his vote according to his views on the fiscal necessities of the country.

Owing to the great strain and strenuous endeavours occasioned by the war, this is the first opportunity since the cessation of the activities of the late struggle that the Government, or any member of it, has had of putting before the people of Canada its policy. The Prime Minister has been travelling from coast to coast outlining, where ever he has spoken, the policy of the Government, which is uniformly the same. The leader of the Opposition also has been making a tour of Canada, but we find him most inconsistent. As he travels through territories different from a geographical standpoint, where interests are not identical, we see that he has a policy to suit every individual district. And so far as the leader of the National Progressives, as they style themselves, is concerned, I am sure that hon. members, as they listened to his statement of his policy, could hear the echoes from afar of such men in the past as the late Sir Richard Cartwright and others who shared his views on fiscal matters. However, I do not think that one need have very much mental aptitude to realize, despite the rambling and the vaporizing to the contrary of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), that there is a collusion between those two great leaders.

An hon. MEMBER: A collision?

Mr. MYERS: No, a collusion: an alliance if you prefer; or, if I may put it in other language, a confusion of harmony, the confusion being for the sole purpose of misleading the people. They are out and they want to get in, and if I have an opportunity of discussing in this House the Budget proposals of the Minister of Finance, I hope to be able to deal more thoroughly with what the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) described as the political foot-ball of Canada. Now, I think I have given one reason why the amendment of the leader of the Opposition should not be accepted, and that is the fact that the Tariff Commission is about to revise the artiff, which will mean stability for Canada. That is what we need. If the Government were to take the advice of the leader of the Opposition and resign, and if the Governor General called upon him to form a Government, it would mean possibly a year of unrest and instability so far as fiscal matters are concerned; and that is one good reason for postponing an election until the constitutional period has expired.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Self-preservation.

Mr. MYERS: I believe there is an alliance between the leaders of the dual Opposition for a purpose. You have heard, Mr. Speaker, the well-known expression: "Two minds with but a single thought; two hearts that beat as one". Well, I believe that these words are eminently applicable to these hon. leaders. I have the platform which was adopted by the Organized Farmers of Canada. I see that in one of their planks they advocate the reform of the Federal Senate. I do not know what they propose in the way of reform, but I hope it will not be along the line recommended by a certain Senator from Manitoba. I certainly believe there are ways in which the Senate can be reformed. At the present time the representation in the Senate of various provinces is not on a fair basis according to territory. At the present time the province of Saskatchewan is entitled to six senators. We have four now and there are two vacancies. The present senators are: Hon. Messrs. Ross and Willoughby of Moosejaw, Laird of Regina, and Turriff, who at present, I believe, is domiciled in the city of Ottawa, I would point out that the present senatorial representation is grouped around Regina, within a radius of forty or fifty miles, and all central and northern Saskatchewan is unrepresented in the Senate.

Now I believe that instead of having appointments to the Senate made on the prerogative of the Prime Minister, who nominates whom he sees fit, every province should be divided into senatorial districts and senators should be elected for those districts and be compelled to reside in the district which they represent. Further, I believe that the election to fill any Senate vacancy should be according to the rules which now govern elections to the House of Commons. The right of sitting in the Senate should also be accorded to women. This Government, and I am glad of it, has extended the suffrage to women and they are now entitled to sit in this Chamber as well as in the Provincial Legislatures I see no reason why they should not be enabled to sit in the Upper Chamber of this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk with respect to matters which may possibly be termed parochial. But the question of freight rates is not a parochial one. In the West we feel that, under the judgments rendered by the Board of Railway Commissioners, we are particularly discriminated against. It was especially hard, Sir, to have an in-

creased rate go into effect about October 1, last year, when we were starting to ship our grain. I believe it to be the duty of this Government—and I give the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) credit for advocating the same thing—to ask for the resignation of the Board of Railway Commissioners if they will not do justice to Western Canada. Now, interlocked with the subject of freight rates is the matter of the operation of the Canadian National Railway which unfortunately has a large deficit every year. In my opinion the Government should plan out a re-organization of the directorate and general management of that system. As long as deficits continue in the operation of the Canadian National System of Railways, there will be a demand for the enforcement of the existing, and possibly higher, freight rates; and therefore this Government should ask for the resignation of the present management in order that a thorough re-organization may be brought about and experts appointed to efficiently operate the system.

I believe, Sir, that Canada, as far as possible, should live on its own resources. In saying that I have reference to the large amount of money that is spent in importing coal from United States. Now in Eastern Canada as well as in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, we have vast coal fields; and I believe it would be a good policy on the part of the Government if they could so arrange railway freight rates, and the rates of our own merchant marine, as to bring western coal at a reasonable price from the head of the Great Lakes to the consumers of the East. I notice that the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) has a resolution on the Order Paper dealing with the matter of the coal supply of Canada, and I am very pleased indeed that the hon. member is bringing this important subject to the attention of the House.

This leads me to the grain situation, a very important matter from my point of view as a Western member. I was very much gratified when the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) brought this matter forward. During the war the grain trade channels were very much disrupted. In 1917, owing to price fluctuations, the Government in their wisdom thought it better to fix the price for our wheat. The same course was adopted in 1918. In 1919 there was great uncertainty. The then Minister of Agriculture, now the leader of the National Progressive Party (Mr. Crerar), in many communications to me, stated that the Government could not do anything, that owing to the grain trade being in such an unstable condition it was not possible to make any provision from the public treasury. That hon. gentleman later burned his bridges behind him and left the Government. We have heard it stated that there was opposition to the establishment of the Wheat Board. I do not wish to lay myself open to the charge of making unfair accusations, but as a western member I feel that some of us on this side who represent constituencies in Saskatchewan are not being fairly dealt with as far as the Wheat Board is concerned. I am not going to eulogize the work of the Wheat Board because other hon. gentlemen who have already spoken have done so effectively. But there was opposition to the creation of the Wheat Board. The Government organized that Board in the face of direct opposition from the farmers. The member from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), a very estimable gentleman, speaking on May 21st, 1920, as reported at page 2365 of Hansard, expressed himself as follows:

> The hon. gentleman who has preceded me touched on one of these (statements) and that is the Wheat Board. We did not ask for the Wheat Board. The inference, if not the statement, is to the effect that the farmers asked for the Wheat Board. One hon. member described it as the pooling of our wheat. While the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) stated that the Government appointed the Wheat Board I want to go further and say that the Government did it against the strong opposition of the farmers of this country. The farmers did not want it and they did not ask for it.

Now, I think that settles the point beyond all question.

Mr. MAHARG: If the hon. member wishes to be fair, will he please continue and read further from that speech?

Mr. MYERS: I will do so, I do not want to be unfair. It says:

> The farmers did not want it, and they did not ask for it. But if the Government stepped in, took possession and broke down the lines which had been built up, financially and otherwise, and if there is pooling in the buying of wheat overseas—

I suppose that is what the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) refers to.

> —we have no hesitation in saying that we consider it the proper course for our Government to carry out pooling in the selling of wheat, just so long at least as there was pooling in buying from us.

Nevertheless, there is the plain statement, Sir, that they were in opposition to

the formation of the Wheat Board. However, as I say, I am not going to refer to the workings of the Wheat Board. We all know that it was a success in spite of what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) said on Friday night, that he was not personally opposed to the formation of the Wheat Board. Yet in his maiden speech in this House he said that he had visited many elevators in North Dakota and they were paying $3.05 a bushel there; that the American farmer was pocketing $1.11 more than the Canadian farmer; that the farmers in his constituency were receiving 70 cents to $1 less a bushel for their wheat; that his participation certificates were in a box at home, and he was quite convinced in his own mind that he would get less for his wheat than was paid to the American farmer. Well, it was very interesting when the report of the Wheat Board was tabled, which showed that the Canadian farmer received about 25 cents a bushel more on the average for his wheat than the American farmer did, owing to the working of the Wheat Board.

Then, Sir, we come to the enabling resolution which would have enabled this Government, if they saw fit, to re-establish the Canada Wheat Board. I will give my hon. friend from Maple Creek due credit for very heartily supporting that resolution, merely to show that I do not want to be unfair to him. But the member for Assiniboia in speaking on that enabling resolution was not quite so certain about what he wanted as the hon. member for Maple Creek. At page 4112, volume 5, of Hansard, I find the member for Assiniboia is reported as saying:

> I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as indicating that I am diametrically opposed to this legislation or entirely in sympathy with it.

Mr. BEST: He was climbing the fence.

Mr. MYERS: I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. member for Assiniboia. He said just at the conclusion of his speech:

> I propose to vote for the re-establishment of the Wheat Board this year. I pledge myself only for this year.

I think that kind of support was not likely to give this Government very much backbone towards re-establishing the Wheat Board. We know that the leader of the National Progressive party was not in sympathy with it; he was honest in his conviction, but he was opposed to it. He stated in Hansard:

> Personally, I am opposed entirely to any permanent policy which means control of the marketing of the grain of this country.

I suppose there was a reason why he was opposed to such a policy. But when we consider that the Grain Growers' Grain Company and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company handled about one-third of the total wheat crop of the Prairie Provinces, I believe they should have given the Government a more sympathetic support towards the re-establishment of the Wheat Board.

Mr. MAHARG: May I ask what my hon. friend means by the word "they?" He was speaking of two companies and said that they should have given more enthusiastic support.

Mr. MYERS: I mean the directors of both companies and all concerned with their operation, because, Mr. Speaker, they are supposed to be the champions of the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MAHARG: May I ask my hon. friend if he is aware that at the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, about two months after the Wheat Board came into existence, they passed a unanimous resolution asking for a continuance of the national marketing of our grain?

Mr. MYERS: I think I saw that in the press. But what I am getting at is the fact that there was not the enthusiastic support of the organized grain companies in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta that there should have been. The situation is this, that the member for Assiniboia last week delivered a tirade of abuse against the Government, and yet when this enabling resolution was being discussed in the House he did not seem to know his own mind.

Throughout the West there has been an agitation for the formation of a wheat pool. This is a copy of the questionnaire which has been sent out from the Grain Growers' Guide Limited. It says:

> Enclose one dollar and answer questions contained hereon.

I do not know whether the Grain Growers' Guide is more concerned about its subscription list, or about the farmers' dilemma in connection with the marketing of their grain. However, I have been hoping that the organizations of the farmers would formulate some feasible scheme. I would heartily support a wheat pool or any other scheme which would

enable us to handle our grain in a more efficient manner than we are able to do it under the present system. We see nothing in the press that anything has been formulated. I would certainly urge them to formulate a wheat pool or some other stabilizing agency which will enable us in Western Canada to get rid of many of the grievances with which we are hampered to-day.

I was very glad indeed that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) urged the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to look into the many grievances, major and minor, affecting the grain trade of Canada. I would not like to see this left to the Board of Grain Commissioners; I would rather see an independent Royal Commission appointed, clothed with proper authority to investigate every phase of the grain trade. As the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Blair) said, "Start at the country elevator and continue to the mills in Europe if necessary." I am going to read a tabulated statement which covers the ground very thoroughly:

That a commission be appointed to investigate: the grading and weighing of grain; the receiving, handling and shipping of grain through country elevators and from country points; the operation of grain exchanges by the members thereof; the work of grain exchanges; the handling of grain at terminal points; the holding of grain at terminal points; the operation of public and private terminal elevators and eastern public elevators; the operation of the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association; the operation of the North-west Grain Dealers' Association; the trimming of grain at the upper and lower lake ports and ocean ports; lake shipments; the shipment of grain to Atlantic and Pacific ports; the operation of Canadian flour and feed mills.

Another thing, Sir, is, I think, of great importance. We have a report from the Quebec Board of Trade which says that in the six years from 1912 to 1918, 1,096 million bushels of grain were shipped from Fort William by water. Of this vast quantity, there were sent to Port McNicoll, Port Colborne, Midland and other Georgian Bay ports, for the suuply of all the flour mills in Eastern Canada—some of which was subsequently shipped by rail to New York, Portland, etc., for export, and a small quantity to Montreal and St. John—578 million bushels. To Buffalo—the greater part afterwards sent to New York and other United States seaports for export—there were sent 518 million bushels.

I believe the condition here revealed is a mistake from a Canadian national viewpoint. We have three great transcontinental lines of railway. We have the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John, and I do not see why one bushel of our wheat should reach New York. We have the Transcontinental Railway going into Quebec with a shorter mileage between Quebec and the West than either of the two transcontinental railways. We have an excellent natural harbour at that port, and for the life of me I cannot see why we do not use it. This is another matter which, in my judgment, should be taken into consideration by this Royal Commission—the facilities for marketing our grain and shipping it to Liverpool by Canadian ports only, thus preventing the loss of the identity of our hard wheat through the American practice of mixing it with their soft wheat.

I think there are three main reasons why this Government should carry on at the present time. I cannot see that there has been any really urgent demand for an election from the majority of the people. No matter what Government is in power, there will always be demands from certain quarters for their resignation. As many speakers have reiterated during the course of this debate, not one charge of scandal or graft or corruption can be brought against this Government—a wonderful record. I believe it is the only Government of this country that has been free from taint of graft or corruption, and that consideration should commend itself to the electors. The second reason I referred to a few moments ago—that we want tariff revision and that we want Budget proposals brought down based on the tariff revision with a view to creating that degree of stability in our industries on which the employment of labour depends.

The hon. member for Nelson said that it was very important that we should have redistribution. Why, Sir, we in Western Canada will gain from fifteen to twenty seats after redistribution, and any person in that part of the country who votes for an election before redistribution is not acting in accordance with the wishes of the people out there. Personally I have received more requests that dissolution of this Parliament should not take place until after redistribution than requests to go to the country immediately. In the election campaign of 1917 the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in his manifesto to the electors, stated that Canada would gain twenty-two seats by redistribution and that there were twenty-four vacancies in the House of Commons. Well, Sir, in war time, when the very existence of our people was at stake, the leader of the Opposition of that day thought it of sufficient importance to

go to the country on account of having possibly twenty-two additional representatives from the West. It is even more advisable that we should now wait until redistribution takes place, after the census in June, before holding an election.

The leader of the National Progressive party seemed to be very much alarmed over what might happen when the redistribution Bill was brought down. He seemed to fear that almost a crime would be committed in the way the country would be gerrymandered. Well, Sir, if we are spared we will be in the House when the redistribution bill is being discussed, and I will stand shoulder to shoulder with the member for Marquette and vote against the Government if they attempt to do anything of that nature. I think, however, that his fears are groundless, because we have an honest Prime Minister, a man who would not permit the perpetration of such a crime.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) said, with regard to redistribution, that it was a matter of principle; that hon. gentlemen from the West were capable of looking after the interests of the West—members who will be returned at the next election, and members who are here now. That created a suspicion in my mind, because it is well known that the province from which he comes will probably lose some members when redistribution takes place. I believe that the hon. member was speaking purely from a selfish point of view when he spoke that way.

10 p.m.

I have tried during the course of my rambling remarks to make it quite plain that it is my intention to vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I believe it is my duty, particularly as a western member, to carry on here until we get proper representation for Western Canada.

Mr. THOMAS HAY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before touching upon any of the matters which are of interest to the country at this time, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the mover (Mr. McIsaac), and the seconder (Mr. MacKelvie), of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, whose addresses contained very much information of interest to the House and to the country. Coming, as they do, one from each extreme end of Canada, these hon. members have given us information regarding their particular parts of the country which should be helpful to the members of the House and to the people generally.

I wish also, before going further, to congratulate the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), upon his elevation to the position which he now occupies. It is truly an exalted position and one which carries with it very great responsibilities indeed. I feel sure that the right hon. gentleman, with his ability and his sincerity, will bring to the duties of his office the very best that is in him, and will do all he can to further the interests of the great Dominion and administration of whose affairs has been committed to his charge. I believe that the people of Canada generally are satisfied with the choice. I am sure that when it was announced that the right hon. gentleman was selected to lead the Government of this country a sigh of relief was breathed by the citizens generally upon realizing that such an able man had been selected to look after the destinies of Canada. Of course, our friends across the floor will, perhaps, not agree with what I have to say, but I am satisfied that the great majority of the Canadian people think as I do on the subject of an election. I know throughout the western part of this Dominion, at any rate, and, I believe in the province of Ontario and the other provinces, there is really no great demand for an election at this time; in fact, I am satisfied that the very opposite is the desire of the people, that is, they are quite content that the Prime Minister and the present Government should carry on.

Last session the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in speaking on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, seemed to be very much worried because no hint of policy was contained in that speech. He said that it was empty and barren and dealt more with matters of a foreign nature than with domestic matters. This year, when a definite policy was laid down and a number of very important matters were dealt with in the speech from the Throne, he refused entirely to deal with them. He sidestepped the issue, and ever since this debate opened his supporters, following his example, sidestepped the issue also. It is perhaps policy on their part to do that; but we know and the people know and hon. gentlemen occupying benches across this Chamber know that my hon. friends opposite will not be in a position to do that when they come face to face with the electors of this Dominion; they will then be compelled to face the issue and to deal with the facts. I am satisfied that the great issue that will

be brought before the people at the next general election will be the tariff issue, and my hon. friends opposite will be compelled to deal with that on every platform throughout the Dominion. The leader of the Opposition, instead of meeting the issue fairly and squarely, endeavoured to draw, as it were, a red herring across his trail; he endeavoured to divert the minds of the people and the members to some other issue which is really not an issue at the present time. Through the medium of Parliament he told the people that the great issue at this time was that of a general election, but there is really no such demand. He referred to the Government and its supporters as usurpers of office and office seekers. To my mind, that charge, particularly the one referring to members as office seekers, rebounds like a boomerang on the head of the hon. gentleman, because a charge like that cannot be sustained. We know members occupying the treasury benches are in office at present and are likely to be in office for some time, and consequently, the men who are office seekers at the present moment are hon. gentlemen opposite. I think that is quite clear. Their object in trying to bring about a general election at this time is to get a snap verdict from the people. It has been stated in this House by many speakers—and we know it to be a fact—that the members of the Government during the past three years were so busy with problems arising out of the war and after-war problems, which were many, difficult and knotty, problems such as the statesmen of this Dominion have never before been called upon to wrestle with, that they were not in a position to inform the country as to what had been done and what they intended to do. In the meantime, the Opposition to a man—and I include both branches of that Opposition—were busy throughout the country trying to create a sentiment unfavourable to this Government. To some extent they have succeeded in doing that, and they believe, after they have succeeded in creating a sentiment largely unfavourable to the Government, they may be in a position to win a snap verdict from the people and consequently be returned to office, but I do not think there is much chance of that. If the Prime Minister and his ministers carry on and complete the work that they have been engaged in, the people, after the case has been fully explained to them, will realize that they have had, during the troublesome times through which we have passed, a Government that has been capable, honest, and sincere in purpose.

I should like to say a word regarding the matter of our home market, which I consider would be jeopardized if hon. gentlemen who occupy seats at the extreme end of the Chamber on your left, Sir, were returned to power. Of course, they will say that this is a matter which the old political parties, particularly the Conservative party, have held up for years as a bogey before the people of this Dominion, and have succeeded in obtaining their votes in that way. But I am satisfied that if their policy was put into force in this country, it would be a real menace, not only to the manufacturing interests but to the farming interests as well, because they are dependent to some extent on each other. The farming industry alone never made a country great and wealthy; to bring that about manufacturing industries are required as well; in fact, I believe the success of the farming industry of any country lies largely with the manufacturing interests. Their interests are indissolubly bound up together and the one cannot be separated from the other. I have heard it stated on many occasions, and I think I have heard the statement made in the House, that 85 per cent of the products of Canada are consumed and used in the Dominion. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I am sure, Sir, you will agree with me when I say that if that be the fact, that means a great deal to the farming interests of this Dominion, because it certainly means that the home market is a valuable market to our farmers. Anything that would help to reduce that market or to curtail its purchasing power in any way would certainly not be in the interests of the farmers. I am satisfied that the most valuable market that a country can have is its home market. We have had evidences of that every day, and particularly during the last few years. We know that Great Britain at the present time has an embargo against Canadian cattle. In 1919, I believe it was, we had the spectacle of the United States placing an embargo against Canadian wheat and at present they are raising the duties against Canadian grain and other products of the farm. Consequently, we must look to our own markets to take the produce of our farms, if we wish to be an independent people as far as agriculture is concerned. The Fordney Bill, which passed the Senate quite recently, aims at protecting the farmers and producers of the United

States. I think there is a lesson in that for the Canadian people. If in a country like the United States, where they have a better climate than ours for producing certain lines of produce, it has been found necessary to protect their farming interests, surely it is necessary for the Canadian people living adjacent to that great republic to do something to protect our interests along the same line.

I want to join hands with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in his request for a commission to investigate the Canadian wheat trade from the time the grain leaves the farmer's wagon till it arrives at its destination, wherever that may be. I am satisfied that many of the elevator companies and others handling the farmer's grain are making immense profits on their handling, through overages, and in many other ways. Some hon. member has already dealt this evening with the difference between the track price and the price on the street. The spread there is, in my opinion, unwarrantable, and I think it is unwarrantable in the opinion of any member who has given any study to this question at all. I strongly support my hon. friend's request for a commission to investigate the grain trade in all its phases and aspects, to ascertain wherein conditions can be bettered in the handling of the grain, and see that the profits shall accrue to the farmer and not to the elevator companies or the men engaged in the handling of the crop.

The leader of the Opposition, in his great hurry to introduce a motion of want of confidence in this Government, overlooked another very important matter which was mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I refer to old age pensions and unemployment insurance. This did not seem to strike the leader of the Opposition or any of his followers as being worthy of any notice whatever. I do not know what the labour representatives sitting behind the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) thought, when not only the leader of the Opposition overlooked this very important question, but their own leader practically said there was no need of old age pensions or unemployment insurance at this particular time. I believe the labour interests of this country are keenly alive to the necessity of some kind of unemployment insurance, and I should like to quote from a little pamphlet issued by the Labour Congress of Canada, dated February 1921, and entitled "Legislative Programme of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada." Dealing with this question of unemployment insurance, they say:

> If any argument were needed as to its necessity it has been fully furnished during the past few months when thousands of good Canadian citizens have suffered through lack of employment and through fear of its consequences. We recommend the enactment of unemployment insurance embodying certain principles.

Then they go on to state what those principles should be. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Marquette state that unemployment insurance was not necessary at the present time. I think the matter of unemployment insurance and old age pensions is one of the vital questions confronting the Canadian people at this time, and it is one that will have to be solved by the statesmen of this country in the near future. Unemployment has always existed in this country, and it will always continue to exist, because we are largely an agricultural people, and agriculture employs men for only six or eight months in the year. After that, they have to look elsewhere for employment. Now, if the greatest and basic industry of this Dominion can afford employment to men only for a portion of the year, unemployment will naturally continue to exist in this country, and this question of unemployment is one of the big problems with which we are face to face at the present time. I repeat, I was surprised to hear the leader of the Agrarian party treat this subject of vital importance so lightly. I do not know what the feelings of the labour people of this country will be when they know that both leaders of the two parties aspiring to come into power in this country and take charge of the destinies of Canada did not see fit to devote more than a minute of their time to this question of supreme importance to the labour men of this country. It is a question that will have to be grappled with sooner or later, and personally I would support any system of old age pensions and unemployment insurance that would not throw the burden on the Federal Government or even on the Provincial Governments. I would support a system of old age pensions and unemployment insurance that would compel the men who would get assistance from that fund to contribute something towards it. I feel that is the only reasonable way of bringing into force a system that would be of assistance to the labouring men during periods of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has covered a very wide range, and the ground has been pretty well covered, I think, since the opening of the debate two weeks ago. Anything I might add would simply be a re-hash of arguments that have been made before, but in closing I just wish to give this little bit of advice to the Prime Minister. It is this: that he carry on. I believe that the people of this Dominion expect him to carry on.

They are struck with his sincerity and his honesty of purpose in endeavouring to give the country a good Government. They were struck with his sincerity as he went through the country a few months ago laying down the same policy in different parts of the country and not varying his policy to suit the different districts in which he spoke. There was no vaciliation about his policy; there was no trying to shift matters to other shoulders or to get away from the issue in any way. His policy was clear-cut, straight and above board. That is what the people are looking for and I am satisfied that after they have been enlightened as to what the Government has accomplished during the past year, and what their policy is with respect to the future, there will be no danger of this Government's being voted out of office. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the interest and attention which have been accorded me.

Mr. FERRIS BOLTON (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House at any great length, nor is it my purpose to hand out any more bouquets to the Prime Minister or to the mover and seconder of the Address. I think that that phase of the debate has been amply attended to, and with all the best sentiments expressed I am in hearty accord. I simply rise to endorse the request made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), to have a commission appointed to look into the grain trade. There is no more vital question before the farmers of the West than the handling and transportation of the products of the farm. Years ago our grain came from the machines in a rather clean state and was fit for shipment. Very soon, however, the advent of noxious weeds made it necessary for the elevators to put in cleaners to clean the grain before shipment; but this was soon discarded and at the present time nearly all grain is shipped in a very unclean state, and in this way the farmers do not know what they are getting or how much they will be docked. They have to pay freight charges on the screenings as well as giving it away for nothing and I think it would be the very best thing for the farmers to have a commission appointed to investigate the handling of grain from start to finish.

When the hon. member for Macdonald brought this question up, I thought that, as it was a suggestion of a progressive character, the Progressive party opposite would join in the discussion. But strange to say, up to the present time nothing has been said from that quarter on the subject. I suppose time will tell whether the proposal is too progressive or not progressive enough.

I desire to bring another question to the attention of the Government, especially of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. McCurdy) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne), and that is the drying up of our lakes in the Prairie Provinces. A great many lakes out there have no inlet or outlet and have simply dried up, first turning into hay meadow and then wheat fields. But there are other lakes situated on the river courses and they are drying up with the result that the fish, a great source of food to the farmers, have been practically destroyed. The lakes have become so low in many cases that they have frozen to the bottom that the fish have died and become a great nuisance to the surrounding country in the spring, lying dead along the beach. There has been an improvement made on Killarney and Pelican lakes in the Southwestern portion of the province, which is a credit to the Government; but there is a lake situated entirely in my constituency that has been used considerably as a summer resort. There are a great many cottages built along the beach, and there is a beautiful piece of ground used for a summer school and by picnic parties. But this lake has dried down about three feet and the weeds grow up to the top of the water, which becomes stagnant. I am informed that from three to five thousand dollars would dam the lake up and raise it about three feet. In this way the nuisance would be avoided and we should have a pleasant summer resort.

As to the main question before the House, I must say that I have never had an intimation from my constituency to the effect that I was not doing my duty because I was supporting the present Government. When I was elected there was not a word said about the duration of Parliament, the understanding being that it would run its full term. And I might say that supporters of the hon. leader of the

Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), who voted against me and who would support any candidate running in the interests of the hon. gentleman, if he could find one in the constituency, have informed me that it is advisable for us to continue, because the people do not want an election. These people have told me that they expect us to continue until our time has expired. I therefore think that I have a mandate to support the present Government while it exists. If the leader of the Opposition did not get a mandate in 1917, I do not think we are to blame for that. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that I shall vote against the amendments submitted and in support of the motion before the House.

On motion of Mr. Michael Clark (Red Deer) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Right Hon. C. J. Doherty the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Tuesday, March 1, 1921.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Copies of the Orders in Council carrying out the provisions of the sections of the Act bringing into effect the Treaty of Peace between His Majesty and certain other powers.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ending March 31, 1920.—Right Hon. Arthur Meighen.

PRIVATE BILLS.—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 14, respecting Gilmour and Hughson, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 15, to incorporate North American Trust Company of Canada.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 16, respecting "Les Révérends Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée des Territoires du Nord-Ouest."—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

CANADIAN NATIONALS DEFINITION ACT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17, to define Canadian Nationals. He said: The purpose of the Bill is to define what constitutes a Canadian national. The necessity for such a definition results, in a large measure at all events, from the fact that under different measures adopted in connection with the carrying out of the operations of the League of Nations, there are provisions made defining certain rights and privileges which may be enjoyed by the nationals of the different members of the League. Under those circumstances it is necessary, I think, that we should make a definition by statute so that the world may know who is, and is recognized as a Canadian national. The Bill contains one section which defines as being Canadian nationals, British subjects, domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the Motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the Session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Campbell, resumed from Monday, February 28.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I was immediately preceded in this debate late last evening by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Bolton). My friend is of so modest and unostentatious a disposition, that I am quite sure there are a number, of the members of this House even, who are not aware of the fact that he lost three sons in the great war, and has since passed through terrible family afflictions. I want to take the opportunity afforded me, Sir, by following in this debate to say that I observed with the very greatest satisfaction from the manly, firm and modest way in which he voiced his opinions that his sons came by their grit honourably, and that he himself has come through his troubles in the way that a true Canadian man should do. I am sure that the House, in regard to these circumstances, will join with me in at once offering to my friend our sympathy and our congratulations. My hon. friend himself was preceded by another stalwart and manly friend of mine on the other side of the House who, like the member for Lisgar, might well speak more frequently. My friend from Selkirk (Mr. Hay) appears to me, though I have never gone particularly into his political lineage, to have been brought up in the true old Tory school because he was much concerned last night about the "home market". Well, I do not want to refer in extenso to what he said, but perhaps it may throw light upon argument which I have to offer later

in this debate if I tell him a story which seems to me to illustrate the weakness of the home market if a nation has to depend upon that exclusively. There was a man once who undertook to breed carp and to breed cats. He established his cat ranch on the banks of a lake. In the lake he bred the carp. When the carp had some young he caught some of them and fed them to the cats. The cats eating the carp in their turn propagated their species, and he fed the young cats to the carp. So he went on changing cats for carp and carp for cats. He had a splendid home market but he never got any richer and he never exported anything. We in this part of the House believe in a larger market than that story illustrates.

I am conscious, Sir, of no mental reservation whatsoever when I join with many of my fellow members in offering to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr Meighen) my most sincere and hearty congratulations, on personal grounds, on his accession at a comparatively early period of life to the Prime Ministership of this great Dominion, a position which his character, his ability, and his record alike make him eminently fitted to occupy.

I want to say that I congratulate also my hon. friends the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from His Excellency. The mover's speech was a model for such an occasion, couched in virile and good English, scarcely at all partisan, commendably brief. The speech of my hon. friend the seconder was an exceedingly able one considering that it was a maiden speech, and I am sure it has engendered in us all friendly anticipation of the times when we shall hear him again. He was not quite so non-partisan as the mover of the Address however, because coming from the county of Yale he could not refrain from reminding us that in that county they raise apples. We had learned that from several speeches of the Prime Minister during the election in that county. My hon. friend's anxiety about apples is a splendid illustration of the real nature of protection. The outlook of protection is always local, always sectional, always narrow, never national. The difference between my hon. friend and myself is this: he is concerned about the comparatively few Canadians who produce apples in Yale; I am concerned about Canadians all over the country who eat apples. His interest is in making apples dear; mine is in making them cheap. That is the outlook of protection not only in Yale, but in any part of the country in which the heresy prevails. When a protectionist comes from Nova Scotia—and I am afraid they have protectionists in that province, Sir—he says: You want free wheat in the West? Why, certainly. You want free implements? Why, have them by all means. You want free coal? Ah! that is a different matter. And he turns away sorrowfully, because they produce coal in Nova Scotia. In Peterborough the protectionist says: Peterborough and Progress. Well, I say, Canada and Progress. The outlook is narrow and sectional in the one case; it is really national in the other. My hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Denis)—I hope he was only an advocate on the occasion—goes before the Tariff Commission and asks for an outrageous duty upon tobacco, because they grow tobacco in Joliette. What do I care about where they grow tobacco? When I want to smoke it I want to get it good, and cheap, and I do not care where it comes from. That is the difference of outlook. So we claim for our views that we have the true national policy, and that the term "National Policy" as applied to protection is a total misnomer.

Let me press the point a little further. There is no duty so urgent upon Canadians of thoughtful and noble mind—and I believe they are all thoughtful and noble, or nearly so—as the duty of paying our national debt, principal and interest. Does this House think that that debt can be discharged, Mr. Speaker, by the export of excess tomatoes, or excess apples, or excess tobacco, or even excess manufactures? Our exports of manufactures are a mere bagatelle. If we are to discharge that debt, principal and interest, we must do it by the tremendous surplus, which, we are well able to produce, of the great unprotected and unprotectable natural products of the country; and we are prepared to do it if you will get off our backs and give us a chance. That is the true national policy: Support the industries that will make your nation great, honourable, and prosperous.

I quite agree with my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) that the debate on this Address has taken rather a peculiar form. I agree with him that it has been customary, both in our Parliament and in the Mother of Parliaments, in a debate on the Address to discuss the subjects raised in the Address and the past

and present proceedings of the Administration. I shall follow my leader in endeavouring to keep up this old tradition.

I am glad to be able to agree with the Administration that in this country we are freer from unrest and external signs of the aftermath of the war than perhaps in any of the other billigerent nations. I agree with the Administration also in what they state in the same paragraph of the Speech from the Throne as to the harvest having been on the whole fairly good. I am sure that Administration would not claim an undue amount of credit for the fairly good harvest; and I think that the credit is only a limited one in regard to that other matter upon which the nation is congratulated. I do not deny them all credit, far from it. This country has on the whole done very well for her returned soldiers, but, Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that we are free from unrest is due, perhaps, in the first place, to the very high character of the men we sent to the front, most of whom have settled down in splendid shape and are bringing to their civil occupations the same grit and the same force of character which put them in the war at the beginning and kept them there until victory crowned our banners. It is due, in the second place, to many efforts which have been made on the part of our employers of labour—I know some of them in this city, Sir Henry Egan and others—who from the middle of the war busied themselves to keep positions open for the returned soldiers, and in this I am glad to say they have been well supported by the Administration. But it is due, in the third place, to this consideration, which we can be all proud of as Canadians, that this country to-day presents perhaps better opportunities than are presented by any other country in the world for a man who wants to live his life in a bracing and delightful climate and by his own endeavours to work out his temporal and material prosperity.

Now, I have just referred to the fact that this bebate has taken a peculiar course. For the first nine days, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House were engaged very largely in taunting my hon. friends of the official Opposition—I do not use the term offensively; it is the only one that occurs to me for the moment—with the fact that they did not refer extensively to the tariff. Well, the Government's supporters are not easy to please, because on Thursday last the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) referred pretty extensively to the tariff. But the moment he did so what happened on the Government side? They have not up to the present paid any particular attention to what my leader said about the tariff, but member after member has talked about a subject that is not metioned in the Speech from the Throne at all. An investigation is promised in the speech by His Excellency into the questions of Old Age Pensions and Insurance against Unemployment. But, I repeat, a request has come from member after member for an investigation that is not mentioned in the speech, and that request is a very peculiar one. It is a request for a grain commission—a commission to inquire into and investigate the grain business of Canada. Well, at first sight I thought this was an unrehearsed, and therefore unprinted, portion of the speech by His Excellency; but on second thought it occurred to me that it would have been a much more fit theme to place in the motion of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, calling for censure upon the Government. If the grain business is wrong, who is responsible for it? This Government, or a government very much like this, has been in power in this country since 1911. During this time we have had grain legislation before the House; the Nestor of the Tory party and of the Administration, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), is absolutely responsible for the grain laws that prevail in this country at the present time. And they have a Grain Commission; so this proposal that has been adumbrated, that emanated first from the member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) and has been supported all over that side of the House, is that we should have a Government commission to inquire into why another Government commission is not doing its duty. Well, I would like to know if we are going to pyramid commissions upon commissions? If the first Government commission, which is the creature of a member of the Administration, the Nestor of the Tory party and the Administration, is not doing its duty, how do we know that the second commission will do its duty? I think we had better prod the commission that we have in the meantime. All that I would like to say about these promised investigations, whether in the speech or out of it, is that I venture a prophecy that they will be pretty much protracted, and as they will be pretty much protracted their well-considered findings will not come before Parliament until the successors of this present

House are doing business here. And when I mention the successors I am afflicted by my friendly feelings for fellow-members and certain anxieties about myself, to such an extent that I think we had better leave the findings and investigations to our successors. The coming House certainly will differ very materially in personnel from that which at present occupies the Chamber.

I heard with very great pleasure the magnificent speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon the League of Nations, and as he poured forth those rounded periods containing noble ideals couched in lofty language, as a Canadian I felt proud that we had an "old man eloquent" in Canada whom we need not be afraid to send to Geneva or anywhere else. With regard to the League of Nations, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say this: that the sentiments of the Canadian people from the Atlantic to the Pacific are thoroughly peaceful sentiments as regards our fellow men and that the Administration may be sure that behind any effort they may make to maintain the peace of the world they have the unanimous strength and support of the whole Canadian people. I should just like to say further in regard to the League that I think if there is a danger attaching to its operations it is to be found in a tendency too greatly to multiply its machinery and to increase too much its international obligations. There are a great many obligations that are in their very nature national, and to endeavour to get a Parliament of the World at the present stage of human development is, perhaps, to anticipate the millennium a little too rapidly. While I say that, I feel certain that the League is a tremendous step in the direction of making it sure that in the future history of this world, if any nation should venture to break international law flagrantly as Germany did, and confess their doing it while they do it, there is almost a certainty that the civilized peoples of the world will rise and say: You are the common enemy of the race, and you must be prepared for being handled by the rest of mankind.

While touching on this topic may I say that I am sincerely pained from time to time to hear the jibes that are sometimes thrown across the border at our friends in the United States. I am equally pained by the jibes that come from certain sections of the population—a very small part of it, I am glad to think—of the United States towards Canada. Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no greater destiny in the immediate future, of no higher duty, of no more sacred privilege for Canada, than to stand the nearest of the dominions to the Old Land, between that Old Land and the other portions of the Empire, and close, on the other hand, to the great American people; and to bend her influence, as she is well able to do, from her geographical position and from the sentiments of her people, to the production of a perfect understanding between all those who speak the British tongue and value British institutions, whether they be in the Republic or in the Empire. If we could have such a perfect understanding between these peoples, we should indeed have taken the first and the greatest step towards a most effective League of Nations.

Now, I think I have touched upon all the subsidiary portions of the speech of His Excellency. The Government recognize, as any responsible government must at this time, that the main considerations of Government and Parliament for some time must gather around questions of finance, questions of trade, questions of the national financial obligations—and questions of tariff, if you like. So the Government have frankly and very honestly and courageously told us their views upon tariff, and that the tariff will be the main business of the session. I have no sympathy with the contention that there is any limit to the rights of this Parliament to deal with tariff questions in this session or in any other session so long as Parliament lasts. Why, Mr. Speaker, the tariff is and has been during all the time we have been a nation one of our methods of taxation, and to talk about any question of taxation being out of the purview of Parliament for a single moment is to talk what I conceive to be parliamentary nonsense. Neither, as I shall show when I come to deal with the amendment, have I any sympathy with many other views that have been expressed from this side of the House. I shall be glad if anything that falls from my lips this afternoon shall be of assistance to the Government in their investigations of tariff questions and in arriving at right conclusions before we reach the Budget, if we ever do reach it.

In entering upon this subject, I thought I could not do better than devote a little attention to a speech delivered in this Parliament by the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) during the last Budget debate. I do so because that speech is of importance, having regard to the source from

which it came, and also because it enables me to refer to some of the matters raised in the Governor General's speech. Indeed, the speech derived a fictitious importance from the source from which it came, because it was delivered by a minister of the Crown who has since become Prime Minister of Canada. It was so important in the view of the party managers of my hon. friends opposite that, I understand, they printed 40,000 copies of it and sent it broadcast throughout Canada. The first part of it consisted of an almost impassioned defence of certain taxes which, I think, when the Budget was before us, were called "excise taxes." Like a good many other things, or people anyhow, that want to disappear, they adopted an alias and became "luxury taxes." The fate of those taxes is really the only comment that is necessary, the only answer that needs to be made to my right hon. friend as to his defence of those taxes at the time. A consideration of the fate of those taxes reminds me that this Government is very prone to political infanticide. I think, in the last two speeches from the Throne, the farmers from the West and producers generally throughout Canada were specially admonished to great efforts of production. In any case, I know members of the Government and many other hon. gentlemen opposite, before the war terminated and until last summer, took the opportunity, from platform and even from pulpit on Sunday evenings, and in Parliament, to urge upon the people efforts at increased production. I had, on principle, no objection to those efforts, but I said always that they needed to be supplemented by efforts on the part of the Administration to make arrangements whereby you could sell your product. The only way you will ever increase production is to make a ready sale for what is produced, and that was always my comment. But, referring to this matter of political infanticide, I notice that the question of production has disappeared from the speech from the Throne; it has disappeared from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they are now concerned about sales. During the war there was almost no need to urge production, because we had the necessary inducement to produce; we had the inducement of the greatest markets we ever enjoyed, opened to us by the exigencies of the war, and our customers were foreign peoples and foreign governments. But perhaps the principal offender, or the principal worker as regards preaching this principle of production, was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who previously to last summer missed no opportunity, for at least two and a half years of preaching this doctrine, when suddenly the bottom fell out of prices, and he turned on his heel and he said: The trouble with this country is that the farmers have produced more than they can sell, and then he hopped off to Geneva. That was a nice thing for men in the West who, in obedience to the Government's injunction, had hired men at $6 a day and had lying on their hands stuff in abundance which they could not sell.

Another offspring of the Government that we do not hear much of in Parliament these days is called daylight saving. The Minister of Trade and Commerce dandled that interesting nursling on his knee for two sickly seasons, and then he handed it over to the chief nurse, the Prime Minister, who, at the bidding of forces, I do not know where, suffocated the infant with a pillow behind the Speaker's chair late one Friday evening.

I do not know what is the precise condition in which the Board of Commerce is now. It had a mixed parentage; it was not entirely the child of this Administration. I am afraid that with diabolical ingenuity the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) had something to do with leading the Government on to thin ice in that matter. I know, when they constituted the Board of Commerce, he said: We have been asking for this all the time. Well, he got it. But what is its precise condition now, I do not know. If it is alive, it is not functioning; we do not hear anything about it, and indeed, the only thing that we have seen of it lately has been the incursion of its late chairman into a by-election down in West Peterborough.

The Prime Minister, with numbers of others in the Government, came into power in this House with a pledge against free wheat. I took part, as my right hon. friend did, in the debates which preceded the election of 1911, and we were told that if ever free wheat was given, the keystone of the protectionist arch was gone. Well, it is gone, and it was taken away by the gentlemen who came in promising that they would never take it away.

The Prime Minister, when he came into power, was rather an enthusiastic advocate of indirect taxation. I am not at all sure if he did not make a speech doubting if the Federal Government had power—that

was in his green and salad days—to put on an income tax. He shakes his head. Well, I have known lawyers to do that about things that were very doubtful. I remember the speech; but not being a lawyer and being a modest man, I am quite willing to admit that I may have misinterpreted it—especially a speech by my right hon friend. But for three years of the war he sat behind a Minister of Finance who said that an income tax was a bad tax for the country; that it could not be thought of. I am glad the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), who, by the way, is free from all those doings, states that this year he expects to collect $40,000,000 by income tax, and if he gets $80,000,000 next year, I shall not blame him; I am quite willing to have mine doubled. But the point is, the views of the Government on both these things went by the board. Now I was quite prepared when the Budget came down, for the luxury taxes to meet the same fate that so many of the infants of the Government had already met, but I must confess that I scarcely expected that we should see in this country or in any other British country a Budget introduced by Order in Council, because that is what happened. My hon. friend, for a good-natured man, nearly got angry with me when I told him he ought to think out his taxation proposals and bring them down in the Budget, and stand upon them for a year. I have been looking up in the recess some authorities on this question, although I did not need to, because I happened to know what I was talking about; but I looked up a speech of Mr. Gladstone's in which he laid down in Midlothian at seventy years of age certain elementary principles of finance. The principles which he claimed in that particular speech were also and equally subscribed to, by Mr. Goulbourn and Sir Robert Peel, on opposite sides of politics in the early days of Mr. Gladstone's political career. The first principle was one that this Government might very well practise: "Never be afraid of economy in detail." In that very speech the great Gladstone held up his hands in horror at the thought that somewhere in the Empire something of a (job) had been perpetrated by the creation of an office carrying with it the modest sum of £2,000, or $10,000, a year. If he had lived in our present day he would have seen almost any one of our provincial administrations, of whatever stripe, equal to creating one of these jobs over-night. Economy in detail; I pass that by, and come to his second great principle of finance, which was: "You ought to have one financial statement, and only one financial statement in the year." The reasons are obvious. My. hon. friend knows them now. He has had them brought under his notice by the people dealing in automobiles, and other of the manufacturers and traders of this country. When a Budget statement is brought down, a Government is prepared to stand or fall upon it, and must be, because while it is kept secret until actually brought down, immediately it is brought down tradesmen and dealers must be prepared to deal upon that Budget with the reasonably certain knowledge that the arrangements made in it will prevail until the next Budget statement. I do not want to spend too much of the time of the House in whipping a dead horse. The taxes are gone; but I take the liberty of inculcating this lesson in regard to them. It is melancholy to reflect, in regard to this question of political infanticide, that this House was kept up until seven in the morning to pass those taxes. We passed that Budget at seven o'clock in the morning, and in two minutes the Minister of Finance destroyed the whole thing by an Order in Council. Then they talk about constitutionalism and the proper treatment of Parliament. Why, Sir, it is the most horrible treatment that ever was handed out to Parliament.

There is another lesson I would like to draw from these taxes. I called them at the time an internal tariff, and I told the minister exactly what he has since found out. I told him—indeed, I was too moderate—that he would find these taxes difficult to collect. Well, it was far worse than that; they were impossible to collect. What happened was that the honest man paid the taxes and gathered them from his customers, and was troubled with all kinds of red tape because he did not send in proper statements, but men not so particular told the Government to go to the bow-wows, and did not collect the taxes at all. My hon. friend knows that happened all over the country. He knows now that the taxes are bad, and if he had only listened to me he would have known they were bad when they were brought down in the Budget. Well, the Prime Minister with his usual courage, which frequently amounts to daring, when asked in Peterborough about these taxes was ready with his answer,—he is always ready with his answer when anybody interrupts. He said: The taxes were right when the Government put them

on, and the Government is right in taking them off.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And my hon. friends opposite applaud. What can you do with reasoners of that description? The most slippery eel that ever slid through the waters was easily caught compared with men who will applaud a statement like that. My right hon. friend, as I said, gave rather an impassioned defence of the taxes in their original form. He sat behind the Minister, and voted for them in their altered form, and he sits there to-day just as docilely now that the Minister has passed them into the condition of the world before creation, that is, the condition of being without form and void.

I should like to ask the Administration at this point, do they really think they are justified in asking this House for a vote of confidence? I do not want to go into the details that have been offered so profusely from this side of the House, but it is true, however, that probably no Administration ever ruled as they have done during the last two-and-a-half years and had to apologize for so many discarded policies—and with each discarded policy they have parted with a piece of their personnel. Then they come to this House with all the assurance in the world and say: We are the men to govern you, we want a vote of confidence. I should like to know if they really think they are deserving of it. If they do, then I must proceed to other reasons why I do not think so.

I noticed this in the second part of my right hon. friend's speech last summer. That second part of his speech was a performance in which he showed much more than his usual courage, but much less than his usual discretion. Mr. Morley—Lord Morley, as he is now—said on a somewhat famous occasion that the economist who is not a politician gets into very serious scrapes; but, he said, they are nothing to the scrapes which the politician gets into who is not an economist. I could not help thinking of those words as I heard and read, as I have done several times, the speech in question of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen). There was abundant internal evidence, if I am a judge, of the speech having been prepared from a brief; and if my diagnosis is a correct one, there never was able barrister so befooled by ill-informed solicitors. I know from the Prime Minister himself that it was prepared from a brief because he practically told us in the speech that he had not studied these questions. That may be a surprise to him, but I am going to demonstrate that he practically told us he had not studied these questions. Fluency sometimes degenerates into flippancy, and I think it did so on this occasion. My hon. friend and leader (Mr. Crerar), had produced some figures in the House proving what I thought was admitted by all and deplored, in Canada, that there was a great deal of rural depopulation in Ontario. Those figures have been supplemented in very careful examinations by Mr. J. J. Morrison, the Secretary of the United Farmers of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not ask hon. gentlemen opposite to have the least respect for Mr. Morrison; but if he were the least respectable man in the world, if his figures are according to Cocker, my friends have got to respect him for that. I thought we all knew there was rural depopulation. Well, what does my right hon. friend say on this subject? He says:

> I never saw a farm abandoned that appeared, at all events from the road, to be fit for anybody to farm.

My hon. friend studied the values of farms from the road, possibly when driving past in an automobile. His language admits it. Well now, my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is on the whole a very faithful supporter of my right hon. friend; so is the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best). They both know something about farming, and they know that no man in his senses will try to study whether or not a farm is really worth anything merely from a survey from the road. He will want to go on the land and look at it. But we are blessed with a Prime Minister who can tell you all about these things from the road; that is where he studied his political economy. Have not I gone far to prove that he had not looked into these matters as closely as he should have done? He has been far too busy hunting Bolsheviks. But he went further. He said: The figures are all against my hon. friend anyhow, because the prices of agricultural land are going up. Well, that is very much the same as if absolute ocular demonstration were brought to him that a certain tenant had left a certain house and he were to reply: But he cannot have left the house because the rent has been raised! Why, the raising of the rent might be the cause of his leaving.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: You will notice, Mr. Speaker, I waited for the laughter of my right hon. friend and his supporters. A great deal of the rise in value of agricultural land is not due to the fact that the land is used; it is because of speculation in land. But what amount of rise in prices will prove or disprove facts that are gathered by an examination into the population of the various areas of locality? —every such examination proving to the hilt that people are leaving the country districts and that many country districts in Ontario now have fewer people than before? But my right hon. friend could not ascertain these things from the road; he would need to go into the figures carefully and to study these matters zealously. Well, ill-prepared as he evidently was according to his own statement for dealing with this project, he nevertheless undertakes to show that the fiscal policy of Great Britain for seventy years has been a failure. His first step in the progression of fallacies by which he attempted to prove that contention was to state that since the year 1850 Great Britain had had what he calls an adverse balance of trade. Now, I want to tell my right hon. friend—and on this point I am not going to reason with him; I am going to tell him what is so—that he is absolutely wrong in assuming, at the beginning of his thinking upon this subject, that an excess of imports over exports is necessarily an "adverse" balance of trade. It is not so. Adam Smith, the father of political economy, in his great book which is still the highest authority on political economy that ever was published, characterizes my right hon. friend's views as absurd,—too strong language, possibly, for Parliament, but not too strong for the old Scotch economist and philosopher, who goes on to say—and here he is not giving an opinion but history—that almost every nation in Europe had had its ruin prophesied because of this so-called adverse balance of trade, but that they had gone on to prosper. That is history, Sir; not opinion. Let me give two simple illustrations of the way in which the so-called adverse balance of trade of Britain was constituted, of what her excess of imports consisted. Suppose I go to a bank, Mr. Speaker, and borrow $1,000 at 8 per cent. At the end of twelve months I have to pay into the bank $1,080. Now, the bank takes in $1,080 where it only paid out $1,000; its imports exceed its exports. My right hon. friend says that that is an adverse balance of trade. Well, the bank never thought so, so far as its own interests were concerned; and certainly the borrower does not. But that is exactly how half of Britain's excess of imports before the war was constituted. She accumulated so much wealth by her free trade that she had investments all over the world drawing interest, and the interest on these investments went into Britain in the shape of imports bought by individuals within the nation out of their wealth, but constituting an excess of imports in the nation's trade balance. And just at this point, may I say to my right hon. friend, if he had studied these questions, if he had thought out these points, he would have known that people do not go on buying profusely year after year for seventy years out of poverty but out of prosperity. Let any hon. gentleman in this House try to conduct the business of buying, without the wherewithal to pay, in any store in Ottawa, and see if he can keep it up for seventy days, never mind seventy years. Now, I want to illustrate in another way another portion of what constituted Britain's excess of imports. Suppose I traded a yearling steer for 20 bushels of wheat with a neighbouring farmer. That would have been about a fair exchange a year and a half ago; a yearling steer, at prices then prevailing, would have been worth somewhere in the neighbourhood of twenty bushels of wheat. And suppose I arranged with my neighbour that I would take my steer over in my wagon and bring back the wheat. Clearly, so far as the carrying part of the business was concerned, that would not be a fair deal, and I would naturally, if I were a Canadian anyhow, say to my farmer neighbour; now, I want a couple of bushels extra for carrying both the steer and the wheat. And if the other man were at all reasonable he would give me twenty-two bushels of wheat instead of the twenty that bought the steer; that is to say, I should earn two bushels by doing the carrying both ways. My right hon. friend would call that an adverse balance of trade. Well, I would not; I would call it favourable to me to the extent of two bushels. And that is exactly what constituted the other half of the adverse balance of Britain's trade. Why, at the present moment she is building fifty-one per cent of the entire ships constructed in the world. Before the war she did the carrying trade of the world; and she earned by her carrying trade the other half of her excess imports. But that

was not adverse to Britain. The merest tyro in political economy knows that it provided her with that wealth which saved the fortunes of the world when she had to go to war and was able to realize on that wealth.

But I do not wonder that hon. members on the other side seem to get somewhat tired at my referring to Britain. I did not do so in the debate in which my right hon. friend spoke, and I do not wish to restrict my considerations to Britain now. This argument was introduced by himself in a way he felt to be rather peculiar at the time, because he admitted that the hon. member for Red Deer preceding him had not said quite so much about Britain as in former speeches. I shall show my hon. friend from the history of our own country that excess of imports is not necessarily an adverse balance of trade. We had what my hon. friend would call a favourable balance of trade in the year 1895. A Tory Government had been in power for seventeen years and they produced a "favourable" balance of trade, all right. We had a total trade of $202,000,000; we exported $102,000,000 and imported $100,000,000. Was the country prosperous then? If it was, why did they part with the Administration which had been running the National Policy for seventeen years? There is the fact. The total trade was a bagatelle; the nation was stagnant; at least I have always heard so, if I am not rightly informed upon the subject my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) can repeat some of the speeches which were heard in such profusion about the lack of prosperity before 1896. And when I first came into this House—nobody pretended to tell me that the nation was prosperous at that time. What happened afterwards? Immediately after 1896 this country became prosperous. I do not want to argue this from the party point of view, but for some reason or other the people were prosperous. As the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier used to say, some of his opponents proved the prosperity of the country from books, but, said he, "I do not do it in that way, I do not need to. Everyone in my audience knows the country is prosperous because you have the evidence of it in your pockets." It was growing time of Canada. What was our balance of trade at that time? Why we imported hundreds of millions of dollars worth more every year than we exported; it was the expanding time in Canada's history as a great nation. Now these are the facts and I am exceedingly anxious to convince my right hon. friend. I trust he will be a big figure in the public life of Canada long after this tongue is silent and these eyes are closed, and I take with a grain of salt his statement when he goes down to the eastern provinces saying that he has nailed the protectionist flag to the mast for life. A right hon. gentleman who can take three different views on the luxury taxes in six months is quite equal to changing his views on the tariff.

My right hon. friend said that Canada began to catch up in its business, by the way, in 1916. Now he is such a good friend of mine that I do not like to prefer a charge of want of generosity even against his arguments, but I do think that was an ungenerous argument. Why, does not everybody know that the nations of Europe were glad to import anything we could send to them in the way of food, and in the way of munitions, while the war was on? It was no trick, as we say on this side of the Atlantic, to do business in war time. They had to have the food, they had to have the munitions. The twenty millions of men fighting had to be fed and the food and the munitions were imported, of course, and we exported them from this side. But if we began to "catch up" in 1916 all I have got to say is we began to "catch down" very soon after my right hon. friend became Prime Minster, because the exports of Canada are not nearly as favourable now as they were at the time he spoke only last June—there has been a change in the scene since then. It is a remarkable fact, however, if it be a fact, that in 1850 Britain began to have what he calls an adverse balance of trade, and in 1896 Canada began to have what he calls an adverse balance of trade, and at the moment they had it they began to prosper and to increase their total volume of trade and to become rich and a considerable people. That is how I read history on this question of balance of trade.

Now I am going to tell my right hon. friend when an excess of imports may become adverse. It is not so when it represents interest on capital invested abroad. It is not so when it represent the payment for carrying services done for all the nations of the globe. But it easily becomes so when it represents borrowings if those borrowings are carried too far. At the present moment we hear a great deal about the excess of our imports from the United States. Well, I do not think there is any mystery about those. I remember

when the ex-Minister of Finance raised a seventy million loan in the States during the war. I said I did not object to the loan, we had to get money somehow to carry on the war, but I told him year after year that a better way to get it would be by direct taxation. I said: Let the House understand what you are doing; when you are borrowing all this money you are employing the factories and workmen of the country from which you borrow, because your borrowings come in here in goods; and while a young country may go a certain distance in borrowing capital for its development it is very easy to go too far. I want to say here and now, Mr. Speaker, that with the magnificent asset of property which we have in our great territory, with its varied riches, what we want in this country is not so much capital as people. Bring people in of the right kind who will work up our resources. The wealth is there if you will enable them to work it up and produce by taking obstacles out of the way of the sale of the product. I do not think there is any doubt that Sir Edmund Walker was absolutely right in the last sentence he uttered in his recent statement to his shareholders, when he said: This country is all right but we need to go cautiously, for the outstanding sin of our people is extravagance and a readiness to contract debts. If that is true of the people, it is vastly more true not only of our Federal Government but of our municipal and our various provincial governments. We have got to work more for our country and borrow less. Why, Sir, municipal and provincial bonds were issued in this country last year to the tune of $324,000,000; debts contracted upon our territory, that is what they were. Two hundred and twenty-three millions of this $324,000,000 are held in the United States and, as I say, the example was set to these municipal and provincial governments by the Federal Government, at least during the war. We have got, as my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has said again and again, to borrow less. We have got to economize more. We have got to work harder and we have got to trade more freely. Well, I have laboured that point at considerable length; I could not avoid it. I have gone far to prove to the House that an excess of imports is not necessarily an adverse balance of trade. I have laboured the argument fully because if you grant the first point, of course the second is easy. My right hon. friend's next position in his progression of fallacies was that Britain having followed for seventy years a wrong method of trading, her people were poor in large sections and they were poor because of free trade. He says it must be so, Bannerman said so. Now it is true that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman made a statement in a certain speech that there were twelve millions of British people near the poverty line. But what was he talking about when he made that statement? He was talking about the iniquitous land laws of Great Britain, and he was attributing the poverty to a wrong handling of the land of Britain and the need of different methods of taxation. But of all the men in the world, Sir Henry Bannerman was the last man to attribute any of the poverty of Britain to free trade; he was one of the greatest free trade supporters England ever had. But my right hon. friend comes along and says: Sir Henry Bannerman makes the statement. I do not know whether my right hon. friend knew where he made it, or what he was talking about. If he did know, then he said in effect: "The statement is true but Sir Henry's conclusion is all wrong; it is not the land laws of Britain that are wrong but the fiscal policy of Britain. Sir Henry did not know what he was talking about! He was only a member for thirty-nine years for one constituency and he had not had time to study this question." Then Mr. Rowntree said that Britain was poor. Well, Mr. Rowntree attributed a large amount of the poverty of Britain to intemperance, to the drinking of strong drink, and I think that the commonsense of every hon. gentleman will force him to admit that if a man works hard enough on Scotch whiskey with a limited income he will become poor whether he is living under free trade or under protection. That was Mr. Rowntree's view. But the Prime Minister says: "No, Mr. Rowntree does not know anything about it. It is free trade that makes the people poor."

Well, there is a method of testing this, apart from Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's opinions or Mr. Rowntree's opinions or the opinions of my right hon. friend. If he will read Macaulay's History of England he will find in the third chapter that in the time of Charles II, when there were only a few million people in Britain, there were 250 paupers in the thousand.

He mentions his authorities—statisticians, not the politicians whom my right hon. friend quotes. At the time when Macaulay wrote the third chapter of his History there were 80 paupers in the thousand; in 1872 there were only 40 paupers in the thousand—that was after free trade had been in operation a little over twenty years; and in 1907, a few years before the war broke out, pauperism had been reduced to 25 in the thousand. And from the time of free trade Britain's population had nearly doubled. That is the condition of poverty as far as it can be learned from the Board of Trade figures of the British Government. So that the second contention of my right hon. friend is just as baseless as the first. If it had been true that they had been following a wrong system of trading, of course it might have led to the poverty that there is in Britain and that there is in every big country—and that there has been for two thousand years, anyhow, because we were told then by an undisputed authority, that the poor we have always with us. If it had been true that Britain traded wrong, then it might be true that povery was the result of that wrong method of trading. But neither statement has one particle of support in the solid facts of the case.

The next step in my right hon friend's progress of fallacy is that he made a favourable comparison as regards United States labour in contrast with British labour. I had not had time to go fully into the conditions of labour in the United States, but I had quoted—and I think my right hon. friend was referring to that quotation—an article which appeared in a paper of the highest repute in the Old Country, written by Ernest Hodder Williams, a publicist in Britain of high standing, who had visited the United States almost every year. But he found his article upon the investigations of a journalist of the highest standing who is well known to the statesmen who attended the Peace Conference; his name is R. Stannard Baker. I am going to quote a single paragraph from that article, for the double reason that I think it is wise that we should know something at any rate about conditions of labour in the United States before we compare them unfavourably with conditions of labour in Britain; and if my right hon. friend is really an admirer of labour conditions in the United States, then the labour men of Canada should know it, because I think in that way they would avoid the policy which has produced this condition. Mr. Williams, gathering his information from Mr. Baker, wrote:

> One of the causes of the recent steel strike in America was the fact that the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week were so common in industry. Many men in the steel works lived at least four miles from the mill. They got up at four-thirty in the morning, at six o'clock they began work, going steadily until five in the afternoon, with no regular stop for luncheon hour, though during waiting periods they had time for something to eat; home at six o'clock, then after supper bed. They made big money, but they did not live—they existed, worked and slept. According to Judge Gary's own testimony, there are over 69,000 men in the United States Steel Corporation working twelve hours a day.

I defy my right hon. friend or any other man in this world to go into Britain to-day and find conditions of labour that will for one moment compare with what is brought out in that paragraph as prevailing in the great Steel Corporation, which is one of the glories of protection according to my right hon. friend.

The next step in the fallacy is perfectly natural. "Ireland has participated in the general ruin." I always thought that my right hon. friend's friends attributed the difficulties and troubles of Ireland to a very different cause. But it is all free trade, it appears, because my right hon. friend tells us, in almost his first incursion into economics, that free trade dwarfed the nascent industries of Ireland. Four million people inhabit Ireland. Its agriculture is one of the finest in the world. Before the war Ireland was producing the largest number of bushels of wheat to the acre of any country in Europe. That is an important industry. Who said it was dwarfed? They supply every year a large amount of Britain's need of store cattle. Has my right hon. friend ever heard of the tobacco industry of Ireland?—one of the greatest in Europe. He has heard of Irish linen? —the finest that is made anywhere. He has heard of Irish lace? If he has not, and his boat calls at Queenstown, he will see some of it in going over to England next May or June, for the Irish women come on board ship to sell their lace —beautiful stuff. Has he heard of Ireland's shipbuilding? I venture the prophesy that in the next twelve months the Irish people who live in Belfast will build more ships than will be built in all Canada with the Canadian Government behind our shipbuilding industry. But my right hon. friend says in his review of history, that free trade has dwarfed the nascent industries of Ireland. Well, naturally where people

have been following the wrong system of trade they get poor, they have horrible conditions of labour, and they have been fleeing the country as they would a pest house. They must have been doing it for this reason—because my right hon. friend says so. He says that free trade has filled the emigrant ships with fugitives from their native land. Well, that is of all the causes of emigration from the British Isles the most recent cause that I have heard or read expounded. Why, Sir, in the early fifties of the last century a thousand people were leaving the British Isles every day, and then they were wondering whether those old lands would stand the drain on their blood and the strain of time and circumstance. The Old Land was struggling then up towards thirty million of people, and she sent out her thousand a day, and she has kept on sending them out all over the world. To-day in spite of that steady stream of emigration, she has neared the fifty million mark in population, and last year—good luck to her and God bless her?—she had the largest number of births in her history. Yet free trade has 'filled the British emigrant ships with fugitives from their native land!" Well, in Britain, they take a different view of this subject, as my hon. friend himself will in time. They say there, with pride:

> We sailed wherever ship could sail;
> We founded many a mighty state;
> Heaven grant our greatness may not fail
> Through craven fear of being great.

"Fugitives from their native land!" Why, my right hon. friend must be something of a "fugitive" himself. Where did his ancestors come from? His policies are a little medieval, but I never took him for an aboriginal. My right hon. friend has the reputation of being a fighter, and he deserves it. It is true, in a sense, that free trade was the cause of this expansion, and I submit to my right hon. friend the reason; you cannot travel abroad unless you have the price. They had to stay in Britain under protection because they had not enough money to enable them to get out, but the moment they got free trade they expanded. It is true in a glorious sense, and if free trade has built the British Empire I want to say that that is the greatest of free trade's glories. My right hon. friend carries his fighting propensities too far when he fights with Providence for having built the British Empire; he must really restrain his terrible animosities a little. It is a fact that people do emigrate most when they are most prosperous. As I say, they have the price and they also have the ambition, having done so well, to get out and try to do a little better. Of course, having had the "unfavourable balance of trade" and being "impoverished," and having had her industries "ruined" and having been obliged to "flee their native land," the people of Britain, my right hon. friend is persuaded, are about to desert a wrong policy, and he bases himself on the reports of certain committees. Well, I will concede this: that there are selfish men in Britain as well as in protectionist countries, and if they could persuade the government to change a fiscal policy by reports of committees so as to put illegal gains into their pockets, I am sorry to confess, there are Britishers who would take the gains. So they report that their trade would be helped—their particular trade—by the abandonment of free trade. My right hon. friend mentioned—and I take only one of his cases as an illustration—the matter of the iron and steel trade in Great Britain. He read the report of a committee asking for duties on iron and steel. But my hon. friend from Maisoneuve (Mr. Lemieux), punctured his argument on that point by putting one simple question: "Have the Government acted upon this report?" My right hon. friend was bound to answer that they had not, and I venture to prophesy that they will never dream of acting on it. I will tell my hon. friend why: iron and steel are the basic or building materials of the very greatest of Britain's industries. If Britain were to put a duty on iron and steel and make those things dearer, what would become of the cutlery trade of Sheffield; and what would become—which is vastly more important—of the shipbuilding of Great Britain, which is the glory of the country and of the Empire and which won the war? That is my answer to my right hon. friend upon this question: they will not tax iron and steel; do not let my right hon. friend, in trying to form an opinion about what is going to happen in Britain, attach too much importance to what the journeymen in politics say; I advise him to keep his eye upon the big figures in British public life, and that he listen to what they say. What are the Cecils saying about free trade? The moment there is a question of an anti-dumping law to keep out a few chemicals and a few tungsten burners, which bulk to a tremendous extent, I need not say, in the trade of Britain, the Cecils get restive and show an inclination to leave the Unionist Coalition over there, because they know

this question and they know that Britain's commercial greatness has depended upon her fiscal policy. Lord Derby is in the same boat—a man of enormous wealth and enormous responsibility and of great connections in Lancashire—he shows restiveness and an inclination to leave the Government. And what did Mr. Lloyd George himself say only a week ago? I draw particular attention to this, because Mr. Lloyd George is the head of the administration in Britain:

> If international trade fails, I do not care what you do, you will have nothing but starvation and ruin.

That being the opinion of the Prime Minister of Britain he is a very sanguine protectionist who would base the policy of this country upon any expectation that Britain is going to change her fiscal policy.

What about America in this connection? My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the other night asked us how we would feel if the Fordney Bill passed. Who is Fordney? I never heard of him until this Bill was brought in. He is a politician, of course, trying to implement his pledges to the farmers in the last election. That is not the place to go for American opinion. If you want to form an intelligent forecast of what America is likely to do on trade, go to her captains of industry; go to her great financiers; go to the New York journals, most of them. There are two supreme needs of America at the present moment; one is imports and one is exports—strange as that may appear. The financial magnates and the really instructed men who know about America's position in the world of trade and commerce know this; she must have imports, in the first place, because at Washington there are treasury bills variously estimated at from ten to fifteen billion dollars representing the debts of various foreign nations to America contracted during the war. These debts can only be discharged if America imports goods to pay for them, so that she must arrange her fiscal policy so as to go on importing. But these men that I speak of are equally clear in the view that America must develop a great export trade. They say, in so many words: she must follow the example of Britain in seeking outlets for the capital she accumulated during the war by helping foreign development through her investments abroad. They are under no misapprehension as to how Britain's so-called adverse balance of trade was caused; they want to send out their capital, and they say they must do it.

Now, it is a dangerous thing for one who has occupied the time of the House longer than he intended to inflict a quotation upon hon. members, but I have in my hand the Wall Street Journal of Friday last, containing a review of topics of taxation, the tariff, and America's foreign trade relations, by Thomas W. Lamont, one of the leading members of Pierpont Morgan and Company, and one of the greatest financiers and authorities on finance in the States. I do not apologize for reading this, because the opinions of such a man about what is likely to happen in the immediate future in connection with America's trade relations must have enormous weight with every thoughtful Canadian and must have an effect, if we are wise, on the steps we take in developing our own policy. I quote from this article:

> I do not for a moment mean to suggest that this country should forthwith go to a free-trade basis. Anything approaching such a complete change is impossible. But the tendency toward freer trade is bound to become more marked. Our position before the war as a debtor nation was a far different one from what it is to-day. When in those days we sold food and raw materials for export we were able to find our pay for them in a number of different ways. The peoples abroad sold us services in the way of ocean transportation, they sold us insurance. Lastly, on a large scale, they loaned us capital, which is only another way of saying that they provided credits with which we paid our own imports.
>
> Now the position is reversed. From being a nation in debt to the peoples abroad, to the extent of say $5,000,000,000, as we were in 1914, we have become, on net balance, a creditor to the peoples abroad to the extent of $12,000,000,000, perhaps even $15,000,000,000. Therefore, whether we will it or not, from this time forward we must act the part of a creditor nation; we must be governed by the economic and commercial laws that govern creditor nations. We must begin to realize, if we do not already realize it, that we cannot continue to pile up these credits indefinitely without disarranging our own and the world's markets. In other words, we shall find our operations working against the old mercantile theory of trade, that same ancient theory that England, as a great creditor and commercial nation, found herself compelled to abandon a hundred and fifty years ago. We shall find ourselves ardently desiring to buy as well as to sell. If such shall prove to be the case—and I see no escape from it—we shall automatically tend toward freer trade. We shall inevitably grow to realize that the ideal status for the world is for our country to produce those things which it can product cheapest and best, and to exchange those things for the products of other countries which those countries are able to produce better and more cheaply than we.
>
> I shall not be surprised if the new Congress, realizing our country's enormously changed situation, will find the difficulties of thoroughgoing tariff revision so great that they may abandon any immediate attempt at it.

This quotation will go on Hansard, and I trust my hon. friends opposite will peruse it carefully and find out what the really big men of the United States are saying and thinking about these things.

Such is the fairy tale that the Prime Minister of this Dominion told the House and the country in his speech on the last Budget. It is exactly contrary to the historic facts of the case. If my right hon. friend will acquaint himself, not with the views of economists, but with the writings of standard authors, he will know that Britain, at the end of her protective period, was steeped in poverty as regards the masses of her people. Read Carlyle's "Past and Present"; read the best works of fiction relating to that period; read Macaulay; read the speech which Emerson delivered at Manchester in 1847. The year after free trade was passed, but two years before it came into operation, Mr. Emerson, speaking at Manchester, referred to conditions prevailing at the end of the protective period as conditions of "gloom and commercial crises, affliction and beggary". That is the language, not of a Britisher, but of one of the most distinguished sons of New England in the United States. Since that time, Britain, by her fiscal policy, has increased enormously in wealth, in prosperity, in the comfort of her people and in the greatness of her world-wide destiny. That is the true history of the case.

I should like to have referred to some of the other arguments which my right hon. friend has used in the country in support of the policy to which he gives his honest and open adherence. He says: "We believe in protection"—and the address repeats the fallacy—"because it keeps the workmen at home and it keeps industries in Canada." It did not do that during the first years of the protective or so-called National Policy in this country. A million French-Canadians went to find their homes in the United States, and the population of Canada, at the end of the period, was practically stationary. It was when there was some slight departure, all too slight, I admit, from that policy, that we in this country began to expand, and we would have expanded to a far greater degree if the departure had been greater. It begs the whole question.

Another argument used both by the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is the argument of antiquity. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said, I think, down in Elgin, "Why, we have had this policy in the United States for 141 years and in Canada for 42 years." My right hon. friend, showing how well he is adapted for being a leader by following his follower, took the figures from the latter and repeated them in the Eastern Townships of Quebec. Well, 141 years in the United States and 42 years in Canada—that is a very brief period in the history of a nation. It was only in 1776 that Adam Smith's work was published, and he knew so much of the difficulty of penetrating the human cranium with new ideas that he had very little expectation that his views would make much progress in his life-time. But if my right hon. friend wants to argue from antiquity, he should go further back. There was a king, who lived long ago; he was a very rich king, and he was a very wise king, wiser than my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), wiser even than the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is related of him: "And the king made silver and gold at Jerusalem as plenteous as stones, and cedar trees made he as the sycamore trees that are in the vale for abundance. And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt and linen yarn; and the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price." So that the wisest man that ever lived was not afraid of imports; he was a free trader; he would trade in Egypt or anywhere else where he could get good horses and linen, if the other people at Jerusalem would take the stuff those other countries produced and pay for it. My right hon. friend says—and in this he has also copied the argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce—"England"—I prefer the term "Britain", myself, but we use the word "England" in that way—"England is the only nation that ever has gone in for free trade." Well, that may be so, though Holland, one of the brightest little countries in Europe, has gone pretty near it. But may I say to my right hon. friend that Britain is the only country that could have cleared the seven seas of every German ship in four months, and that is what my right hon. friend called "muddling through the war?" Britain is the only country that could have won the battle of Jutland, and she won it. Britain is the only country that established constitutional government hundreds of years ago, at a time when every other nation in Europe was a tyranny and North America was a wild. Was she wrong in blazing the trail in

that case? Was it to her disadvantage to have constitutional government? Was it rather not to the disadvantage of the laggards of human progress, for whom my right hon. friend becomes the apologist? I do not think the example of blazing the trail—the expression is a Canadian one—is one that we should be warned against by our leading statesmen in this fair young country. I think I have said enough to make my right hon. friend and my hon. friends opposite a little thoughtful about what Britain is likely to do, about what her free trade policy has done for her, and about what America is likely to do. They will become more thoughtful as the days go by. I gather, though, that a lot of the people of Canada are thinking a little differently now on this question from the way they used to think.

It is time I remembered that there is an amendment on the subject before the House—though I claim that every word that I have uttered is thoroughly germane to the subject and in line with the best traditions of debate. It cannot be said that I have in any way funked the main question in the Address, and I apologize for the time I have spent over it. Now, there is an amendment to the amendment. Well, that amendment to the amendment has no attractions for me, for two reasons. In the first place, when I heard it put forward, I reflected that in human life it frequently happens that people who try to sit between two stools presently find themselves occupying a more lowly posture. I do not care for the amendment from that practical point of view. But this amendment being before us, I think it is a fair thing to say that there are three possible views to be taken of it. We may vote complete confidence in the Administration; we may vote partial confidence in the Administration; or we may vote no confidence in the Administration. One of these courses we may take in the first instance, and we may follow the other afterwards. Well, as I look at things, it would be impossible to vote partial confidence in the Administration first, and then vote no confidence in it afterwards. That would not be a logical course of procedure, so as far as I am concerned I shall vote as I feel, which on the grounds I have elaborated at great length is want of confidence in the Government. Not that the amendment is free from fault. One objection to the amendment to my mind, is that it states as a fact what is not a fact. I do not think for one moment that the Prime Minister and his colleagues are guilty of usurpation. "Usurpation" is a word with a well-defined meaning. Usurpation is the seizure of Government by force against the constitution and against the law. I have not looked at the dictionary, but I have ventured on that definition myself. That being so, I think my hon. friend who proposed the amendment gave away his case when he admitted the Government were in office according to law and according to the constitution. The second objection is that it professes to wish to get a proper representation of the people. But if it were carried and an immediate election took place, that is just what it would not get. On this point I differ very, very acutely from my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), when he says there is no need for redistribution to precede the election. I think, in ordinary times, and under ordinary conditions, redistribution ought to precede the election, immediately if possible, or as nearly as possible; and if my hon. friend had been here I should have asked him what is the object of redistribution? It has only one object in the world—to get a proper representation of the people at the ensuing election. So, if the object of the amendment be to get a proper representation of the people, if it prevented redistribution it would fail in attaining that object.

There is another point in regard to representation which I would like to mention, and if the Government live long enough to deal with the subject, I hope they will give serious consideration to it also. If the elections are going to take place in this country under conditions such as have prevailed recently we are going to be face to face with conditions under which constituencies will be very generally represented by minority members. In Elgin we had an hon. gentleman elected, whom I am very proud to have as a colleague—he could not help the circumstances, he had to run under the conditions that prevailed, but he was voted for only by three-eighths of the constituents. In Peterborough only 4,000, in round numbers, voted for the successful candidate, out of 13,000 votes cast. If we are to have numerous candidates in single-member constituencies, I do not think it will make for stable conditions and the maintenance of the best kind of representation in the House, to have men elected to represent minorities, and I would ask the

minister seriously to consider when they come to the question of redistribution, if they ever do, the possibility of having the single transferable vote in single-member ridings and trying out proportional representation in given areas of the country. That is a matter deserving very serious consideration. We are living in times when changes are very rapid, and may easily become too rapid, and one of the great advantages of proportional representation is that it would give you some guarantee of having in each succeeding Parliament a fair proportion of men who, like my right hon. friend, have attained their political knowledge and political position by constant service, year after year, in the House of Commons. I would seriously impress that view on my right hon. friend. Let me put it plainly in other words. I think it is desirable that men of a certain size in our public life, so far as they are willing should be retained for the public service whether they call themselves Liberals, Tories, or Progressives. Politics is the science of Government, and like any other science, it can only be learned by application, and by the practice of it. In Great Britain a politician of a certain size is never lost to the public service until he is lost through death. If he loses his seat in one part of the country, he finds a seat in some other part, and under proportional representation I think that men of a certain size would be sure of getting elected to the House—not by any gerrymandering process, but by the process of giving proper representation to minorities. May I be very personal in the application of my argument? Let me suppose a case. My right hon. friend sits for Portage La Prairie. Now it might be—on personal grounds I hope it won't be—on personal grounds, I said—that Portage La Prairie will turn its back on my right hon. friend.

Mr. HOCKEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: It is a possibility.

Mr. HOCKEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Well, of course, people who are very sanguine before elections are liable to have their eyes opened when the elections take place. There may be strange things happen in Toronto. I am only begging for a possibility. I say, that might happen. Now I venture to think this: If you had a system of proportional representation in the city of Winnipeg, and my right hon. friend were one of the candidates his size would ensure that if there were five members, he would come pretty near the head of the poll, because he would get the votes of men of size all over that great city. That is just a little illustration of how proportional representation might work out. It is a matter which the Government will have to consider very seriously if it wants to secure real representation in this House, if we are to have various groups running candidates in various parts of the country.

Mr. CURRIE: How would you re-elect newly appointed ministers?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I always thought that was an absurdity, an anachronism, better got rid of. There are many people in Great Britain, and more in Canada, who think that sending ministers back for re-election is really a thing of the past and ought to be abolished. I do not think there is much in that practice.

I have another objection to the amendment. It is contrary as far as I know, to the invariable practice of the Old Land in regard to amendments to the Address.

They nearly always hinge upon some question of principle, and I think it is well that that should be so. In this connection may I say that I think it is unfortunate that the official opposition in this House are apparently not in a position to take direct issue with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister upon the tariff question. I wish to be quite frank in this matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King), with very great courtesy, has extended an invitation to Progressives all over Canada to fight under his banner. Well, there are reasons why consideration of that proposal is impossible, and I want to give them with perfect candour. In the first place, I believe it is impossible for a great party successfully to face the electorate speaking with two voices upon what is the main issue of the day. Now, I submit that in all kindness to my hon. friend. The Prime Minister, within his perfect rights, has agreed with the Progressive party and with my hon. friend himself that the tariff is a great issue to-day. The Prime Minister says it is the greatest issue. We agree with him and join issue with him on the question. We are opposed to the principle of protection; he is in favour of it. I submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he should tell his friends that it is really impossible, in the serious condition of the minds of our people, to speak with two voices upon what is the great issue of the day. I hope my hon. friends opposite will applaud the next thing I say. It is impossible for a party

truly liberal to have any success linked to the medieval superstition or imposture of protection, and I may say that I borrow both these epithets from William Ewart Gladstone; he got light upon the tariff question when he was just about the age of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and he came in his old age to look upon protection as a superstition and an imposture. I put it to my hon. friends in all seriousness that it is impossible for them to turn a friendly face to a superstition and an imposture. In this connection, may I remind the House that last year I quoted from a distinguished man who for so many years represented Quebec East? That constituency is still fortunate in having a distinguished man (Mr. Lapointe) for its representative and he gave a definition of Liberalism a couple of years ago which was very simple and easy to remember, and which I believe to be absolutely correct. He said that Liberalism is freedom. Well, I hope he had in his mind besides freedom in religion and freedom in civil rights, freedom in trade also. If it is freedom it means ultimately some time freedom in trade as well as in other respects. And I want to say very seriously to my hon. friends from Quebec—I hope I shall not be charged with carrying on a courtship in that quarter, as so many of our public men have been, for if I court the people of Quebec, it is not for their votes or anything I want from them—I want to say to them that I should greatly value their intellectual and moral adhesion to my views. Let me say that in my opinion my hon. friend from Quebec East was right in his definition; Liberalism, historically as well as etymologically, means freedom. But let me carry his thought a little further. In fighting for freedom, how are the forces ranged? In fighting for freedom, from the time the word was used in 1828 and 1829 when Catholic Emancipation was carried and the Tests and Corporation Acts were repealed, and all down through the fights of Liberalism in Britain. I will tell my hon. friend how the forces were ranged. Liberalism was always fighting for the rights of the masses against the usurpation of the classes—using that word in a greatly different sense from the way it is used in the amendment. Well, how does protection stand in regard to the classes and the masses? Protection perpetuates the injustice of taxing the many for the sake of the few; it is an accentuated form of special privilege, and against special privilege, whether in Canada or in Britain, all true Liberalism has always fought. On these grounds I appeal to the people of the province of Quebec to study these questions. There may be capitalists, there are capitalists, in the city of Montreal, who are protectionists, but Jean-Baptiste est libre-échangiste—pas mon ami, le "Jean-Baptiste" de cette Chambre, mais le vrai Jean-Baptiste—; il est en faveur du libre-échange. Protection, standing as it does for special privilege, is typical Toryism. If you have any doubt look opposite and see who support it.

And that impels me to state that there is no course for us in this corner of the Chamber but to vote for the amendment in each division that will be called. In the first place, we canot vote a confidence which we do not feel, and in the next place, whether we will it or not, the Prime Minister, though he made an appeal to me—a compliment which I want to say sincerely I felt intensely—has made it impossible for me to vote for the Address. There are advantages accruing to the nailing of one's colours to the mast. My right hon. friend is being commended by his supporters because he has nailed his colours to the mast. He comes to me and says: "Nail your colours there too." But the mast is on a sinking ship from my point of view; I do not mean the ship of administration, but that battered medieval ship of protection. Now, my right hon. friend, in that speech on the last Budget which has got so much of my attention, gave me absolution beforehand for voting for the amendment. He said in that speech, when we were dealing with this same question on which the right hon. gentleman has nailed his colours to the mast:

> I can understand a man whose feet are based on free trade voting against this budget; I cannot understand those who believe in the principle of protection voting against it.

So if my hon. friend wants support from this House, according to his own showing, for this Address, which puts the principle of protection in its very heart and centre, if he can find any protectionists opposite he may fittingly make his appeal to them for help. But he cannot fittingly appeal to us. He is for protection; we do not believe in it. Having no confidence in the Administration, and having less if possible in its policy of protection, we shall vote, as I understand it, for the amendment.

My right hon. friend, in my opinion, was skating on very thin ice when he said: If you get your election by this bald amend-

ment—and I admit the hairless condition of the amendment—what will you be fighting on them? What will you have to go to the country on? Surely my right hon. friend knows that the moment a Government takes office in this country it is on its trial. It is composed of marked men. It can be tried any time properly by vote of censure in this House, and is always tried sooner or later before a higher and a final tribunal. It is the Government and its policy that we shall vote on if we go to the country. Besides my right hon. friend must know—I do not want to refer to recent elections at too great length, I am not greatly impressed by what Mr. Gladstone once called the science of political meteorology; if we in this corner of the Chamber had got as much excited as some people seem to do every time they win an election we should all have been in hopeless hysterics long ago; we have got so used to winning by-elections that they are like water on a duck's back with us, and do not excite us at all; passing events—my right hon. friend I say, must know by even a casual glance at recent by-elections that the choice at the present moment is not purely a choice between Grit and Tory. There are third choices and the people know it.

Something has been said about the issue being confused. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders) said my leader was not clear in his enunciation of policy. Well, he stands upon a policy that was drawn up by my hon. friend the member for Macdonald, absolutely.

Mr. CRERAR: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: My leader applauds me. He has not departed from a single plank that my hon. friend put under him, he stands on it still. If my hon. friend is on it still, he is mighty near the edge waiting to jump off. There is no doubt about where we are in this matter. My hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Argue) very properly and very fairly asked us on the cross-bench portion of the Chamber what mandate we had to be here. Well, I can only speak for myself on that subject. One afternoon in the House, after the war was over, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) brought in some question regarding shipbuilding. I took the liberty, which I have frequently taken in this House, to try and show him in very moderate language that he would promote shipbuilding if he would promote foreign trade—a thing which appears tolerably evident to anybody who thinks out the subject—and the consequence was that within a few hours, two of the strongest protectionist speeches were delivered that I have ever heard in this House during the time I have sat in it; and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the fumes that arose around me, to my trained nostrils were the fumes of Toryism and not Unionism. I was smoked out. I went to the cross-benches next day, I escaped for my life. Because I have breathed the air of freedom of opinion all the time I have lived, and freedom of trade as well. That is where I got my mandate. I told the people who elected me that I believed the same thing that I believed when they first elected me. When I was elected for Red Deer I was elected as a free trader. I believe in freedom. When I supported my right hon. friend in the war I believed that the greatest fight that was ever waged for freedom was being waged on the battle fields of Europe. I believed in freedom then, I believe in freedom now—freedom first and last for me. There has been no inconsistency about my position. If Liberalism means freedom then I am as good a Liberal to-day as ever I was. But for the time being we are "Progressives" because I have given reasons why I am a little doubtful about certain brands of Liberalism. Liberalism to me must be real Liberalism.

Do not let my right hon. friend have any trouble about what will go before the country. It is the Government that is always on its trial. It is on trial in this House, and the people have a second choice. Where, I think, those who want to return hon. gentlemen opposite, who want to return to the old methods of political thought, fail, is in not having a thorough appreciation of the psychology of the people at this time. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, and of every other country, are thinking in a way they have never thought before. There is a consciousness—which may in some cases be only a sub-consciousness—that having participated in common sacrifices, having escaped a common danger, having won a common and glorious victory, they ought to participate, to the full in the things for which the battle was fought and for which the victory was won. There is a democratic sentiment in this country, arising in all quarters of it, which cares little for old party names and less for old party shibboleths. I myself care very little for

detailed programmes. Tell me the spirit and the principle of a man or a party, and I will tell you whether that man is a Tory or whether he is a Progressive. It is the spirit that counts. We read in our newspapers and we said in our speeches during the war that the world would not be the same after the war, and it is not the same. It is not the same because everywhere there is a grim determination that democratic principles shall prevail among the peoples of the earth and that special privilege shall die. There is a determination that life and meaning shall be put into that old phrase which has been used from time immemorial on this side of the Atlantic: "Special privileges to none, equal rights and opportunities for all." There never was a time when the rank and file of the people, not only in Canada but in all nations of the earth—and this is the issue that will be fought in the next election—were praying more earnestly, if not in the words in the thought of the old Corn Law rhymer, Ebenezer Elliott. During that supposed time of prosperity in Britain when protection prevailed, Ebenezer Elliott voiced the sentiments of the people themselves in regard to this matter —and he is voicing the sentiments of democratic people everywhere to-day—when he wrote:

When wilt Thou save the people, O God of Mercy, When?
The people, Lord, the people—not Crowns and Thrones, but men.
God save the people, Thine they are,
Thy children, as Thy angels fair.
From guilt, oppression, and despair,
God save the people.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will agree that it has just had one of those very able, very learned, and very eloquent appeals to which the hon. member for Red Deer sometimes gives us an opportunity to listen. If we cannot on all occasions agree with the opinions or ideas advanced in this House by the hon. member for Red Deer, we can still join in paying this tribute to him, that he speaks with a vast amount of sincerity and a vast amount of boldness, because I believe he is one of the members of this House who is not afraid to state his actual opinion upon any occasion or upon any question.

I regret, as we on this side of the House will regret, that upon this important occasion he considers it his duty to vote for the first amendment moved, namely, the want-of-confidence motion in the Administration. He has given to the House during the course of his two and a quarter hours' address reasons which, I am satisfied, appeal to him and convince him what is the right course for him to take. But they certainly are far wide of the reasons which have been advanced by the official leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) for voting want of confidence in this Government. There is no resemblance between the reasons advanced to-day by my hon. friend from Red Deer and the reasons advanced upon the opening day of the session by the official leader of the Opposition.

While I admit that my hon. friend from Red Deer was quite within his rights to take the stand which he has taken this afternoon, and to submit as his chief reason for voting in favour of this amendment the fact that he does not approve the fiscal policy of the Government, I realize, as I am sure the House will realize, that that has been the attitude of the hon. gentleman ever since the general election of 1917. He was not a supporter of the fiscal policy of the Government then, he is not a supporter of it now. If he has no confidence to-day in this Government on account of its fiscal policy, it is no new thing whatever, it is merely the repetition of an old idea or old attitude on his part.

I confess that we on this side of the House were pleased with the somewhat genuine and generous tribute of congratulation which he sounded at the opening of his speech towards the Government and those of us who support it. He spoke of the business properity and the contentment which has been pretty general in this country since the war, as we all know, and he attributed a limited amount of credit to the Government for this satisfactory condition, although I am prepared to say he gave the chief credit to Providence. He congratulated us also on the fact that there was a certain amount of prosperity now throughout the length and breadth of Canada. We are glad of his good opinion in this respect; and we are glad that he has been manly enough and bold enough to declare that in his estimation the charge of usurpation of office which was launched against this Government by the official leader of the Opposition on the opening day of the session is entirely unfounded and unjustified.

There was this to be said in regard to the argument of my hon. friend from Red Deer upon the fiscal question. After he had enumerated what, I imagine, were in his view the shortcomings of the Administration; after he had touched on the pro-

posal emanating from hon. members on this side of the House for the appointment of a Grain Commission; after he had made some very humorous comments upon that subject which is known in this House as Daylight Saving; after he had enlarged more or less upon the luxury taxes and declared, what he had always declared for three sessions, must eventually prevail, then he turned round and said, "For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote no confidence in the Government; but I can find other and stronger reasons for such a vote when I refer to the speech delivered in this House eight or ten months ago upon the tariff question by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government."

I am afraid that that speech of the right hon. leader of the Government made a deep impression upon the hon. member for Red Deer. I believe that last session he was not satisfied with himself in respect of that speech. I think he tried very hard to obtain an opportunity to deliver a second speech upon the subject of the Budget by way of reply to the speech of my right hon. friend, and it seems to me that for eight or ten months back my hon. friend from Red Deer has been nursing this sore question in his heart, he has been pondering over that speech, and this afternoon he has given the House his deliverance upon the question.

My hon. friend will forgive me if I do not attempt to follow him into what I think I might fairly describe as an academic discussion of the fiscal and economic policy of Great Britain. For over one hour to-day he elaborated that fiscal system and his own particular views thereon. Now, I am not greatly concerned, neither is this House, with what is the precise fiscal policy to-day in Great Britain. We are concerned, and vitally concerned, as to what is the fiscal policy to-day and for the future in the Dominion of Canada. And if I do not further allude to my hon. friend's very able and very learned discussion of the British trade policy, he must not think that I have not been thoroughly impressed by his knowledge of the whole vast subject, and that I am not fully aware that he, of all men perhaps in this House, is best able to discuss the British fiscal system; but I do not think that the time of the House is as well occupied in a discussion of that subject as it would be in a discussion of our own fiscal system.

However, my hon. friend did take huge satisfaction to himself by demonstrating to a conclusion, in his opinion, that an adverse balance of trade was a real benefit to a country, and that irrespective of whether that country were Great Britain or Canada. Now, to my mind the two cases are not parallel at all. There is a tremendous lack of similarity between them; the conditions are wide apart. My hon. friend from Red Deer justified his statement that prosperity reigned in Great Britain when there was an excess of imports over exports by reason of two facts —the immense British investments overseas from which handsome revenues were returned; and Great Britain's control of the world's shipping from which also tremendous revenues were returned. These were the two facts which justified his statement to-day that Britain prospered under what we call an "adverse balance of trade."

When he turns to the Dominion of Canada, let me point out to him, both these conditions are absent. Canada, we are forced regretfully to admit, has no foreign investments to speak of. Canada does not enjoy the world's foreign carrying trade. These two sources of revenue, which offset the effect of an adverse balance, are absent in the Dominion of Canada, and if your adverse balance piles up the day will come sooner or later when the balance must be met, and must be met in the only currency the world recognizes—that is, gold. My hon. friend says that in 1895, although our imports were valued at $100,000,000 and our exports at $102,000,000, prosperity did not reign within the Dominion of Canada. Then, he said, as our adverse trade balance began to climb up, our prosperity seemed to return. Yes, it is true our prosperity did seem to return; as our balance kept piling up it seemed that there was greater prosperity in Canada. But I think we were a little short-sighted. We do not feel the effects of the adverse balance of trade the first year, or the second year, or, perhaps, the fifth or the tenth year; but we are feeling it to-day and we shall feel it for many a year to come—until the situation in this country is righted. Let me point out this to my hon. friend: just at this moment—and I am speaking only in approximate figures—I understand that we are buying annually a billion dollars worth of goods from the United States, and we are selling to them about half that amount. We might carry that on for a few years, but the day of settlement is bound to come, and how are we going to settle? The day of settlement is at hand now, unfortunately, and we are settling by going out in the market and buying American currency, and by doing that we are depreciating our own dollar or

appreciating the American dollar—and you have the exchange situation. If you continue to purchase from the United States annually and in vast amounts more than you sell to them; if you keep piling up that adverse balance, your exchange is going to get lower and lower. There are two ways that I know of, and only two, of correcting that. You can correct it by selling the United States more goods, or you can correct it by ceasing to buy so much goods from the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in touching on this question of purchasing from the United States I am touching directly upon one of the questions which is very near and dear to the heart of the Agrarian party, or to that portion of it which belongs to the United Grain Growers. I know that it has almost become a principle with that organization to deal as far as possible with the people in the United States, disregardful of whether or not injury results to the traders of Canada. I mention this matter particularly at this time on account of a statement which was made in the House last Friday night by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid). Fortunately or unfortunately for me, about a month ago I had occasion to make a speech in the riding of South York, represented by my hon. friend who sits next to me (Mr. W. F. Maclean). During the course of my remarks on that occasion I was dealing with the question of the tariff policy of the party known as the United Farmers' party. I was dealing with that plank which demanded free trade in agricultural implements, and I pointed out to my audience on that occasion that it would suit the purposes of the United Grain Growers and the Farmers' party generally if they could obtain free trade in implements, and that, strange as it may seem, that organization has for a long period of years past been dealing in agricultural implements in the western part of this country almost exclusively with firms and manufacturing establishments in the United States. A report of that meeting seems to have got into the newspapers—not an accurate report, but I do not know that I have very much complaint to make with regard to it. It seems to have been published pretty generally; it was one of those telegraphic reports that do get into the papers. It was referred to and put on Hansard the other day by the hon. member for Mackenzie. The part to which I wish to draw attention at this time is reported in Hansard, unrevised edition, at page 353. It says, among other things:

> The ploughs listed in the catalogue, Mr. Guthrie said, were made in Wisconsin; harrows, cultivators, mowers, etc., in Illinois; portable engines and washing machines in Pontiac, Ill.; cream separators in Buffalo, N.Y.; and wagons in Iowa.

Then the report purports to give my exact words, because what follows is in inverted commas:

> "In the lines of goods which I have mentioned, which are called 'U. G. G. goods'," Mr. Guthrie said, "there is not a Canadian article catalogued."

I take no exception to that report of my speech save in one particular—I did not mention wagon. I mentioned the other things but made no reference to wagons. Now, that statement of mine was contradicted by Mr. Rice-Jones, general manager and vice president of the United Grain Growers. He gave a report to the press, and it is in regard to that statement that I wish to place some information before the House—particularly in view of the fact that I am in the presence of the president of the United Grain Growers, if I judge aright from the catalogue of that organization, which I have before me. Mr. Rice-Jones, in his statement, which is reported at page 353 of Hansard, says:

> The Hon. Hugh Guthrie's statement as reported in a despatch is incorrect. He states there is not a Canadian article in the machinery listed in our catalogue as United Grain Growers.

Now, I did not state that, but it is pretty nearly the truth, as I am going to prove. The statement goes on:

> Even the list of machinery which is specifically mentioned as being manufactured in the United States is incorrect.

I am subject to correction. Then he goes on:

> Mowers and rakes and wagons, for instance, are all purchased in Canada.

When I saw that contradiction published in the papers, I thought that in justice to myself I had better look the matter up again, and the first place I looked was in the sworn testimony of Mr. Rice-Jones given before the Tariff Commission. I obtained an extract from it, and I am going to read it to the House so that it will go on Hansard. Mr. Rice-Jones appeared before the Tariff Commission at Winnipeg, and after having made a statement of how much more cheaply he could sell his goods out there if there was no tariff, the chairman of the commission

began to ask him some questions. Now, this is from the record; I will give the evidence:

Sir Henry Drayton: Where do you get this machinery from? From whom do you buy your plow?

Mr. Rice-Jones: It is the Lacrosse plow.

Sir Henry Drayton: From whom do you buy your cultivator?

Mr. Rice-Jones: From the Light Draft Harrow Company.

Sir Henry Drayton: Where do you get it?

Mr. Rice-Jones: It comes from Ohio.

Sir Henry Drayton: What is the name of the firm?

Mr. Rice-Jones: The Light Draft Harrow Company.

Sir Henry Drayton: What is the name of their home town?

Mr. Rice-Jones: I cannot recall the name just now; I can get it for you.

Sir Henry Drayton: It cannot be a very well known name.

Mr. Rice-Jones: It is just a small company.

Sir Henry Drayton: Is that concern just manufacturing for you?

Mr. Rice-Jones: No.

Sir Henry Drayton: Is it a concern with which you have made a special contract?

Mr. Rice-Jones: No.

Sir Henry Drayton: The next is "seed-drill 20 single disc." Where do you get that?

Mr. Rice-Jones: At Lacrosse.

Sir Henry Drayton: That is Lacrosse, Wisconsin?

Mr. Rice-Jones: Yes.

Sir Henry Drayton: Where do you get the washing-machine?

Mr. Rice-Jones: From the Meadows people.

Sir Henry Drayton: Where are they?

Mr. Rice-Jones: I cannot tell you offhand where their plant is.

Sir Henry Drayton: You do not know?

Mr. Rice-Jones: Ohio.

Sir Henry Drayton: Where do the grain grinders come from?

Mr. Rice-Jones: The Letz Company.

Sir Henry Drayton: Where do they come from?

Mr. Rice-Jones: I think their plant is in Wisconsin.

Sir Henry Drayton: You think it is in Wisconsin?

Mr. Rice-Jones: Yes. I can get you that information.

Sir Henry Drayton: I was just wondering where these places were and you do not appear to know anything about them. Where do you get the small gas engines?

Mr. Rice-Jones: From the Hercules Gas Engine Company of Evansville, Indiana.

Sir Henry Drayton: The disc harrow?

Mr. Rice-Jones: Lacrosse.

Sir Henry Drayton: The mower?

Mr. Rice-Jones: From the Acme Mowing Machine Company of Dayton, Ohio.

Sir Henry Drayton: The hay buncher?

Mr. Rice-Jones: The same; Dayton, Ohio.

Sir Henry Drayton: The road grader?

Mr. Rice-Jones: From J. D. Adams & Son, Indianapolis.

Sir Henry Drayton: The road maintainer?

Mr. Rice-Jones: The same.

I am going to emphasize that because of Mr. Rice-Jones' statement that mowers and rakes and wagons, for instance, are

[Mr. Guthrie.]

all purchased in Canada, and yet he swore before the Tariff Commission that he bought his mowers at Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. MAHARG: What was the date of the hearing?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the date of the Tariff Commission would be about September, October, or November of last year. I do not think I said anything about wagons at South York but I began to look through the catalogue on the subject of wagons, and if I did say anything about wagons, I do not know that I made such a terrible blunder. Mr. Rice-Jones says in regard to wagons: "In fact, we have not purchased a wagon in the United States for three years." I turn to their catalogue —this is not the most recent one, it is the one for 1919—and I read in it about a wagon called the "Abingdon" wagon. This is what the catalogue says at page 74:

The "Abingdon" is known throughout Western Canada as one of the highest grade imported farm wagons in Canadian service. For some time the importation of the finest American-made wagons has been practically impossible, but our extensive purchases, made at an early date, enable us to continue to offer them.

That is the denial of the statement of Mr. Rice-Jones, so that I do not think I was so far astray in what I said. The point I was trying to make was this—and I will make it briefly now—that in almost the whole list of farm implements and farm machinery, scarcely a single article sold by the United Grain Growers and advertised in their catalogue is of Canadian manufacture; almost exclusively this farm machinery is of American manufacture.

I am now going over the list a little more carefully. I do not find that the United Grain Growers Association sell what we call threshing machines; I do not find them advertising threshing machines or binders; but I do find them advertising the following farm machinery, and I say that according to their catalogue and the sworn statement of Mr. Rice-Jones the great bulk of it is American manufacture: Ploughs, disc harrows, common harrows, seed drills, cultivators, "Forkner" cultivators, haying machinery, including mowers, rakes, bunchers, sweep rakes, stackers, tedders, grain grinders, potato planters, sprayers, and diggers, portable elevators, gas engines, cream separators, washing machines, road machinery, manure spreaders, "Abingdon" wagons. I can not find in that long list a single

article made in Canada unless it be a steel rake. I can go further; I can even identify most of the articles from the plates upon them. I can tell precisely the factories in which most of these goods were turned out, because I have made it my business to get that information, and while my hon. friend is in the humour and in his place, I should like to ask him one question that he can probably answer. If he does not want to do so, it does not matter. In this catalogue a large motor truck is advertised and greatly commended. I have been told that the Smith Form-a-truck is of American manufacture. I have not been able to verify that, but perhaps my hon. friend, who is president of the company, can tell me whether that is the case or not.

Mr. CRERAR: I regret I cannot give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is about the only thing that could be called a farm implement that might possibly be of Canadian manufacture, except also a little grinder manufactured in Quebec, and I will give my hon. friend and his company full credit for that. But what is this organization doing? What is the party supported by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) doing to-day? Look at the millions upon millions of dollars that are going out of this country every year to buy American machinery and pile up an adverse balance of trade. Is it any wonder that one of the foremost planks in the tariff policy of the Farmers' party is the plank calling for free farm implements? They are paying now only from twelve and one-half to fifteen, indeed, I think in some cases as high as twenty per cent, in duty, but in spite of that tariff, they are succcessfully bringing into this country and selling to a tremendous number of people in the West, American farm machinery against the competition of Canadian manufacturers. If they can do this with a duty of twelve or fifteen or twenty per cent against them, what will they do should they come into power and wipe out that little bit of protection and give free trade in implements? If the free implement plank were adopted in Canada, they would increase their purchases with the United States enormously, because there would be no barrier at all to prevent them; it would be a matter of only a few weeks, or at most a few months, until they would be in a position to close up practically all the industries in this country engaged to-day in the production of that class of material.

But there is another point of view in regard to this matter. It is said that we in Canada are to-day suffering, to some extent at least, from unemployment. Is it a patriotic thing, or a sound thing economically, to take the money of the people of Canada at this critical period, to send it across to the United States to give employment in the factories there, to pay wages and keep employed citizens of the United States, while so many good Canadians during the past few months have been looking for jobs in this country? Would it not, in the first place, be a more patriotic thing, and in the second place, a sounder thing economically, if the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and his friends of the United Grain Growers, would look about them in this country to the scores, yes, even hundreds, of Canadian manufacturers who can supply the goods they require, and try to make terms with them, spend their money in this country and thus give employment to unemployed Canadians.

Mr. CRERAR: It will be—

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend can follow me, but I do not wish to be interrupted. I am going to give my hon. friend a few details in regard to the manufacture of these articles, and he can take the matter up with his people when he goes home. I will deal with the question of gas engines, which alone forms a big item. Does the House know that to-day gas engines are manufactured in 65 Canadian factories, and the only kerosene or gasoline engine that the Grain Growers advertise is the "Hercules" machine made in the United States, every variety and style of it is here advertised and not a single one the product of the 65 factories scattered throughout the provinces of the Dominion. I will supply a list of these manufacturers to my hon. friend if he will make use of it. I come now to the question of cultivators. He will not for one minute say he cannot buy just as good a cultivator in Canada as he can in the United States.

Mr. CRERAR: They will not sell them to us.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Fourteen factories in this country to-day, employing Canadian labour, are turning out cultivators just as good as can be bought anywhere in the United States, but not a single Canadian cultivator does this company sell or advertise in their catalogue.

I come next to grain grinders. Mr. Rice-Jones says that they adopt the Letz—

which is made in the United States. Now there are no less than eighteen firms in Canada making grain grinders, and from all I can gather there are better grain grinders made in Canada than in the United States. There again they give the American manufacturers the preference by advertising exclusively American-made machines, and excluding all the eighteen manufacturers of grain grinders in this country.

I come now to power washing machines. Many of the machines I have mentioned are made in the riding I have the honour to represent, and I feel keenly interested in the matter. Cultivators are made in South Wellington, gas engines are made in South Wellington, power washing machines are made in South Wellington. I would like to see the factories in the riding I have the honour to represent receive some of these orders, and thereby give employment to men in the province of Ontario. Fifteen factories in the Dominion of Canada are making these power washing machines, employing Canadian labour, but with not one of them does the United Grain Growers deal. Not a single Canadian washing machine do they advertise in their catalogue. In every instance they advertise the American machine.

So it is with the cream separator. I am told they are making cream separators at Renfrew, and very good ones too. I know they are making good ones at Peterborough, I know they are making good ones at Hamilton, but in spite of this fact this patriotic organization of traders in the great West deliberately decides to advertise and sell the King separator, made in Buffalo, New York. It will not sell a single Canadian-made separator. It is all very well for the president of that company to occupy a seat in this House and try to interrupt; but I bring this matter forward in order to give the public the facts, to put the facts on Hansard, and then let the Grain Growers' Guide publish these facts broadcast if it will. My attention has been drawn very forcibly within the last month to the fact they are publishing things about me and at the same time are misquoting what I said. Now I will give them a chance to quote from Hansard what I actually do say, and see if they will publish it.

There is one statement in the press despatch reporting an alleged speech I made in South York which is certainly not correct. It is reported in that despatch that I said the Grain Growers or the Farmers' party was "a menace to Canada." I never used that word, nor anything that sounded like it, nor any word that bore its meaning. I did say this, in the course of my remarks, that the most serious opposition in this country to the present Government was to be found in the Farmers' party. I said it was a party that had its origin in the far West among a population which was not entirely British, where the farming population, I believed, of the western provinces was said to be about 60 per cent foreign-born and about 40 per cent British-born. I said I had information that the movement had its genesis among the American farmers in the great West, that they were of a class of people who desired to trade with the people back home, and evidently from this catalogue, they were determined to carry out their desires. I said the movement had started in the West, but had swept eastward. It had taken a strong hold in Ontario and had now got down to the Maritime Provinces and I paid them the compliment of saying they were the most formidable opposition which the Government had politically in Canada to-day. I made no statement that they were a menace to Canada, as I am quoted in the press despatch as saying, and to which statement such severe exceptions was taken by my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) the other night.

I think I can also pay them this further compliment—that so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, we know pretty well where the Farmers' party stands in respect to the tariff. There is no question in the world where the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), stands on the tariff. He is a free-trader out-and-out, first, last and all the time. He proclaimed to-day as forcibly as any man could proclaim that while the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), desired protection on apples, he, the member for Red Deer, desired free trade in apples, that while the member for Yale desired to make apples dear, he, as a free trader, desired to make apples cheap. Now will he be consistent and apply that same argument to wheat? If his desire is to cheapen everything in this country, I can tell him that a cheap country is not the best country to live in for anybody. It never was, and I think it never will be. But I will say this for my hon. friend from Red Deer: he is outspoken, you know where he stands.

I can also pay that tribute to the leader of the Farmers' party in the province of Ontario; I assume that Mr. Drury is the

leader of the Farmers' party in Ontario. I do not know whether he owes allegiance to, or is a follower of, my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), but he is at all events the recognized leader of the Farmers' party in Ontario. I have never yet heard a fair, candid statement from my hon. friend from Marquette as to his tariff policy. I have heard him talking in the language of free trade one minute, and not of free trade the next. I have heard him say he would not be a free trader "in one fell swoop," and I read in a speech he made somewhere in the West that he was a free trader "by easy stages." I do not know exactly what he would do if he came into power in this country, but it is not so with the Prime Minister of Ontario. He gave us a sworn statement on this question, so we cannot question his stand. He was sworn before the committee of this House on the High Cost of Living, in 1919, and in looking over the evidence I find that at page 194, he says: "I want free trade on the manufactured goods."

That is short, concise, and direct. We know where Mr. Drury stands, and the point I desire to make is that we insist upon knowing where the rest of this House stands on the question of the tariff. There is so much pussy-footing, so much camouflage, so much soft-pedalling in the East, and so much loud pedalling on the free trade doctrine in the West, that it is pretty hard to know just where the official Opposition stands to-day, with the exception of my good friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). He is outspoken enough, I think, to satisfy most of the people of this country. To my mind, he is a very outspoken free-trader. Having said so much, I cannot say anything about the remainder of the official Liberal party in this House, and I believe it is time the House knew, and time likewise the country knew, just where they stand. I think one of the most important matters at this particular moment is that someone devise some means of having at the earliest possible moment a clear-cut declaration, by a vote, to establish where each and every member of this House stands on the tariff policies that have from time to time been proclaimed in Canada. A delicious sidelight was thrown on the situation by our good friend the member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier), when in his speech in the House the other day he described in his own clear and graphic manner how the Liberal fiscal policy was framed at the Liberal convention in Ottawa in the year 1919.

He evidently was a member of the committee which was charged with the preparation of the plank in regard to the fiscal policy. He described to us how they met in their committee room, and how the presiding officer on that occasion, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), true to his—

Mr. FIELDING: Will the hon. member pardon me? He is mistaken; I was not the presiding officer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, a prominent member of the committee I should say. However, the hon. member certainly pictured to us how eloquently the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) had pointed out, in the presence of the members of that committee, his view of the matter at all events, which was that the Liberal party was the historic free trade party in this country, that it was the real free trade party in Canada, but that he was completely brushed aside by his friend, the member for Shelburne and Queen's, who interjected: "In theory, we are a free trade party, but only in theory."

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GUTHRIE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with a brief discussion of the platform of the various parties in regard to the fiscal question, I wish to say that I omitted before the adjournment to make reference to one statement made by my hon. friend from Red Deer during the course of his remarks this afternoon. It was in reference to his argument upon the question of the balance of trade. Among other things, he mentioned that the municipalities and the provinces of this country were rapidly piling up debt in the United States. This fact, he said, had an influence upon the question of the balance of trade as between Canada and the United States, and, in some way, he seemed to charge this Government with responsibility in respect of these municipal and provincial loans.

Now, as a matter of fact, the indebtedness of this Government to the United States at the present time is in a very satisfactory position. We know that we have a net indebtedness in Canada of about two and a quarter billions, but it is a gratifying thing to know that a very large proportion of this net debt is owed within our own

borders and to our own people. I suppose it goes without saying that debt cannot be considered as a good thing under any circumstances, but I think a national indebtedness is least objectionable when it is owed to your own people. Approximately, our debt as a nation in the United States to-day is about one hundred and seventy-five millions. We owe Great Britain, I think, about double that amount, but apart from these two items the whole indebtedness of this country is practically confined within our own borders. This Government has nothing to do with provincial or municipal borrowing. Provincial and municipal borrowing is not a new thing. It has been going on, I think, ever since the days of Confederation, and in pre-Confederation times also, but there is this difference to-day in regard to provincial and municipal loans. Formerly those loans were negotiated in London. To-day they are negotiated in New York, and if these loans add to the burden, or the adverse balance, of this country in respect of trade between Canada and the United States, the rebuke of my hon. friend from Red Deer should have been directed against the provinces and the municipalities of this country.

It is argued from time to time that the adverse trade balance as between Canada and the United States has no influence upon the present discount on Canadian money in the United States. It has been argued in my hearing that year after year when, as between the two countries, there was an adverse balance of trade, our money was never at a discount, our money was always at par. Consequently, it is said that an adverse balance of trade has nothing to do with the matter. But, Mr. Speaker, this must also be remembered: In those pre-war years this country, the corporations in this country, the provinces and the municipalities, were all heavy borrowers and in those days our borrowings were in Europe. Our borrowings were in London, in Holland, and in France, and by far the greatest portion of them were financed through New York, and this foreign borrowing, coming through American exchanges to a large extent, rectified the balance of trade and assisted in keeping our exchange level. But we have no foreign borrowings nowadays. We cannot raise money to-day in the London money markets. We cannot raise money to-day in European countries, we cannot avail ourselves of that source of relief in regard to the exchange. As I intimated before six o'clock, so far as I am aware there are only two ways of rectifying the adverse exchange—the one by selling more goods, and the other by ceasing our overpurchases in the United States.

I was proceeding to examine what one might call the official Opposition platform in regard to the fiscal policy in this country. I think that I had remarked that my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) had given the House a most graphic description of the manner in which that policy was formed and adopted by the Liberal Convention which assembled in the city of Ottawa in the summer of 1919. After the policy had been thought out, considered, and formally adopted, it was sent broadcast throughout the Dominion of Canada. Official copies were issued in modest pamphlets such as the one I hold in my hand, and more elaborate publications appeared, with portraits of the leading spirits in the Convention, and were sold in the bookstores at a rate as high as a dollar a piece. Naturally the resolution upon the tariff is one of the important pronouncements of the Liberal Convention. It is not a long pronouncement and it will not hurt if I place it on Hansard in connection with my remarks. It is called simply "Resolution on the Tariff" and reads as follows:

> That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance: First: diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second: reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.
>
> That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour, and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines, and fishermen's equipments; cement and fertilizers should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.
>
> That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.
>
> That the British preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.
>
> And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the applause from the Opposition was not

very general. I noticed that in some quarters there was no applause at all; and that is my chief objection to the manner in which this tariff plank of the Liberal policy is being dealt with by the official Opposition throughout the length and breadth of Canada to-day. It only seems to apply in spots either in the country or in this House. But it will be noticed that there are four pronouncements involved in their tariff plank: the first is a general demand for substantial reductions in the customs tariff; the second is a fairly long free list; the third is another demand for substantial reductions in wearing apparel and footwear and articles of general consumption; and the fourth pronouncement is in favour of an increase in the British preference to fifty per cent.

Now, the question which, I think, is most interesting to the members of this House and to the people of this country is simply this: Do the official Opposition intend to stand upon that platform, or is it one of those platforms which are sometimes made for the purpose of subterfuge of camouflage or the like? I remember well in the old days, twenty or twenty-one years ago a favourite story which my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was fond of telling the House. It related to a coloured porter who wanted to put the passengers off the platform at the end of his sleeping car. He told them that they must not stand there. "Why not?" they demanded. "Oh," he replied, "a platform is not to stand on; a platform is to get in on." And if my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's were in the House now, I would remind him that the tariff plank of the Liberal party formulated in 1919 is entirely different from any tariff policy carried out by the Liberal party during the fifteen years they were in power. From 1900 to 1917 I was a member of that party, and for eleven years I was a supporter of the Government then in power, and I think that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's will agree with me when I say that there was no free trade talk in the Liberal party in those days—there was no such tariff plank in the policy of the Liberal party as I have read to the House to-night. The tariff policy of the Liberal party in those days was a continuance of the old fiscal policy which came into force in 1878. And what I maintain now is, that forty-two years ago Canada adopted a fiscal policy which has continued in force until the present time.

I am quite well aware that prior to 1896 it was not an uncommon thing for leaders of the Liberal party to pronounce in favour of free trade. I often heard declarations from Liberal leaders in those days to the effect that the Liberal party was in favour of free trade as they have it in England; I heard declarations by Liberal leaders that they would not be content until protection had disappeared "root and branch" from our fiscal system. I heard those declarations prior to 1896, but I think the House will agree with me that when the change took place and the Liberal party came into power no one in any quarter of the country ever heard such declarations from Liberal leaders. The Liberal Government adopted the settled fiscal policy of the country with slight alteration and they maintained it in force during their whole term of office. I call to the attention of my hon. friend from Red Deer that when he entered the House of Commons in 1908 his complaint in Parliament and out of Parliament was that he was the only free trader in the House. And it was so. He was the only one who had the courage to state a case in favour of free trade. He used to take us by the buttonhole and lead us into the corridors to instruct us in the intricacies of the doctrine of free trade. He did not find very many apt pupils, I agree, but still he was then, as he now is, an arden free trader. But his complaint in those days was that the Government was a protectionist government, not a free trade government.

The principle of protection was maintained during the whole regime of the Liberal party from 1896 to 1911, and only at this late date, during the summer of 1919, do we have a pronouncement from that party which, if not an out-and-out free trade pronouncement, is a pronouncement which involves such a mutilation of our fiscal system as to render it absolutely innocuous and worthless if put into force, but at the same time is a pronouncement behind which, I believe, the official Opposition does not stand as a body to-day. Had my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition during the recent by-election in Peterborough read to the electors of that riding the tariff pronouncement, as I have read it to-night, had my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's done the same thing, and had the present hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Gordon) said to the electors, "I stand upon the Liberal tariff policy of 1919," I think I can safely predict that the hon. gentleman would not

now be the representative of that constituency.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was not the issue.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Do you wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people have some curiosity to know just where the parties and members of this House stand in regard to this fiscal question? I hope that within a measurable time matters will be so adjusted in this House that we will have the acid test applied and that each hon. member will be asked to declare, by his vote, just where he stands in regard to the fiscal policy of this Dominion. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says that the tariff was not the issue in West Peterborough. I agree that he has done everything in his power to avoid that issue both in the by-elections and in this House. I agree that in the amendment which he has moved to the Address he has up to the present moment rather successfully avoided that issue. It is apparent that he has framed his amendment for the express purpose of avoiding the issue, simply because he knows that he cannot command the united support of his own party behind him upon the tariff issue.

And now just a word in regard to the first amendment. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that in his somewhat animated address in moving his amendment my hon. friend made no charge against the Government of malfeasance, of misfeasance or of non-feasance. He did not suggest that anything in the legislative record of the Government in the past was in any respect improper or lacking, nor did he offer the slightest suggestion to the House that the published platform of the present Administration which was issued last summer contained anything which did not meet his approval. In a word, he made no charge whatever against the Government from a legislative or an administrative point of view.

He contented himself solely with a highly excited and exaggerated denunciation of the Government as usurpers, as buccaneers, I think also; as a Government that would prostitute parliamentary authority, as autocrats, and I do not know what else. But his great difficulty was to find substance, to find a foundation, upon which to rest such a charge, and the more he delved into history for precedent, the more he found himself refuted in the position which he himself took. What strikes the candid observer, what strikes the diligent listener to this debate, is that every single precedent that has been brought forward has proved to be a precedent which establishes the constitutional position of the Government and refutes the statement of the amendment that the Government has nc authority to continue in office.

My hon. friend dipped deeply into British parliamentary history, from, I think, the year 1865. He occupied the time of the House in telling us just how long each Parliament had lasted in Great Britain. He reviewed the Triennial Act, the Septennial Act and the Quinquennial Act, and he did the same thing in connection with the history of this country from Confederation down to the present time—for what purpose I know not, because he established nothing as a result of it. Had he desired to examine the parliamentary history and the parliamentary records of Great Britain and of Canada he would have found those records full of instances which fit the present case. I ask him to examine any period in the last forty or fifty years in the parliamentary history of Great Britain or of Canada; if he does, he will find absolute justification of the position which the Government has taken at this time and the strongest refutation of the position which he himself has assumed.

My. hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power), also indulged in some parliamentary history and cited one or two instances, which, he thought, afforded something like constitutional precedent. I propose as we pass along to mention these two precedents, because I think that they most clearly establish the Government's right to continue in office to the close of the parliamentary term and completely refute the charge made in the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition.

We have in the first place the precedents of Great Britain. The one best known is that of 1892 to 1894. It is well known that the Liberal party under the late Mr. Gladstone carried the elections of 1892 in Great Britain. They were established in power but the majority was not satisfactory. The combined vote of the Irish Nationalists and the Conservatives might upset them at any time. In 1894 Mr. Gladstone, becoming a very old man and being in ill-health, determined to retire. He tendered his resignation to Her Majesty the Queen, and she sent for Lord Rosebery, who formed a new government. The Gladstone Government had then been in office only two years but there were loud cries from the Conservatives of England for a dissolution. The

charge was made by Mr. Balfour that there was no mandate; that the new Government should dissolve and appeal to the people. But all Liberal authority at that time supported Lord Rosebery, among them Lord Morley, Sir William Vernon Harcourt and others, and Lord Rosebery determined to carry on and refused to dissolve the House. In taking this course he maintained that he was following constitutional precedent, and I submit that he was. But his predicament was a very odd one. He met Parliament; he brought down the speech from the Throne, and on the first day of the sitting he was met by a motion from Mr. Henry Labouchere to amend the address and the motion carried in the House of Commons by a majority of two against the Government. I read from volume 2 of Herbert Paul, page 260:

> Although the majority for this irregular proposal was only two, it put the Government in a most humiliating plight, and they were compelled, with the contemptuous assistance of the Conservatives, to negative their own Address as the only feasible plan for getting rid of the amendment.

But even in this serious situation Lord Rosebery did not think of resignation; he persevered, as was his constitutional right. During that session Sir William Harcourt was only able to carry his budget by a majority of twelve. A month or two later Mr. Speaker Peel resigned, and the Government only succeeded in carrying the Speakership and elected Mr. Gully by a majority of eleven. However, in the summer of 1895, the Opposition were strong enough to carry a vote for reduction of a vote in a Finance Bill—it was carried by a majority of seven, and only then was it that the Rosebery Administration resigned. Were they right or were they wrong? They were elected in 1892. The Gladstone Government ceased to exist in 1894 for the same reason that the Borden Ministry ceased in this country in 1920. A new Government came into existence in England under Lord Rosebery. The demand was made in England by the Conservatives of those days for a dissolution. The Liberals said: No, and continued until they were defeated in the House and had to dissolve.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That Government was not a war Government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we will come to a war government, later on because there was one in 1890. In 1895 the Salisbury administration took power. They dissolved the House, carried the election and continued in office until 1900 when the "kharki election" took place in England.

Mr. LEMIEUX: An old Tory trick.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was charged, of course, by the Liberals that the Conservative party in bringing on an election had taken advantage of the Boer War. Peace was not concluded, I think, for a year and a half afterwards, and it was alleged by Liberals that the Conservatives had taken a most unfair advantage and had held a war election. The Conservative party were returned to power on that occasion by a very substantial majority. Lord Salisbury was Prime Minister. In July, 1902, ill health and old age being given as the reasons, he retired, and Mr. Balfour was called upon to form a new administration. Then the boot was on the other foot. There are quotations from the speech of Mr. Asquith, Lord Morley and Sir William Harcourt on record in which it was urged that as a new administration had been formed which had no mandate from the people that the government should dissolve parliament. The charge was made by Mr. Asquith that this was a war government; that the party which had attained power had taken advantage of war time to secure an election for themselves which in normal times they could not have secured. But in spite of such criticism the government determined what its constitutional right was. It did not heed the taunts or the criticism of Mr. Asquith and the Liberal party but continued in office until January, 1896. Then dissolution took place and the Liberal administration went into power.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, I am going to give you a Liberal precedent now. The Liberal administration went into power under Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Unfortunately, the duties of office weighed upon him, and after a period of only two years, his health became so poor that he was obliged to resign, and on the advice of his physician, on the 6th of April, 1906, he proceeded to the Continent where his Majesty then was, and tendered his resignation. His resignation was accepted and Mr. Asquith was sent for. He went to Europe and was there asked to form a new ministry. He returned to London on the 10th of April and announced that he would do so. Once more the clamour was made against the new administration, this time by the Conservatives—it looks to me Mr. Speaker, as it depended a great deal in Great Britain, and perhaps, in Canada as well, on the question of "whose ox is gored." The charge was that as Mr. Asquith had no

mandate that he should dissolve parliament, but Mr. Asquith continued to carry on, and did carry on, until the expiration of the parliamentary term. Now, these are all the precedents I have been able to find in British history throughout the last twenty-five years, back to 1892 and I challenge my hon. friends opposite to find a solitary instance in which a contrary proceeding was adopted in Great Britain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite willing to accept the challenge and I will quote proceedings to-morrow.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Now, I am going to turn to the Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Of course, Canadian precedents, unfortunately neet with laughter on the other side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Unfortunately, they are all against my hon. friends opposite. I will go back to 1891—I started with 1892 in Great Britain and I think I covered the whole ground. Again I will issue the challenge: in every single instance in this country from 1891 down to the present time the precedents which exist establish the right of the government and refute the contentions of the Opposition.

In 1891, on the death of Sir John Macdonald, a new administration had to be formed. The House knows as well as I do that when a prime minister dies or resigns his administration comes to an end. The ministers do not need to resign; the resignation of the prime minister operates as the resignation of the whole government, and a new administration comes into being. Then came Sir John Abbot. He did not dissolve the House; he went right on. Unfortunately his health failed, and his Government came to an end by reason of resignation—a case on all fours with the present instance. Then Sir John Thompson was called on to form and did form an administration. He did not dissolve the House; he carried on. Unfortunately, in the course of a short time, he died and Sir Mackenzie Bowell was called upon to form a government. Sir Mackenzie Bowell did not dissolve Parliament; he formed a new government and carried on. I do not think that in the Dominion Parliament from 1891 until last July there was a single instance where the precedent established both in Great Britain and Canada was not precisely followed in the case of every new administration; Time after time in the various provinces of Canada the same situation has arisen. In 1896, in three provinces, three distinct administrations came to an end by reason of the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who had attained power, called to his Councils three provincial premiers. In Ontario the government of Sir Oliver Mowat was in power. He resigned: his government came to an end; he came to Ottawa, and a new government was formed. This is pure Liberal doctrine. Mr. Hardy formed a new administration, but he did not dissolve the legislature. Subsequently Mr. Hardy resigned, and the late Sir George Ross came in and formed a new government, but he if I remember correctly did not dissolve the legislature. In Nova Scotia, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was prime minister. He was called to Ottawa in 1896, while still premier of that province. He was succeeded in Nova Scotia by a new premier, Mr. Murray, who formed a new government; but there was no dissolution, no mandate from the people; the government simply carried on in accordance with constitutional practice. So in New Brunswick where Mr. Blair was prime minister, Mr. Blair came to Ottawa, a new premier came in; a new government was formed in New Brunswick but there was no dissolution. So, also, as recently as 1917, the same thing happened out in the western provinces when Mr. Sifton came to Ottawa, and, so also when through the resignation of Mr. Scott in Saskatchewan, when Mr. Martin took office, I do not think there was a dissolution, but I am not sure of that. More recently than all, within the last few months, in the province of Quebec, a Liberal premier resigned, a new government was formed in Quebec, but there was no dissolution, simply a carrying on to the end of the parliamentary term. What I maintain is this: We have a plain direction in the law of this country, section 50 of the British North America Act, which was quoted to this House by the leader of the Opposition, and which says that Parliament shall extend for a term of five years. We in this Government have followed both the letter and the spirit of that law, and our action has been in entire accord with the best parliamentary procedure. I do not know just what body of the people is clamouring for an election at this time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Everybody.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know the leader of the Opposition imagines that there is in this country some tremendous demand that he should be the rescuer of Canada during the present crisis; but I have been travelling throughout Canada lately, and I have not noticed any loud or prolonged or widespread cry for assistance, guidance or direction from the hands of my hon. friend. It is said by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that he does not agree with the constitutional doctrine propounded of the leader of the Opposition in his amendment but he thinks that on account of the by-elections, this Government should resign. In all fairness, I am going to put the case to the hon. member for Marquette. This Government came into being last July, since which date there have been five appeals to the people in four provinces of Canada. In three of those appeals in three separate provinces, the people have in the most decided tone commended the Government and sent us a supporter. In two instances in Ontario, the Government has not been sustained, in one constituency a supporter being sent to the leader of the Agrarian movement and in one constituency a supporter being sent to the official leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the Government platform.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There have been five by-elections since this Administration was formed. If you want to discuss the sins of omission or commission, if there were such, of the former administration, you may be able to say that there were, under a former government by-elections, that showed the temper of the people. But is it not a fair and reasonable proposition that I am making—namely, that the question should be decided on the record of the by-elections which have taken place since this Government was formed? Is that not a fair way of obtaining an expression of the opinion of the people of this country?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If you do so, you will have to admit that the preponderance of public opinion is in favour of the Government and of the course which it is pursuing. On the other hand, if you wish to go back to the year 1917, and take the record of the by-elections since Union Government was formed in that year, I am quite free to say that in doing so you may show that a majority of the by-elections have been against the government. But it was not this Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This Government is answerable only since the middle of July last year—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —and this Government is prepared to stand on its record before the people and to be judged by the people on that record. Sometimes I think the official leader of the Opposition assumes unto himself, in respect of his position, a good deal of authority which he does not actually possess amongst the electors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: That is to be proved.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Exception was taken on Friday last by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), to a statement made on this side of the House to the effect that the official leader of the Opposition represented merely a remnant of the Liberal party. I do not see why my hon. friend should take such grave exception to a statement of this kind. I can tell my hon. friend exactly what he knows to be the fact, namely, that in eight provinces out of the nine in this country, he represents only a remnant of the old Liberal party. My hon. friend has only to cast his eye about this Chamber to satisfy himself upon this point.

In two of those provinces my hon. friend does not represent a single elector if one may judge by his following in this House. So when my hon. friend talks of the great Liberal convention and the great Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada let me tell him—and I am only telling him what he knows already—that the old historic Liberal party in this country, save in one single province, has ceased to exist. Let me point out to him the figures. In the Maritime Provinces there are 31 representatives sitting in this Parliament, and my hon. friend can muster only 11; and one on the cross-benches will give him 12.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Just try an election.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I thought a few real facts would waken some of them up. Let me tell my hon. friends opposite that in the great province of Ontario there are just as many old line Liberals supporting my right hon. friend and his Government in this House as are supporting the leader of the official Opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Somebody dissents from that. It will not take very long to count them. I was fond of making the statement before the West Peterborough election that the Government had one more than the Opposition, but now I think we stand just ten-ten; that is, the Government has just as many of the old Liberal party from Ontario supporting it as has my hon. friend opposite. Then let me tell my hon. friend that from lake Superior to the Pacific ocean he as only two supporters of the old Liberal party, in a total of about fifty-seven constituencies.

All my friends around me must well remember the days when we looked to British Columbia and the Yukon, with 14 seats, as a great Liberal stronghold. But glance at it to-day in this House. How many followers does my hon. friend muster behind him of old line Liberals from British Columbia and the Yukon? Does he lead a remnant? No, not even a remnant, not a single supporter. From the old Liberal province of Alberta, one single member supports my hon. friend. From the old Liberal province of Saskatchewan with 16 seats in this House, there is not a single representative of the old Liberal party sitting behind my hon. friend. Take Manitoba. One single representative from that great province. Am I not right then, Mr. Speaker, when I say that my hon. friend the leader of the official Opposition, when he assumes in this House or in this country to speak for the old Liberal party of this Dominion, is assuming a good deal more than he is entitled to? He has only to look across the House. He has only to recognize the members of the old Liberal guard, sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. McMASTER: It is hard to recognize them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No longer Liberals, I admit—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —because when the testing time came we found that the line of cleavage was so deep, so well defined—

Mr. DUFF: So many loaves and fishes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —we found the issue which had to be determined was perhaps the greatest issue which any of us would have to determine in our public lives, and when we took the decisive step, we took it deliberately, knowing what it involved.

And now we are proud to be members supporting the present Administration, supporting a party which we ourselves helped to form in the first instance, on a platform which we ourselves helped to prepare, and in support of a Prime Minister who was the man of our own selection. That is the real situation which exists in this House to-day. There is no use trying to camouflage the facts. Those are the plain facts as they exist to-day. While it is charged in various quarters that the former supporters of this Administration are flocking back to my hon. friend's support, I can discover only two of them. I see a great many who have crossed the floor and joined the Agrarian party, but I have seen only two in all who have become out-and-out members of the official Opposition. I do not even like to call them the old Liberal party because, as I said before, they represent merely a small remnant of that old party.

Now just a word as to the sub-amendment. To my mind it raises a question of considerable difficulty and importance in the House. I do not know but what under certain circumstances the sub-amendment might have been considered well-timed and appropriate, but I think there would be great difficulty in the way of any government accepting such an amendment under present circumstances. I see great difficulties in the way of the Government accepting a sub-amendment to the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, which itself is a pronouncement of Government policy put into the hands of His Excellency the Governor General, to be presented to the House. I can, however, see force and reason in the sub-amendment, while I do not see either force, reason or propriety in the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the official Opposition.

There are a number of important considerations which must be dealt with. There is one practical consideration which is quite outstanding. It is a stock-in-trade charge of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that this Government is non-representative, is mis-representative is unrepresentative, and so forth, but let me tell him that if Parliament were dissolved and an appeal made to the people of this country with the constituencies arranged as they are to-day, we would have a Government just as mis-representative, just as unrepresentative, of the people of Canada as one could well imagine. You would have absolute non-representation in 25 or 30

seats in the West, but that is not the difficulty with which I am for the moment concerned. I heard a fiery denouncement in this House by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) a few nights ago. He thought some monstrous iniquity would be perpetrated upon the people of this country if the census were taken in June, and a redistribution of seats were to take place soon thereafter. Why, it is the natural and proper thing according to our law. The situation in Canada to-day, particularly in regard to the industrial centres, demands that there shall be no delay in regard to a redistribution of seats. The thing has become so anomalous as to be almost a public scandal. Think of it—and surely these facts will appeal to hon. members of the House—or in the city of Toronto, a riding like Parkdale sends one member to the House of Commons—

Mr. CAHILL: One too many.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —while the adjoining rural constituencies of Peel, Halton, Dufferin, South Perth and East Elgin, all put together, have not the population of Parkdale, yet they send five members to the House. I am told the situation is just as scandalous in the province of Quebec. I heard in the city of Montreal a few days ago that ten rural ridings in the province of Quebec, returning ten members to this House, did not have the population of two certain ridings in the city of Montreal.

Mr. SHEARD: Was one of them Brome?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, Brome was one of them. Now, Mr. Speaker, is not that a situation that demands a speedy remedy? Why should it take three, four or even five industrial workers in the city of Toronto to cast a vote equal only to a single vote cast in the townships adjoining the city? I have heard it said at a public meeting in the city of Toronto that the inequality is so great in Ontario that during the provincial elections of 1919 in Ontario the Conservative candidates in the city of Toronto polled more votes than the combined vote of the party now in power in Ontario under Mr. Drury.

Is it not a most glaringly unfair situation? Whatever government is in power in this country, such an unequal situation calls for a speedy remedy. You cannot impose such a disqualification, such an inequality, upon industrial workers resident in the city nor should it be allowed to continue. All men and all women are supposed to be free and equal under our law, and the theory of our constitution is that they shall have equal treatment and opportunity. We pride ourselves upon our democracy; yet we suffer to be continued in this country a system which allows four or five members to represent a rural district with a population only equal to one constituency in the city of Toronto. I do not say that any particular political party is to blame for this situation, which has simply been allowed to grow up in this country.

I have read debates in this House in the early days, long years before I became a member, when this question was under discussion. An argument was advanced that the city of Toronto should not have equal representation with the rural districts, because, as a rule, there were three or four members for other constituencies living within the city boundaries. I read another argument on the question, in which it was contended that it would be unfair to the candidate to impose upon him a large territory and a large population in the country because he would not have time to get around during elections. These are surely considerations of a most minor character. The theory of our law is equality, and the sooner we come to equality of voting and representation in this country the better.

There is opportunity to remedy this situation in the near future. I would not hesitate to say that cities like Montreal and Toronto and other cities in Quebec and Ontario, as well as the great cities in the West, are entitled to greater and more equal representation than they now have and must get it at an early date. The time is not far distant when they can be given it. Under our law the census will be taken in June. If dissolution took place now and an appeal were made to the country, the residents of these industrial centres would to a large extent be disqualified at the next election; they would not be entitled to proper representation. The greatest inequality would exist. That, Mr. Speaker, is to my mind one most substantial reason why the Government should continue to carry on, and why we should take the census.

On the contrary, there is only one possible reason which can suggest itself to any one why we should not carry on, and that reason will be definitely evidenced when the vote on the question now before the House is recorded. That question is

simply this: Have we or have we not, the confidence of the House of Commons? That is the test, and the question will be settled when this vote is taken. The duty of this Government, if it is decided that it has the confidence of the Commons, is to go ahead and do its work, take the census and bring down to the House a fair redistribution Bill applicable to every part of the country.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my first duty is to give expression to the regret that I feel because of the absence of hon. gentlemen who were in our midst last session and whom we shall see no more. I desire to pay my tribute of respect to their memory and also to the memory of that faithful servant of the State, Mr. Thomas P. Owens to whom I was personally, greatly indebted as were other members of the House.

With our deceased colleagues who sat opposite, Sir, I had little intercourse but I knew their lives, and I concur in the fitting tribute paid to them by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), my hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), and others.

I entertained for the late Mr. Gladu a feeling of the warmest friendship. With the masses in the province whence I come, I mourn the loss of this powerful and beloved tribune; with many of us who knew him intimately, I mourn the loss of a friend.

Sir, the passing of our late colleague should not be for us a cause of grief, only, but it should also teach us a fruitful lesson. Of that lesson, I could find no more adequate expression than in these beautiful words of Jouffroy:

> Qu'importe aux autres et à nous, quand nous quittons ce monde, les plaisirs et les peines que nous y avons éprouvés? Tout cela n'existe qu'au moment où il est senti. La trace du vent dans les feuilles n'est pas plus fugitive. Nous n'emportons de la vie que la perfection que nous avons donnée à notre âme—nous n'y laissons que le bien que nous avons fait.
>
> What matter to others and to ourselves when we leave this world, the pleasures and the sorrows that we have experienced? All that exists is but at the moment when it is felt. The trace of the wind through the leaves is not more fugitive. We carry with us from this life only the perfection given to our souls; we leave in it but the good we have accomplished.

This lesson, Sir, suggests another one. At the opening of our sessional labour, we would be derelict to our highest duties if we did not approach the problems which confront us, with a sincere desire of ascertaining the truth and giving expression to it. The truth is a thing beautiful and most powerful; so beautiful indeed that no adornment could be found for her, and painters and sculptors of all ages and of all nations had to represent her in her nude purity—"a lovely lady garmented in light," says Shelley. So powerful is it, Sir, that it is an attribute of God himself and the Bible in which you believe, and which is also the foundation of my faith, tells us that truth will make us free.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

In the year 1900—alas, 21 years ago—at the termination of our humanities, following a usage ancient in our province, the scholars of our class passed a conventum, and as is customary on such occasions, chose a motto, as a guiding principle throughout our lives: "Vitam impendere Vero,"—to spend our lives at the service of the truth.

As to my fidelity in the past to this fundamental principle I leave it to others to judge; as to my ability in future to adhere to it, that remains to be seen. But, I can now venture to state that I enter into the study of the questions raised during this debate with an absolute sincerity of purpose, a complete freedom of action, totally untrammelled.

Mr. Speaker, could we not fairly summarize this debate and the speech from the Throne in three questions?

1. Does the majority of this House represent the major consensus of opinion in the country, and has the Government supported by it, a sufficient mandate to carry on?

2. What should our fiscal policy be?

3. What is our real national status and how should we shape our future destinies?

To the study of these three vital questions I propose to limit my remarks.

In the first place: "Is the majority in this House a true image of public opinion?" And this bears itself a previous question: "Is there really a majority of duly elected members sitting behind the present Government?" In 1917 the Government was returned with a majority of seventy. Sir, I doubt very much if the vote shortly to be taken will reveal more than fifteen, but call it twenty. Since 1917, this country has come back to peace conditions. Therefore, if you want to establish a correct relation between the people and this House have you not to deduct from that majority those members who would never have sat in Parliament had they voted those legitimate electors who were disfranchised by the War Times' Election Act? Have you not to deduct further those members who were

elected by "the amphibiological fracas" of the soldiers vote? Would you not also have to prune further from the list the names of those members who owe their election to foreigners who have since been disfranchised by our laws? I venture to say, Sir, that those three categories of members do not represent public opinion. In all verity, relieved of this deadweight, the Government would not be supported in this House by the one hundred and eighteen members who constitute the majority of the representatives of the people. Numerically, the true majority of the Government has vanished.

Let us examine the situation in respect of the principle which the gentlemen opposite were elected to defend. In 1917 there was only one principle involved, namely, the enforcement of the Military Service Act. The veracity of this statement cannot be questioned. The manifests of the ex-Prime Minister, the speeches of the right hon. leader of the Government, the emphatic declarations of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), and indeed of all the Liberal members of the Union Government, already cited in extenso in the debate, are conclusive on this point.

The Government came before the people under extraordinary circumstances. They begged the people to lay aside for the time being all other considerations, and not to judge them on the record of the previous Tory Administration. They asked a special mandate for a specific purpose, the successful prosecution of the war. This purpose has been accomplished. Do you not hear, Sir, the high injunction from the people that their mandate has come to an end, that their tenure of office has terminated, and that their persistency deprives the electorate of its right to exercise control over Parliament?

This question of confidence has also another aspect; it is that which concerns the personnel of the Cabinet. Who will contend that in 1917, the expression of confidence snatched from the people of this country was not mainly obtained on the credit of the Liberal members of the Cabinet? Why, Sir, the very fact that they took Liberals in amply proves my assertion. Would they have been taken in had not the Government been in that "imperious need which cannot be withstood" as Dryden would put it. The respected names and known principles of the Liberal members were a guarantee to the people that no other question than the prosecution of the war would be taken up. And yet these Liberal members could be elected only on declarations of principles like this one:

> I joined this Government as a Liberal and I am a Liberal to-day. More than that no person can make me anything else.

Therefore every Liberal defection from the Cabinet was for it a direct blow which had its repercussion in public opinion; and successively were torn away from the Ministry considerable parts of the confidence of the people with the withrawals from the Cabinet of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), Hon. Mr. Carvell. the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mewburn), the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), and the late Secretary of State, towers of strength in the Unionist structure. They were the salt of the Government. If the Government therefore has lost so much of its savour, wherewith shall it be now salted? Its remnants, Sir, could I not rightly picture with Tennyson: "Portions and parcels of a dreadful past."

Mr. Speaker, let me put again my first question; does the majority of this House truly reflect the opinion of the people? No, the electorate is not adequately represented in this House. Many of those who sit here either received their mandate from people who have no longer a vote, or did not submit it to those who have become again their judges. All of them received it for a specific purpose which has been accomplished. Their Liberal association, a vital factor in their election, has been dissolved. Their tenure of office is morally at an end and if they arrogate to themselves a right which they do not possess.

Let us examine the right hon. Prime Minister's argument on this point and see whether it is graced with any degree of accuracy. We can correctly reduce it to three points. 1st. "This Government is in office by the right of the confidence of a majority of the Parliament elected by a majority of the people." (Hansard, page 31.) "In point of character, in point of purpose, in point of aim and policy, we are all in full accord with the Government we succeeded—we are the continuation of that Government in every respect." In the platform on which they appealed to the electors in 1917, though it was set out in the plainest terms that the carrying out of the war was the main purpose of that campaign, there are no less than thirteen other duties which the Government set itself to achieve. I think,

Sir, that I have conclusively established that the majority in this House does not represent the majority of the people. But to corroborate my statement, let me call the unquestioned testimony of the most ardent supporters of the Union Government. I refer you, Sir, to the statements of the Hon. Mr. Carvell, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), made here when they opposed the War Times' Election Act as an iniquitous measure. Forsooth, this Act was so vicious in principle that it had to be removed from our Statutes which it disgraced. It broke faith with citizens established in this country for more than ten years. It gave the franchise to foreigners who had never had any interest in our land. It unsettled our whole electoral economy and subverted the very foundation of our citizenship which we had afterwards to re-establish. This Government is not supported by the representatives of the majority of the people. Said the Prime Minister:

> In point of character, of aim and of purposes, we are the same Government. In addition to the prosecution of the war we had thirteen other specific duties.

Let us consider these two statements together. On both of them the right hon. gentleman is contradicted by his ex-leader, by his colleagues, and by his own speeches. At Milton on November 29th, 1917, the right hon. member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden), said:

> There is only one issue in this campaign, whether we shall keep our pledge or bond given to those men, or whether we shall abandon them when they need our help most.

This declaration the right hon. gentleman repeated a hundred times in different parts of the country. And his (Mr. Meighen's) colleagues—what did they understand? Let us listen to the hon member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar):

> That is not to say that I do not feel strongly on the tariff, but I feel the present issue is not the tariff but the winning of the war.

Listen to the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder):

> When the Government was formed in 1917 there was a tacit understanding that until the war was over, our soldiers home, and demobilization completed, we should carry on, and that is the view I take now.

And, again, the same gentleman said:

> The present Government, as originally constituted was not created for the purpose of making a general revision of the tariff. This Government was for a war purpose and to carry out a war policy.

[Mr. Vien.]

And he continued:

> The members comprising the Government held strongly divergent views on the tariff question. We recognized at that time that those differences existed, and we decided to lay aside our differences for the time being.

What is true of members of the Government is equally true of members of the House on both sides: the members of this House were not elected because of their tariff leanings. Hear now, Sir, the right hon. Prime Minister himself:

> There was never a clearer issue before the people than to-day. It is simply an issue of Union Government and the vigorous prosecution of the war, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Canada's virtual withdrawal from the war.

It is simply an issue of Union Government and vigorous prosecution of the war. Can he now verily state, as he does, that in point of character, of aim and of purpose his Government stands where it stood in 1917? Can he contend that, in addition to the prosecution of the war, thirteen points had been put before the people? The right hon. gentleman would lead one to believe that he is a distant rival of the father of the fourteen points; but he is surely not a lover of the truth.

On the question of the tariff, to which I now come, the right hon. gentleman is armed with a double-barreled gun, one barrel loaded against the Liberal Opposition, the other against the Progressive party. Against the Liberals he shoots the idea that we are not serious in our endeavours to reduce the tariff; that we are high protectionists, as he is himself; that we avoid the issue; and he suggests to the Farmers that they had better support him because they know where he stands. Against the Farmers he fires the opinion that they are radicals allied to the worst and most subversive elements—men preaching dangerous doctrines. The inuendo is an invitation to Quebec to form an alliance with him. These rhetorical methods are typical of the right hon. gentleman. They have been described in the press as follows:

> The tactical methods upon which Mr. Meighen relies to achieve his ends upon the public platform were fully illustrated in the public addresses which he delivered during his recent western trip. It is Mr. Meighen's method to state at the outset of his speech the case as between himself and his opponents. He states it with care and deliberation and with a great appearance of fairness. After doing this he proceeds to the destruction of the Opposition by direct and vigorously delivered assault. Unreflecting observers are likely to attribute the resulting victory to the strength of Mr. Meighen's case; but more sophisticated unlookers are apt to remark that it is chiefly due to the weakness of the Opposition's case as set

forth by Mr. Meighen. The Opposition's case in reality some times differs somewhat from its case as set forth by Mr. Meighen in preparation for his tilt at it; and there are times when Mr. Meighen's platform triumphs are victories, not over real opponents but over "men of straw."

Speaking in this House, the Prime Minister did not renew his attack on those radical communists who, he suggested, formed part of, or at least are allied with, the Farmers' party. Was his ammunition expended? Let not our Farmer friends believe it. For the time being both barrels of his firearm were busy discharging the ammunition compounded of his subtle sophistries against those "miserable Grits" who in their platform had dared to touch the most holy arch of tariff protection, and against their leader, who, in the judgment of the right hon. member, was intensely anxious to see that no clear issue got before the electors at all. Standing in front of the temple, ad instar the Pharisee of old, the Prime Minister says: "Oh farmer, praise the Lord with me that I am not like my contemptible opponent, non-committal and deceitful. In the speech from the Throne I have written a paragraph that defines clearly and definitely where the Government stands; a paragraph that states the principle in words that no man can fail to comprehend." Let us see whether my right hon. friend can get out of this more justified than his exemplar.

The paragraph to which he refers is as follows:

> It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained.

Will my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) lend me an expression for the purpose of defining correctly this plank of the Government's platform? Yes, Sir, I find it in his recent speech in the House. It was not intended to apply to this paragraph of the speech from the Throne, but it fits in very nicely as a description of it—"A new policy, wonderfully vague in its definitions." I say "a new policy" advisedly, because the protection of industries, including agriculture, as suggested by the speech from the Throne, is a radical departure from the well-known policy of the Tory party, which has always been the protection of industries at the expense of agriculture. But is it not also gloriously indefinite? Because I never heard of any details being given out by the Government to show how they reconcile high tariff with the interests of the agriculturalists. On the contrary, notwithstanding this paragraph in the speech from the Throne, the right hon. gentleman tells us, as reported in Hansard, page 40:

> We are not proposing any departure from the historic policy of this country pursued under this Government, under the late Government, under the Government of which the leader of the Opposition was himself a member.

"We are not proposing any departure," he says, but in the same breath he says also:

> In the speech from the Throne there is a paragraph that defines clearly and definitely where the Government stands, a paragraph that states the principle in words that no man can fail to comprehend.

"My advisers are convinced of the necessity for the revision of the customs tariff," says the speech from the Throne. "We are not proposing any departure; if we were we would not have the support of the Minister of Immigration," says the right hon. gentleman, and he concludes with a frantic appeal to the member for Red Deer to support this party whose position he knows to be consistently maintained. Let us dig a little deeper, Sir, perhaps we shall find in the Prime Minister's declaration some particle of truth. Speaking of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration, he says:

> The one man who has been consistent on this tariff issue. He is standing where he stood when the Liberal party were in power on the tariff issue.

Speaking at Winnipeg on the 13th of November, 1920, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Calder) said:

> Three years ago I did not understand the tariff question as well as I do at the present time. I was more or less a parrot, just as other people are parrots. I got up in the Legislature and advocated free fertilizers when I did not know the first thing about it.

Listen again to the Prime Minister's later declaration:

> The Minister of Immigration . . . is standing where he stood when the Liberal party were in power on the tariff issue.

Oh, truth, beautiful truth, the right hon. gentleman is no lover of thee! It is part of the political tactics of our friends opposite on the question of the tariff to throw into the eyes of the electorate the dust of two sophisms. To the big interests they say: Beware of the farmers and of their radical ally; if they attain to power they

will subvert the whole economic structure. To the farmers they say: Do not trust the Liberals; they are protectionists in fact if not in principle. Neither of these statements is true, Sir. All over the world the stabler element in each country is the farming element. The farmer owns the land, he tills the soil, he has taken root. He is not transient in character, and he is not radical in principle. Is he a communist? Why should he be ready to share a hardly gained heritage with any prodigal spendthrift? Here let me borrow an expression from the Prime Minister himself: The absurdity of the argument is simply pathetic. In respect to the Liberals, could there be a more impudent statement than that the present Government stands where the Liberal party stood when it was in power? Did we not lose power on the question of reciprocity, so savagely fought by our opponents with their delusive bogey, "no truck or trade with the Yankees." The Liberal party can stand on its record. In 1893 they passed resolutions advocating tariff reduction and reciprocity. During their fifteen years on the Treasury Benches they removed the tariff on many articles; they reduced it at least twenty-five per cent, and afterwards to the extent of thirty-three per cent by the British preference, and they fell on the battlefield of freer trade espousing the cause of reciprocity.

In 1919, they reaffirmed their faith in the policy of freer trade and reciprocity, and that policy they will, if returned to power, carry out in the full measure that circumstances will permit. That they have not all at once embodied in the laws their advocated principles is not to be wondered at, it is to their credit and it is certain they will not fall into radicalism in the future. They are the doctors; the country is their patient, and a patient very sick after forty years of protection. It would be criminal to administer to him too suddenly a full ration of the healthier food of freer trade, but under their good care the patient will recover, and will gradually come to it. The farmer of today is like a man starting upon a journey and in search of a companion. Two offer themselves, both fully armed with the same weapons. One is armed to hold him up, en route, for his purse or his life. This is the protectionist, using the tariff for the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. The other is armed to defend the farmer in case of need. This is the Liberal aiming to protect legitimate industry and to prevent dumping, but caring not for the sap-sucker, mushroom industry. His choice between the two is not doubtful. Let us hear his leader:

I would describe our position thus,

Says the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in his Winnipeg speech:

Our eyes are set on the goal of the elimination of protection as a principle in our fiscal policy. We propose to get to that goal by stages that will make it as easy as possible for our industries to readjust themselves to it. During this period revenues will, of course, come from the tariff, and there is no reason why customs duties cannot continue as in Great Britain to afford a very considerable portion of our revenue, and if need be the principle of a countervailing excise tax can be applied, in this way compelling the home manufacturer who enjoys the protection to contribute his share to the national treasury. Furthermore, there is no reason why a form of assistance cannot be given to industry without the pernicious privileges that obtain under the operation of a protective tariff. Energy to turn the wheels of our factories is one of the main essentials in the development of industry. We have that power in Canada in abundance in the unharnessed energy of our magnificent rivers. It is quite a proper function for governments to develop this, as indeed it has been developed in Winnipeg, and place it at the disposal of the manufacturer at cost.

The Liberals can stand on their record, and our farmer friends know where we stand. The Minister (Mr. Guthrie) accuses the farmers of not encouraging Canadian industries, and in the full swing of his oration, he did not allow proper explanations to come forth. I thought at the moment it was not very generous and not befitting the greatness of a minister of the Crown, but it is only human on the part of the hon. gentleman, not to allow the desired effect of his address to be spoiled. I am not the guardian of my farmer friends; they are quite capable of looking out for themselves; but it did not suit the purpose of the minister to be told that if the farmers could purchase cheaper in Canada, they would be good enough business men to find their requirements in their own country. It also did not suit the minister to be told that if the farmers did not purchase in Canada, the reason was because, owing to the co-operative character of the farmers' organization, the big industries of Canada would not sell to them. It did not suit the minister either to be told that if the Canadian manufacturer does not come up to the mark with his American competitor, the reason is that he lacks the incentive of competition, which is the life of trade

and which gives to the latter this superiority over the Canadian manufacturer, who, fed with the milk of protection, is not in that healthy condition which ensures the survival of the fittest.

As to the difference between England and Canada he would have been told, had he permitted the interjection, that by a striking departure from what was done in England, our capital, energy and manpower were in Canada diverted by protection from our basic industries and the development of our natural resources that await the hand of that sturdy canadianism which stands courageously upon its own feet and regards as contemptible the tutorship of the protective tariff. But I am sorry for the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. I have a liking for the hon. gentleman, and I regret to see that he is absent from his seat to-night. "A Liberal I was, a Liberal I am, and nobody can make me anything else,"—does he say? Alas, in his duel with the Prime Minister, he was vanquished. Vae victis—to the victor the spoils. Here he stands, hands, feet and soul tied to the chariot of a Tory leader who drags him in his triumphant course to the capitol. "I was a parrot," groans the poor victim. Indeed, it is somewhat unfortunate for the Prime Minister himself. Geese once saved the capitol; parrots never did, and the capitol itself was never nearer to the Tarpeian Rock than it is to-day. Horrified at the treatment she had received at the hands of the Prime Minister, the Truth fled to London, Paris and Geneva, running after our three diplomat ministers for refuge. Suffocated by the flight, she found them at the Peace Conference, busying themselves in that nursery of their newly-born child, "Canadian Nationhood." Poor new Susanna, what vain attempts had you not to suffer from these three wicked elders!

For three years, Sir, these hon. gentlemen have assumed the mission of convincing the Canadian people that a complete evolution has taken place in our national status; that we are no longer a colony governed by Downing street, not even a self-governing dominion, but an independent nation in the sub-league of the British commonwealth.

I shall not quote all the interesting statements we have heard in this House on that subject. Let us summarize them in these words of my right hon. friend, the Minister of Justice:

> We stand to-day by common acknowledgment of the statements not only of the other dominions, but of the United Kingdom itself, nations each equal in status with every other. There is a dazzling light that shines upon this country, and shows her forth to the world as a nation standing on a footing of equality amongst the nations.

Then, using the favourite method of his leader, he proceeded to put up his man of straw. Referring to hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, he said:

> They have not seen this developing work of time in which their late leader had so implicit faith. They do not seem to have the aspirations that he had. They want to see their Canada always in her swaddling clothes—clamouring to be kept in the nursery. In the Egyptian darkness of their colonial condition the light appears to be too much for their unaccustomed eyes.

That stale old saw so often used, and more often abused, is completely worn out. It contains two fallacies, and was broken into pieces in 1919, by two graphic words of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). When speaking on the ratification of the treaty of peace, he said:

> I reaffirm my admiration for the theories enunciated by the members of this Government. I wish they were right, but I am afraid they are wrong.

Is it not childish, Sir, to try this make-believe on the Canadian people: "Canada stands to-day in the world on a footing of equality amongst the nations?"

Why, what other independent nation, even the most humble, is presided over by a Governor General? What other sends her law cases to the tribunal of British Islanders, in appeals of last resort? What other nation has to pass under the jurisdiction of British diplomats in her official or business relations abroad?

What other nation would allow British newspapers to discuss openly who should be the representative of His Majesty the King in this country, all booming their respective candidates? If we are a nation, Sir, let the right hon. gentleman take a step further and introduce legislation enabling this Parliament to determine who shall preside over our destinies.

Last April, when in Paris, it came to my notice that a high Canadian official was desirous of obtaining an audience from the President of France. Our provincial agent could not arrange it; Canada's High Commissioner could not arrange it. The British Ambassador alone was accredited to the French Government. But a citizen of Monte Carlo could apply to the representative of his own country.

Sir, I wish we were a nation, but we shall not allow the right hon. gentleman to pay us with words. We have lost none of the aspirations of our late beloved leader, but we want the real thing, not its shadow. His statement therefore is doubly untrue.

Mr. Speaker, there is an element of real nationhood which is sadly lacking in this country. It is the binding spirit of national unity. They have it in France. They have it in England. They have it in the United States. When a Frenchman speaks of his France, his sweet France, he has spoken his last word. The love of his native land inspired his national bard in immortal lines never truer than to-day:

O France! douce France, O ma France bénie!
Rien n'épuisera donc ta force et ton génie!
Terre du dévouement, de l'héroïsme, de la foi,
Il ne faut donc jamais désespérer de toi,
Puisque malgré tes jours de deuil et de misère,
Tu trouves un héros, dès qu'il est nécessaire.

The Englishman has said his all when he has named "Merry Old England." And full of pride he sings: "Rule Britannia! Britons never shall be slaves!" Ten million Sammies sprang to their feet at the call of the Stars and Stripes, ready to jump over the top for the defence of old U.S. During his political life, Sir Wilfrid Laurier tried to develop in Canada a sentiment akin to that, fostering lofty ideals, mutual love, moral and economic progress. He fell under the assaults of hon. gentlemen opposite, animated by prejudices that he had always combatted. A dark cloud passed over this country. Its silver lining is now more and more in sight. Let us have dissolution; let us ask the people to constitute a Parliament and a Government fully armed with its confidence, and let us sink contemptible differences and prejudices. Let us all work for the upbuilding not of a visionary but of a real and powerful nation. Then, but not till then, shall we be able all to sing from the bottom of our hearts: "O Canada, mon pays, mes amours".

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words before the question is put. I have followed with considerable interest the speeches of both my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McIsaac), and the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), and to both gentlemen I tender my hearty congratulations. I do not quite understand the language of the roaring waves of the Atlantic Ocean, nor am I inspired by the atmosphere of the deep valleys where the apple blossoms seem to delight every citizen of that part of the country. But after having heard such a description from representatives of the extreme East as well as the extreme West, I feel like asking my hon. friends this question, whether, after all, Ottawa, within sound of the Chaudiere falls, is not the proper place for the capital of the Dominion? But the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty), and the ex-President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell), went to Geneva with a message from this Government. What was that message? They went to represent Canada as a nation and not to undertake responsibility for all wars that may take place in the future in Europe or anywhere else. Who, in South America or even North America during the last war, made a sacrifice equal proportionately to Canada's either in life or in money? The duties of our delegates at Geneva were properly discharged when they opposed strongly section 10 of the Treaty. If we are no longer colonials we have to decide for ourselves what attitude this young country shall adopt in future in any European wars. For my part I regard this country as a democracy, and responsibility for the expenditure on our part of money or the contributing of arms and men should, I think, be entirely within the discretion of this nation.

At the great Conference, we have heard, many problems were solved, and many great questions settled. But to my mind there is one great subject which should have been thoroughly discussed and not have been left over for future consideration. In the name of humanity, in the name of the suffering orphans, in the name of small nations, Canada with great courage responded to the call and sent her bravest sons to do battle during four years of war. Canada has lost over 50,000 of her best men. Noble act on the part of this country! Our soldiers were equal to the soldiers of that "contemptible little army" that kept the Germans in check for so many days in the northern part of France; they were equal to the French soldiers who took charge of 450 miles of front during the war. Our sacrifice shall

remain fruitless if the millions of orphans and thousands upon thousands of widows are not provided for with food and clothing and given ample support and maintenance.

It is true that Austria has received some help; and it is also true that during last winter very many of our people suffered greatly, being in dire need. Let the nations who profited by the war be called upon to help the survivors of these unfortunate sufferers who were driven to take part in the great struggle at the behest of their respective Kings, Emperors or Presidents. What did the nations in South America do during the war? How many of these nations, many of whom have joined the League of Nations, are ready to do something in return to relieve the widows and orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice for the salvation of the world? What have Norway, Sweden, and Denmark done? I am informed that these countries have requested the privilege of joining the League of Nations. If this is so I would ask our delegates to get into communication with the proper authorities with a view to making these nations, which are to join the League, contribute to some extent to the debts which Canada contracted during the war.

Last session during one of my speeches I alluded to immigration into this country, and I suggested that immigrants from rural districts in foreign countries should be encouraged to come to Canada. Events which have transpired since that time have caused me to change my mind more or less. I am now convinced that for the present our effors at immigration should be directed towards the repatriation of our own people who have crossed the boundary line into the country to the south within the last few years in the hope of making a better living. I invite those former fellow citizens of ours to come back to Canada. They are the ones who at present, and at all times, should be encouraged to once more make their homes in the Dominion, because they understand the Canadian Constitution well and know how best to fulfil their duties as Canadians. I would therefore advise the Government to confine their efforts along the line of immigration to inducing former Canadians to return, and seeing that they are the only immigrants for the present admitted to Canada.

The speech from the Throne contains the statement:

> My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs Tariff.

What revision does the Prime Minister expect to make? The Minister of Finance went through the Dominion endeavouring to discover what public sentiment was on the question of the tariff. Well, while everybody was endeavouring to arrive at the best solution, the Prime Minister away down in Eastern Canada was preaching high protection. The right hon. gentleman did not have the courage to even wait until a complete report could be obtained from the Minister of Finance before giving expression to his views. Later on in the session I shall avail myself of the opportunity of stating my opinion on the tariff. I will merely say now that from what can be gathered from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite there appears to be only one class of people in Canada who are greately interested in the tariff question, and that is the manufacturers and their representatives in this House. Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of an early appeal to the Canadian electors for many reasons which have already been discussed by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I believe that the sooner an election takes place the better it will be for the welfare of all classes of the country. I have faith in the Canadian people, I have faith in my party, and I have faith in my leader. I believe that the amendment is a wise one and I shall gladly support it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON: (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker before the question is put, I desire to offer a few observations. Preliminary to doing so I wish to extend to the mover and seconder of the Address my hearty congratulations upon the excellent manner in which they acquitted themselves of the task entrusted to them. I also wish to offer my congratulations to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on his attainment to the high office that he now fills. When the right hon. gentleman was promoted to his present office I was asked by many of my constituents what kind of a man the new Prime Minister was. I invariably replied, Sir, that in my opinion he was one of the brainiest men in the House—a man of very keen intellect and a sharp tongue. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the keenness of the Prime Minister's intellect may remain with him for many years, but I could also hope, for his own good and I believe for

the comfort of his opponents, that his tongue might lose some of its sharpness.

I wanted to take part in this debate for more than one reason, but mainly because one is sometimes misunderstood and one's motives misinterpreted if he casts a silent vote. I have reference to the interpretation that was placed upon my own actions, and that of some other members of the group with which I am associated, in connection with the resolution introduced last session by the Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) pertaining to the re-appointment of the Canada Wheat Board for the purpose of handling our 1920 crop. I had believed, Mr. Speaker, that it was pretty generally understood by hon. members on both sides that those of us on the cross-benches from the province of Saskatchewan were in favour of that resolution and in favour of the Canada Wheat Board being re-appointed to handle the wheat crop of 1920. What was my surprise to learn from a paper published in the province of Saskatchewan, known as the Regina Leader, that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, in speaking to the deputation representing the farmers of that province intimated that he had not understood our position to be as I have outlined. In order not to lay myself open to the accusation of misquoting the minister I will give you his own words as reported in the Regina Leader of October 8th, last. I will not read the whole report as it is a lengthy one. I will simply invite your attention to that part of his remarks which makes reference to those of us who occupy places in the Progressive group. The Minister said:

> This year the question of the continuation of control necessary came up for consideration. The matter was thrown into Parliament for discussion, and was debated at length. The Farmers' organizations of the West were represented by Mr. Crerar, Mr. Maharg, Mr. J. F. Reid, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Gould, Dr. Clark and others. The hon. Mr. Calder asked the deputations to read their speeches. So far as he could recall, none of these gentlemen insisted on wheat control, they would take no decided stand. As usual, they were prepared to let the Government take its own course, and if things did not turn out right they would have an opportunity to attack and criticize, and so on.

So far as he could recall, none of these gentlemen insisted on wheat control, they would take no decided stand. As usual, they were prepared to let the Government take its own course, and if things did not turn out right they would have an opportunity to attack and criticize, and so on.

As I said a few moments ago, I thought when this legislation was before the House, and I still think, it was pretty generally understood that those of us from the province of Saskatchewan occupying these cross benches were in favour of that legislation. It is true that not all of us spoke upon the matter when it was before the House. I admit, Sir, that I am a new member and do not pretend to be thoroughly familiar with parliamentary procedure, but if it is necessary that every hon. member should voice his opinion upon all matters of legislation that come before the House, I have learned something that I did not know before. But what are the facts in connection with this matter? As will be noticed from the quotation I have just read, the hon. gentleman directed the attention of this deputation to the speeches of hon. members of this group, and he named six of us. The other evening when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) was speaking one would think that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House believed they had him cornered, so to speak, in respect to his attitude on the reappointing of the Wheat Board. But I would direct their attention and that of the House to a paragraph of the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia as it may be found on page 4113 of Vol. 5 of last year's Hansard. These are his words:

> In conclusion, let me state that I propose to vote for the re-establishment of the Wheat Board this year. I pledge myself only for this year.

It will be noticed that in the interview with the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization which I have quoted, his memory was so faulty that he could not recall any of us on these cross benches having spoken on the subject. I would also refer to the words of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), the leader of this group, to be found on page 4119 of the same volume. He stated:

> Everyone who knows anything of the European situation must realize that conditions there are very unstable, and in these circumstances, perhaps, there is justification for the Government assuming the power which they are asking for under this legislation.

That was the resolution which had been introduced by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). And, further, I will quote from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), and in doing so I

apologize to him, as he has not yet spoken in this debate, but I want to get these quotations together. In referring to the action taken by the Farmers' organization in Western Canada, he said:

> At their convention they went further; they asked not only enabling legislation,—

I might say that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce when introducing this resolution termed it, I think "enabling legislation." The hon. member for Maple Creek continued:

> —but that the Government continue the Wheat Board for another year. The Canadian Council of Agriculture passed a similar resolution, and recently, through their executive, they have again stated that so long as there is governmental control of buying in the European markets, we must have governmental control in Canada in regard to disposing of our wheat.

The hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization—and I am glad to see him in his seat— in speaking to the deputation of farmers in Regina last fall directed their attention to the speeches of the hon. members of this group, and said that they would not take any definite stand. I have just quoted from the speeches of three of the six hon. members that he mentioned at that time to show that they did take a very definite stand. And one would think that if a member of the Government or the Government itself were looking for advice, as the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization said they were in looking to this group, they would have turned to members on their own side of the House. It is easy to perceive that the hon. minister was trying to build up a case against those of us in this group who happen to come from the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I would direct the attention of the House to some of the remarks of hon. members of his own side of the House, and at page 2596, volume 3, of last year's Hansard, will be found a speech of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), during the course of which he said:

> My hon. friends opposite, everyone of them practically, have stood four square for the control of the sale and handling of wheat in this country. They have insisted on the control exercised by the Canada Wheat Board.

To me that seems to be something that the hon. minister could not have taken into consideration. And again I would ask the attention of the House to the words of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when introducing this legislation. He said:

> So that the Bill differs from one which is to come into force immediately—

Speaking to the resolution he had introduced.

> It may not go into force at all. I hope it will not be necessary to put it into force.

The point I wish to make is, that the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization in meeting that deputation of farmers in the province of Saskatchewan—and I think it is only a fair interpretation to put upon his remarks at that time—was trying to place some of the blame for the Canada Wheat Board not being reappointed to handle the 1920 crop upon some of us from that province who sit on these cross benches. I believe the quotations that I have laid before the House will prove that we were in favour of that legislation and had nothing whatever to do with the Wheat Board not being reappointed.

In connection with this wheat control, Mr. Speaker, we have heard it said very often in this House that the farmers of Western Canada are opposed to the Wheat Board. That was in a measure correct, but when the circumstances leading up to control being assumed by the Government of handling our wheat is taken into consideration, I think there was some reason why the farmers of the western provinces were opposed to that control. As is well known, control was first taken for handling the 1917 crop, and I have in my hand a copy of the report of the operations of the Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada. This Board, as is well known, handled the crop of 1917 and 1918, and the balance of the crop of 1916 that was still in the country when they were appointed by Order in Council on the 11th of June, 1917. I wish to read from this report in order to show just how this board was appointed. It says:

> The Government created the board because the accumulating effects of the war upon international trading in general, and trading in wheat in particular, made some such step necessary. The financing of the war by the various countries involved had led to a vast extension of credit and currency in those countries, and this tended toward a general increase in price levels. This was accentuated as regards wheat by several powerful contributory causes. The wheat surpluses of Russia, Australia, India and the Argentine were either inaccessible altogether, or difficult to secure by reason of the increasing shortage of tonnage. Not only the Allied peoples in Great Britain, France, Belgium and Italy, but also the neutral countries in Northern Europe, were dependent upon North America for their necessary wheat supplies. And the methods by which the governments of those countries bought their wheat

in North America in 1915 and 1916 added to the difficulty. Their agents bought wheat, for example, at Winnipeg in competition with each other, and with Canadian and American millers, and in some cases the same government had different buyers for Canadian wheat and flour. The primary object of these buyers for the European governments was to secure quantities of milling wheat; the price was a secondary consideration. And as the grain exchanges in North America were still open and unrestricted, these government buyers soon became the dominating operators.

The effect of all this was not only an increase in the price of wheat, with occasional violent fluctuations, but was in a word the disintegration of the grain exchanges both in Canada and in the United States.

This disintegration appeared dramatically in Winnipeg in the spring of 1917. During the previous winter months the agents of the Allied Governments had bought wheat freely to be delivered in May and July. They bought this wheat mainly, if not altogether, from the operators of country elevators, who as they bought wheat from the farmers from day to day sold it for May and July delivery. Neither the buyers for the Allied Governments nor the elevator operators who sold the wheat were gambling in futures. The buyers were providing to the best of their judgment for the future needs of the countries they represented, and the sellers were securing their loans from the banks by hedging their purchases in the only way known to commercial men of providing against risk. These future contracts called for grades 1, 2 and 3 Northern. It turned out that much of the wheat thus sold or hedged did not measure up to these contract grades. As a rule, and under normal conditions, this presents no great difficulty, because the buyers are willing to accept lower grades on the contracts at fair discounts. This, indeed, is a well-established commercial practice. In the spring of 1917, however, the British representatives intimated that they were unwilling or unable to accept lower grades at discounts, and that they would require the contract grades. This forced the sellers to try to buy the higher grades on the open market, with the result that the prices of these grades went skyrocketing. As prices soared the sellers were called for increasing sums of money, and the limit of their credits was soon reached. In effect the market was cornered and a disaster upon a large scale was impending.

To avert this, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange—

I wish that noted, Mr. Speaker—not the producers of Western Canada at all, but the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

—investigated the conditions, found them as above, closed the market for futures, and by the aid of the Dominion Government, secured the consent of the British authorities to a settlement along commercial lines. As a result, the British accepted the lower grades of wheat on the contracts at fair discounts, the discounts were speedily fixed and the situation cleared up.

While, however, the situation within the Grain Exchange was cleared up for the time, there remained the possibility that a similar crisis might develop at any time so long as the British and European governments continued their methods of buying in an open market at Winnipeg, and this possibility alarmed the grain trade. In the meantime, the increasing cost of living was alarming consumers in North America generally, and the United States had established its food control system. The dependence of Great Britain and her Allies and of European neutral countries upon North America for wheat meant that there was no limit to the price to which wheat might go, except ability to pay. Under these circumstances, a delegation from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange waited on the Dominion Government, and asked for government control of the grain markets during the war.

At that time Mr. Balfour was in the United States on his mission, and the vice-chairman of the British Cereal Commission, Mr. Anderson, was one of his party. Mr. Anderson came to Ottawa, bringing with him Messrs. Robson and Stewart of the Wheat Export Company, the agency of the British Royal Commission, and a series of conferences took place between the Canadian Government, the British representatives and the delegates from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. These conferences resulted in the creation of the Board of Grain Supervisors.

I have read that long report so that it might be known that in the first instance the control of the grain and wheat market in Canada did not come about as a result of the request of, or for the benefit of, the producer, but rather at the direct request of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and those connected with it.

Again, it is claimed that the farmers objected to the Canada Wheat Board which was formed to take over the handling of the grain in 1919. That was true in some quarters; but what were the circumstances leading up to that objection? All will remember that the market was opened early in the grain season of that fall. It remained open for a few days and during that short period wheat advanced very rapidly; then the Government stepped in and appointed the Canada Wheat Board. It was only reasonable that the producers of grain in the Canadian Northwest, seeing these conditions, with the market open and advancing rapidly and the Government stepping in and taking control, should come to the conclusion that the Government did not want the producers to get all that their product would bring them. That was the reason why there was opposition to the Canada Wheat Board. But after the Wheat Board had handled the crop so successfully, the grain producers of Western Canada, who know a good thing when they see it, were perfectly satisfied; accordingly they wanted the Canada Wheat Board appointed last year to handle the 1920 crop. Speaking for myself, I was absolutely in favour of the resolution as introduced last

year by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I take strong exception to the words of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization when he met that deputation in the city of Regina.

The market conditions in the part of Saskatchewan in which I live and in the constituency that I have the honour to represent in this House were very bad during this last fall. I happen to live on the old Canadian Northern branch line running from Regina to Saskatoon and on to Prince Albert. Now, the condition there was simply this: early in the grain season we were not able to get cars. As everybody in Western Canada knows, the market was not open very long when the price started to go down, and before cars were available the price had gone down to such an extent that the farmers did not feel like disposing of their wheat; the consequence was that they held on. Many of them, having taken advances against their wheat in store, were squeezed out on that advance. The peculiar feature of it was that a few days after scores of these men had been squeezed out of their wheat, lots of cars were available. We were told that the cars were needed for the coal trade and that that was why we could not have them for the purpose of moving our grain. I happen to know that in many of the towns along that line there were large numbers of orders for coal, but the coal was not being delivered. If these cars were in the coal trade, why were they not delivering the coal? If cars were not available while the wheat was still in the producers' hands, how did it happen that the moment the wheat was out of the producers' hands, and in the hands of the dealers, plenty of cars were available? That was the case and on top of that came the increase in freight rates, and I am not overdrawing the situation when I say that the inability to procure cars and the increase in freight rates have driven many of the farmers of that part of the country into insolvency. There is no doubt about that, and consequently they are not feeling very kindly disposed towards the powers that be. The other day I noticed that the chairman of the Railway Commission is reported to have made this statement in the city of Montreal:

> As long as he was chairman of the board, freight and other rates would be fixed so as to enable the railways to pay all operating expenses and allow for a reasonable profit on their investment. Mr. Carvell went a little further. Eastern Canada, he said, took the reasonable view of such matters that he did, but he "had nothing to say about the rest of the country." The people there, he said, "seem to have sentiments differing from the rest of Canada."

If the railways of this country are going to be able to charge such rates that dividends can be paid whether or not the users of those railways are put out of business, it is high time that the Government took a hand in the matter.

I wish to refer very briefly to the request made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) for a commission or committee to investigate the grain business of this country. I noticed that some newspapers a day or two ago drew attention to the fact that no members of the Progressive group had backed the hon. member in his request. Mr. Speaker, every member of this group wants an investigation if there is anything to investigate. But, as pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) this afternoon, we already have a Grain Commission appointed by this Government, and if that Commission is not doing its work, it is the business of the Government to see that it does its work properly. If we are to have this business investigated, let it be a thorough investigation, and let the work of the Grain Commission be investigated as well.

I am reminded about another board appointed by the late Government to do service for the Canadian people. I refer to the Board of Commerce, which, if I understand the matter correctly, was appointed to enquire into and, if possible, to assist in lowering the high cost of living in Canada, and to run to ground any profiteers. What was the outcome, and what did that board accomplish? A very few weeks or months after its appointment, the chairman resigned; a little later on the vice-chairman also resigned, and after struggling along for a few weeks, the third and last commissioner, Mr. Murdock, resigned, and coupled with his resignation were certain charges. Briefly, the charges were there that when the board, in its endeavours to carry out the work that it was appointed to do, got into the position to do something effective, the protecting hand of one or more members of the Government of the day was outstretched, and the work of the board was set at naught. The leader of the official Opposition, (Mr. Mackenzie King) asked that a commission be appointed to enquire into the Murdock charges; but, so far as I know, nothing has been done in that regard, and the Canadian people will have very little confidence in any commission that

this Government may appoint to investigate the grain business, or any other line of activity in this country, unless they are given to know what was in or behind the Murdock charges in connection with the workings of the Board of Commerce.

In the fall of last year, after the original members of the Board of Commerce had all resigned, and certain members of the Civil Service were appointed in their place, we had the spectacle of the sugar barons of this country, when they found themselves in a position to lose money, coming to Ottawa and appealing to the so-called Board of Commerce, which in turn placed an embargo upon the importation of sugar into Canada. Public opinion ran so high that the Government eventually had to intervene and rescind that order of the Board. The question that the people of Canada are asking themselves to-day, and that they have been asking since that time is this: Is the action, as we have it, of the sugar men of last fall similar to some things that happened and that are contained in the Murdock charges? And the people are waiting for the information.

The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J F. Reid), in speaking the other evening, had something to say about the work of a Mr. Murray who is attempting to muzzle the press of Canada, and I thought it well to add something to what that hon. member had to say at that time. I shall give to the House a full introduction to Mr. Murray, so that there may be no mistake as to his identity. I am taking this from the Morning Leader, published in Saskatchewan, under date of February 19, 1921:

Gilbert Mackintosh Murray, B.A., former editor of "Industrial Canada," for many years secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and who evolved the brilliant scheme of forcing the press of Canada to support Protection and a Protectionist Government through the distribution of advertising patronage, is needless to say, persona grata with Hon. Jas. Calder, Hon. Dr. Reid, and other influential cogs in the governmental machine at Ottawa.

Prior to resigning the secretaryship of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Murray resided for the first six months of 1919 at Ottawa. During this period his services were supposed to be "loaned" to the Government; his salary, however, was paid by the C. M. A., the Government giving him at the same time a per diem living allowance of $10.

It was right following upon this Ottawa sojourn of Murray's with all the inspiration of close contact with ministers of the Crown fresh upon him, that Murray, in the role of chief propagandist for the Meighen-Protectionists, launched his great scheme for making the press of Canada solidly Protectionist by getting the manufacturers to withhold their advertising from such papers as the Toronto Globe, The Morning Leader, the Saskatoon Phoenix, etc., etc.

[Mr. Johnston.]

At a meeting of manufacturers held in Toronto, which was attended by Murray, he himself laid before them his plans as chief propagandist of the protectionist forces, including his ready-print schemes and other little ideas for spreading Protectionist propaganda and thus, as he says, "educating the voters of Canada." A special committee was appointed to look after certain phases of the propaganda campaign and a fairly substantial initial sum was raised to help the project off to a good start. Among the chief contributors to the initial campaign fund was a well known implement firm and one of the largest textile firms of Eastern Canada.

In fairness to a large number of Canadian manufacturers, it is only right to admit that they, together with at least one prominent official of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, strongly opposed the Murray plan of campaign on the ground that the C. M. A. and the cause of Protection would lose immeasurably more than they would gain should the Canadian people ever get wise to the fact that a cold-blooded plan was in operation to force public opinion to a favourable consideration of Protection by the chloroforming of editorial opinion and tampering with the Canadian press news services.

The whole-hoggers, however, were in control; Murray received orders to go ahead and accordingly the boycott against the lower tariff newspapers was started and the other branches of the propaganda campaign were put through their initial stages preparatory to the final "big drive" in the great task of "educating the voters of Canada" to say "Hurrah for Protection!"

I have two other clippings here from the same paper with reference to this matter. First, there is an explanatory note in reference to these ready-prints, which reads as follows:

"Ready-prints" or "patent insides" are partly printed newspapers supplied by certain publishing houses to the publishers of weekly newspapers, who complete the work of publication by printing the local news and advertising, etc., before issuing the finished papers to their subscribers.

Then it goes on to say:

G. M. Murray the would-be chloroformer and poisoner of the Canadian press, on December 6, 1920, issued "Confidential" circular "M-251", dealing with "Ready-prints and Patent Insides". Murray starts Circular M.-251 with the following statement:—"The situation as regards ready-print services in Canada has undergone considerable change within the last year."

The statement is absolutely true, inasmuch as during that period Gilbert Macintosh Murray became actively interested in the ready-print business—doubtless, as in the case of his proposal for tampering with the Canadian Press news service, for the purpose of "educating the voters of Canada" by getting certain propaganda published in as many Canadian weekly newspapers as possible.

Largely as the result of the activities of Murray and those identified with him in seeking to "educate the voters of Canada," two new ready-print concerns were started, one for the purpose of supplying ready prints to weekly publishers in the prairie provinces and the other for the purpose of supplying eastern publishers.

That statement is significant, Mr. Speaker, because we have heard a lot in this House about certain gentlemen having one policy for the East and one for the West, while the Government had but one policy. But here we see that Mr. Murray, their chief propagandist, with his ready-made prints, has one output for Western Canada and another for Eastern Canada. The article goes on:

> At the outset, the proposition was outlined to Murray's political friends at Ottawa, including members of the present Government, and duly approved as satisfactory, following which the necessary capital was raised by some of Murray's monied business friends, the initial sum of approximately $40,000 being subscribed to start the scheme, among the largest subscribers being a well-known Brantford firm and firms in St. Catharines and Montreal.
>
> A close conecting link between the two Murray ready-print concerns was supplied in the person of W. Nelson Wilkinson, who was placed on the boards of both companies.
>
> Mr. Winkinson was formerly connected with the Toronto World, was subsequently engaged in the Publicity Department of the Government at Ottawa, and has for years been on close friendly terms with Murray.
>
> Starting with a ready-print more or less colourless, it is Murray's intention at the proper time, a few months prior to an election, to endeavour to "educate the voters of Canada."

I want to point out in that connection that we have heard something in this House about a menace. To my mind, this is a real menace. This man Murray has started this ready-print business and he contracts with country newspapers all over the country to supply them with these "patent insides". They enter into that contract, believing they are going to get news as newspapers generally carry it, but a few weeks prior to an election, having tied themselves up with this contract, and not being able to get paper from any other source, they will be forced to publish papers, in all probability, at least so far as Western Canada is concerned, carrying a line of political doctrine to which they are absolutely opposed. The article goes on:

> The following "confidential" circular sent out by Murray December 29, 1920, to the Canadian manufacturers to further enlist their support in his nefarious campaign to undermine the freedom of the press shows the extremes that he and his Ottawa friends are prepared to go to in their desperate attempt to maintain the Meighen-Calder Government in power.

This confidential circular is rather lengthy, so I shall read only enough to give the House an idea of the kind of propaganda that Mr. Murray has undertaken.

> G. M. MURRAY,
> 709 Yonge Street,
> Toronto, Ont.
>
> Confidential. M-256
>
> STORM SIGNALS
>
> The ostrich is said to bury its head in the sand at the approach of danger. Don't be an ostrich! Look your danger squarely in the face and prepare as best you know how to meet it.
>
> To-day the free trade storm signals are set as a warning to the navigators upon the sea of business. Make no mistake about it. They are there to be seen, clear as the sun in the sky, by all except those who keep their heads in the sand. The organized farmers, under the leadership of fanatical theorists, have been worked up into a veritable frenzy of resentment against a fiscal policy that they have come to look upon as a special privilege. They are out to effect changes by a process of destruction,—a process that once initiated may go to untold lengths before it can be checked. If those who would thus be destroyed don't speedily organize for their own defence, and marshall all their resources in money and brains to meet the attack, they will almost certainly find themselves powerless to ward off a blow for which the Grain Grower arm is already bared, nerved with the last ounce of strength and determination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought it well to bring this matter to the attention of the House and to place some of it on Hansard so that the people might know to what lengths those in this country who derive benefit from protection will go to retain that benefit. Mr. Murray has very able assistants in hon. members of this Government in decrying the Western Grain Growers and trying to make the people of the eastern provinces believe that many citizens of Canada out there are Bolshevik in our tendencies, have ideas of secession, and are out to wreck the nation, and I do not know what else. I would ask the people of this country, however, to size the matter up for themselves. The few of us here on the cross benches in this Parliament, endeavour to the best of our abilities to represent the views of the organized farmers in Western Canada, and possibly we may not be a fair sample of the Western Grain Growers; but it would not matter if we were displaced by others, for there are many out there who are quite competent to take our places, and I am sure that they are in no sense nation-wreckers.

Regarding the resolution before the House and the amendment thereto, I have given some consideration to this matter, and this thought has occurred to my mind: It has been said that the present Government have usurped power. This may not be correct, if you take into consideration the fact the term of this Parliament has not expired. But the people in the country

are anxious to know when an election will be held. In 1917, Sir Robert Borden organized a Union ministry which appealed to the country as the Union Government. We were told that there would be a fifty-fifty split as between Liberals and Conservatives in the Cabinet. Well, that part of the contract was never lived up to. Again, the people of the country voted for Sir Robert Borden as leader of the Union Government in 1917, and I will put this proposition to the House, as the people will put it to each one of us as their representatives: If, in 1917, Sir Robert Borden had said to the electors of Canada, "I am going to carry on for the war period, and should the war terminate before the conclusion of the parliamentary term, when that time comes, I am going to resign and my colleague—now Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen)—will then form another government and carry on during the rest of the parliamentary term,"—I submit that there would have been a much different result to the election. I know this much, that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. Mr. Calder), delivered Saskatchewan to Sir Robert Borden and the Union Government holus-bolus; but if the situation had been placed before the people as I suggest in this supposition, he could not have delivered one seat under those conditions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the hon. member mean to imply that Sir Robert Borden has been feigning illness?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I did not desire to interrupt the hon. member, but I think he would be well advised to adhere to the practice and not refer to an hon. member by name.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am sorry to have transgressed the rule, Mr. Speaker; it was not my intention to do so. So far as the question asked by the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) is concerned, I cannot see that it has any bearing whatever on my remarks. I said nothing whatever in reference to Sir Robert Borden's illness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I mean, the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia. The right hon. gentleman's illness has nothing to do with my argument. The statement was made in this House yesterday by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), that this Government was elected in 1917. Well, now, to my mind that is not so. If I understand events correctly, this Government was not elected in 1917 but was manufactured here in July, 1920. Much stress has been laid on the argument regarding redistribution and full representation for Western Canada. Now, Western Canada wants her full representation in this House; there are no two ways about that.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am glad to hear my hon. friend opposite say, "hear, hear;" it is gratifying to know that he is sometimes in the right. I say, Western Canada wants her full representation in this House; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Possess your soul in patience.

Mr. JOHNSTON: But there are things dearer to the heart of the people of Western Canada than redistribution, and one thing of supreme importance is that the sovereign will of the people shall prevail. Redistribution is not possible at this time, but a general election is. In my opinion, a general election is past due, and should have been held in this country many months ago. In saying this I am but voicing the opinion of a vast majority of the people whom I have the honour to represent. Hon. gentlemen from Western Canada, particularly from the province of Saskatchewan, who say in this House or elsewhere that the feeling of Saskatchewan is not for a general election at this time, must keep their ears well filled. I travelled considerably over that province during the recess, and the one big question from one end of the country to the other is: When are we to have a general election?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The same thing in Quebec.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hour is very late and I have spoken much longer than I intended. In rising to speak I said there were one or two reasons why I wished to enter this debate. One particular reason was to set the Minister of Immigration and Colonization right on the Wheat Board proposition, and the other was to refute, if I could, the opinion that seems to have got into the minds of some hon. gentlemen opposite that the people of Saskatchewan were not asking for a general election at this time. Having done that, I feel that I should no longer continue to occupy the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will not work.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): I should regret very much indeed to have to speak at any length at this hour and I should therefore be very glad to have the opportunity, if the leader of the House would permit me to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is quite early yet.

Mr. COPP: Very good. If my right hon. friend refuses to accede to the request I shall have to proceed, but the House has not so far this session sat later than this, and it is only reasonable that I should ask that the debate be adjourned. If my right hon. friend does not see fit to accede to my request, I say to him that in so far as I and the rest of the hon. gentlemen on this side are concerned we are as well prepared to remain here all night as my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want the House to be under any misapprehension. It is not our desire or our intention to ask hon. members to sit here all night, or to refuse to accept a motion to adjourn. However, we would like to continue the debate tonight for a little time longer than apparently seems to be the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have not come to the conclusion that the House should sit all night or anything of the sort, and we have not so intimated.

Mr. FIELDING: Is this not a reasonable hour to adjourn?

Mr. COPP: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister's statement. It is entirely foreign to arrangement that we should at present sit late. It is now after eleven o'clock, and if I were to begin my speech now an adjournment later would have the effect of breaping up my remarks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House might as well sit until half-past eleven.

Mr. COPP: Very well, but it will only have the effect of breaking up my remarks. I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to take a few moments in referring to the very eloquent speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), who is not now in his seat. My hon. friend attempted to read a lecture to hon. gentlemen on this side. I would say to him, if he were in his place that he is not in the proper position—either as a retired Liberal or as a newly converted Tory—to read a lecture to what he styles "the remnant of the Liberal party." I want to say to my hon. friend also that although the Liberal party appreciated the hon. gentleman while he occcupied a seat in this House and supported Liberal policies and Liberal principles, the fact that he and his friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) have left the Liberal party does not mean the breaking up of that party by any means. I would like to know in what water my hon. friend was baptized, so as to permit of the conversion he has undergone in moving from one side of the House to the other? I give him this credit: His conversion apparently was a proper one and one that has been fully carried into effect. What it cost, or where he was baptized, I do not know. It has cost the country a considerable amount, if it has not cost my hon. friend anything.

Let me explain the position which my hon. friend took from 1911 down to 1917 and compare it with the remarks he made in the House this afternoon. Let me compare the remarks which he made on the Reciprocity Agreement in the old Parliament buildings in 1911 with the speech he has favoured us with this afternoon.

Mr. DUFF: Go ahead, let us hear it.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) apparently accused gentlemen of the Agrarian or Progressive group of being disloyal and unpatriotic because they purchased farm machinery in United States and did not make their purchase from our manufacturers in this Dominion. May I be permitted, Sir, to read a few lines in regard to what my hon. friend thought was patriotic in 1911 when the Reciprocity Agreement was under consideration and under debate in this House. Speaking of the price of hogs and beef cattle in the Chicago and Buffalo markets in comparison with the English market my hon. friend on that occasion said this:

> Let him compare Montreal and Toronto markets with Buffalo and Chicago, and he will find that the general average is higher, and markedly so, in Buffalo and Chicago during the last five year period. Now what is it we want? We want in my county the privilege of selling our cattle and hogs in Buffalo and other farm produce as well. You say: What is the use, the Buffalo market is lower. Well, if it is, are we hurt? We will then sell in the British market, and not touch Buffalo or Chicago. My hon. friend tells us that we have two markets now, the home market and the British; but when this arrangement comes into operation, we shall have three markets, and the one we have not got now, but which we want to get, is by far the largest. We will not send our products to Buffalo or Chicago unless we get

better prices than we do at home or in the Mother Country. Our western people are not going to send any cattle to Chicago unless they can get better prices there than elsewhere. If they cannot, they will send them to Eastern Canada or Great Britain. What is there unpatriotic or disloyal in that proposition? How do business men conduct their business? If the prices in Buffalo are good, they send their wares there; if not they send them elsewhere. Then why should not the Government carry on the business of this country on business lines? Why should the Government stay its hand at this juncture and deprive our people of one of the great opportunities of their lives?

Mr. DUFF: Who said that?

Mr. COPP: The Minister of Militia. He was taking the stand that it did not matter in regard to the patriotism or loyalty of the people of the Dominion if they could sell their products in the great market of the United States. It was a proper thing, he said, for our people to have that market. Yet my hon. friend now says there was nothing said by the Liberal party in this House in regard to free trade or a lower tariff. Why, in 1911 my hon. friend himself occupied page after page of Hansard in trying to impress upon the people of Canada that we should have the American market and that free trade in natural products which would result from the Reciprocity Agreement. Nothing said about free trade! Why, my hon. friend was one of the most eloquent exponents of free trade in natural products with the United States at the time the Reciprocity Agreement was before the House for consideration.

The hon. gentleman also had something to say with respect to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville, (Mr. Gauthier) and he pictured an imaginary story which went back and forth at the time of the Liberal Convention in 1919. Of course that story was only a word picture of what he thought may have taken place. My hon. friend should be very well acquainted indeed, Mr. Speaker, with the tell-tale performance of going in and out from secret meetings and revealing what took place. I can say to my hon. friend that no member of the House is better acquainted with that system of carrying on than my hon. friend himself.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to follow the remarks of my hon. friend any further except to say that he was very courageous this afternoon in telling hon. gentlemen on this side that the time had arrived when they should be brought into the lime light, that their tariff planks and tariff policies should be open to inspection, that the acid test should be applied to them in order to discover what their views, and ideas and policy were on the tariff. Let me say to my hon. friend that in his speech this afternoon—which we all enjoyed—while he told us what we on this side of the House should do and what we should not do, he never uttered a single word regarding his own tariff policy, and he dared not give it to the House. Now, if he is so courageous in challenging hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as to what they should do and what they should not do, I would say to him: the opportunity is open to him and to the Government of which he is a member, by accepting our challenge, to appeal to the people and let them decide whether they prefer his particular tariff policy or ours. After listening to the debate that has taken place on the motion moved by my hon. friend from Kings P.E.I. (Mr. McIsaac), and on the amendment thereto by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), one could not help but be highly interested in following the very ingenious, if inconsistent, arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to their position in this House. My hon. friend the mover of the Address, in a carefully prepared and well delivered speech, referred to the retirement of the right hon. the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and delivered an appreciative "obituary" oration to the political memory of the right hon. gentleman. At the same time he offered his very hearty congratulations in which I personally join—to the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who leads the House at the present time on his promotion to the high office which he now holds. It seemed to me, however, that he did not instil into his remarks regarding my right hon. friend the leader of the Government that degree of hope and confidence which has characterized his speeches in the House in the past, and I thought his references to the right hon. gentlemen might very well be treated as the foreword to a book, we will say, to be written and entitled, "The Troubles of the Tory Party in the Future," in which my right hon. friend would be the outstanding character. But considering his uninspiring theme my hon. friend performed his task well, and I congratulate him very heartily.

I was deeply impressed and interested in the remarks made by my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), who occupies a seat

in this Chamber for the first time. I was more particularly interested in the hon. gentleman, because, as he told the House, he was born in the province of New Brunswick and was a resident for some years in my constituency, and members of his family are still there with whom I am very intimately acquainted. Consequently I had that much greater personal interest in my hon. friend's speech. I regret to a certain extent that he turned out to be such a very high protectionist, because that is not the teaching he received in his former county of Westmoreland, as he very well knows. But before he concluded his speech we discovered why he was such a high protectionist, for he was straightforward and frank in regard to his position. He said in so many words, "The reason I am a protectionist is because the late government of the right hon. the ex-Prime Minister put a duty of thirty cents a box on apples which is just that much protection for apple growers in the Okanagan valley." It reminded me somewhat of the story of the juryman who acquitted a man charged with sheep stealing. When asked how they reached such a conclusion they said, "We got a piece of the mutton." My hon. friend is a high protectionist because he gets a very good "piece" of protection on apples.

After the motion had been duly moved and seconded, Sir, we had an amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. That amendment, if carried would, as everyone well knows, mean a general election. My hon. friend quoted a large number of authorities, constitutional and otherwise, in reference to the requirements for a general election, feeling that the time was ripe and the people of the Dominion were demanding an opportunity to pass judgment on the Government. I am bound to admit, along with my right hon. friend, that it has always been an open question and that it is very hard to find out exactly whether a majority of the people want an election or not. But when my right hon. friend answered the arguments advanced by the hon. leader of the Opposition and said, "We were elected for five years, and I am prepared to stand by the letter of the constitution and carry on for five years," I would remind him that while he has, according to the letter of the constitution the legal right to carry on for five years, yet there are two elements in our constitutional law to be considered—there is the written law and the unwritten law. The written law is the British North America Act. The unwritten law is a system of precedents, undertakings, conventions, and understandings that are just as binding on a government or a parliament as the written law, and I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to quote one or two authorities in regard to it. First I will read what Bourinot has to say in regard to the written and the unwritten law of the constitution in his Manual of the Constitutional History of Canada, in which the following passage will be found:

> If we study the constitution of Canada we find that its principles rest both on the written and the unwritten law. In the British North America Act we have the written law, which must direct and limit the legislative functions of the Parliament and the Legislatures of the Dominion. While this Act provides for executive authority and for a division of legislative powers between the Dominion and the provinces—as we have seen in the first chapter of this work—it does not attempt to give legal effect or definition to the flexible system of precedents, conventions and understandings which so largely direct that system of administration and government which has grown up in the course of two centuries in England, and which has been gradually introduced into Canada during the past fifty years, and now forms the guiding principles of parliamentary government in the two countries.

I think every one will admit that there is just as much reason why the unwritten law—the conventions and understandings—should be observed as there is for the observance of our written constitution. There is a moral right, a moral claim, for the observance of one just as much as for the observance of the other—one is the letter of the Constitution and the other is the spirit of it. The Government that was elected in 1917 has not, in my opinion, the confidence of the people; therefore it is their moral right under the unwritten law of our Constitution to give the people an opportunity to say whom they wish to direct the country's affairs during the next number of years, or the next term of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. FIELDING: Might I suggest to the Prime Minister that the Wednesday meeting at two o'clock is a very inconvenient arrangement? I know we cannot change it immediately, but I would like my right hon. friend to consider whether, at the earliest stage when it will be proper to take the matter up, we might not make a change in that respect.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednesday, March 2, 1921.

The House met at two o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. M. CLARK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the detailed report in to-day's issue of the Citizen newspaper of this city, of the observations which I addressed to the House yesterday, I observe that I am made to state that John the Baptist was a free trader. I wish to say, Sir, that I did not make any remark which was capable of that interpretation. I did say that Solomon was a free trader, and I quoted in support of my views the first chapter of the Second Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel. But I need not tell you, Sir, who come from a God-fearing and Scripture-reading province and not from a profane newspaper office that Solomon was a very different character from John the Baptist. I am not aware that there is any record anywhere of the fiscal views of John the Baptist. I can only account for the fact that such a statement was made in what was otherwise a very accurate, and far too generous, account of my observations by the charitable supposition that my sudden incursion into the French language produced for the moment in the mind of the Citizen correspondent an absolutely chaotic condition so far as his scriptural knowledge was concerned.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the Motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the Session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Campbell, resumed from Tuesday, March 1.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment of the debate last night I was referring to the amendment that had been moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That amendment may well be divided into two parts: first that the present Government has not the confidence of this House; and second that it has not the confidence of the country. Though the leader of the Opposition might well have had a certain degree of confidence in his statement that the Government no longer enjoys the confidence of this House, the hon. gentleman having been out of politics for a number of years, he may not have given close attention to the traditions of the Tory party in these recent days. It is the old story—"What we have we'll hold," and it is quite true of the Tory party of this Dominion. They are holding power to-day because of the election in 1917, of which election and the manner in which it was conducted much has been said during the progress of this debate. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) in reply to the leader of the Opposition said: We stand upon the letter of the constitution and will continue to hold office until the expiration of the full term of five years. I reminded my right hon. friend last night that there were two elements in our constitution—the written law and the unwritten law. I grant that my right hon. friend is justified in arguing from the letter of the constitution that he is entitled to carry on for the full term. I submit that unless the Government is convinced by reasonable evidence that it has the confidence of the people as well as the confidence of Parliament, it is their duty to appeal to the people at the very earliest opportunity. That, to my mind, is the essence of responsible Government. It is all very well for my hon. friends opposite to say that they have a majority in Parliament, and that, therefore, they are legally entitled to carry on, but having regard to the moral aspect of the situation, they must come to the conclusion that the people are not satisfied with the present Administration and that they should have an opportunity of saying so by their vote.

My right hon. friend says: We shall be guided by the letter of the constitution. If he stands only upon the letter of the constitution, he might as well have said, in the formation of his cabinet: I will select all my cabinet ministers from Ontario; I will carry on the Government of the whole country with a ministry selected from one particular province. But that would not be according to the unwritten law of our constitution; it would not be according to the moral law of our constitution, because the understanding is that each Prime Minister shall select the members of his cabinet from the different provinces of Canada, not from one province only. We

must, therefore, consider both the letter and the spirit of the constitution in connection with the question which is now before the House.

My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), who spoke yesterday afternoon, took an attitude entirely different from that of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House: He said that this Government has nothing whatever to do with the government that went out on July last; that a new Government was formed, and that that Government is responsible only for what it does from now until such time as it appeals to the people. Apparently my hon. friend did not hear the remarks made by the Prime Minister in this debate, nor could he have done the right hon. gentleman the honour of reading his speech. The Prime Minister took exactly opposite ground. He said: We are the same old Government; we are carrying on as part of the government which existed prior to my acceptance of office. These two hon. gentlemen, therefore, are in direct disagreement in regard to the constitution and the character of the Government.

Besides being responsible to this Parliament, the Government must be responsible to the people. I am bound to say that it is not very strong evidence for a member on the other side to say: I have consulted my constituents, and I know they are not in favour of an election; or for a member on this side to say: I have consulted my constituents, and they are in favour of an election. You cannot come to any very definite conclusion in a matter of this kind if that is all the evidence that is forthcoming. But when you travel over the country from east to west and from north to south, and hear nothing else—on the trains, in the hotels, in the church yards, or elsewhere—but condemnation of the present Administration, it seems to me that the state of public feeling thus disclosed must be admitted. I have been able during the recess to interview a very large number of the electors of my constituency and of my province. I have heard a great many people speak about this matter. I have read the papers of our part of the country, and I find that whether the paper is Liberal or Conservative, the opinion is that we should have an election to clear up the situation that has been brought about by this conglomeration which is found in the seats on the other side of the House.

We should, Mr. Speaker, have a general election on any occasion when a matter of very great moment arises upon which the people should have the right to speak. We have a limited term of Parliament; at certain intervals the people must be consulted. But when any particular emergency arises —a change of policy or a change in the personnel of the Government—the people should have an opportunity to say whether or not the Government have their confidence. In 1911 an occasion of that kind arose, when the Parliament had been in existence only three years. A very important question came before the House—the reciprocity agreement that had been entered into between the Government of this country and the Government of the United States. When the agreement was brought down a debate arose and continued for many weeks and months. From the speeches delivered during that debate, which I have read, I think that no one offered stronger arguments in support of the reciprocity agreement than the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), who addressed the House yesterday afternoon. His speech on that occasion, Sir, is worthy of the perusal of any hon. gentleman, disclosing, as it does, what his ideas were at that time with regard to a downward tread in the tariff. What has brought about the remarkable change of mind on the part of my hon. friend? Surely it has not been the conditions? Surely, Sir, it is not because he believes that the people of Canada are more opposed now to a downward trend in the tariff than they were in 1911? Surely not, because we are getting the answer day by day and week by week; the results of by-elections held during the recess have shown that the people of Canada insist upon a tariff which shall be characterized by a downward trend. My hon. friend surely must know that that is the feeling which prevails in the country at the present time.

In the elections of 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who appealed to the people on the reciprocity question, was defeated, and from that day until the present we have had no reasonable appeal to the people on the question of what government should control the destinies of this country. My hon. friends say that we had an election in 1917, and that is true. A question has arisen in regard to that election that we cannot decide here; everyone must have his own opinion in regard to it. But we have some evidence that the election which was held after the formation of the Union Government, was not an election upon the policy of the Government; it was what was

known as a war election, and the Government was a war government. The formation of that government came about when the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) decided to appeal to the people.

The year 1916 was the year in which, according to our Constitution, the elections should have been held, and the Conservative party of that day, realizing then, as I believe they realize now, that they had not the slightest hope of carrying the country at that time, asked the leader of the Opposition to consent to an extension of Parliament for one year. The war was then in progress, and the situation in Canada was very serious, and not a single word was said in regard to Union Government when the Opposition permitted our Conservative friends to carry on. In 1917, a change came about. My hon. friends, then seeing more clearly than they did in 1916, that it would be impossible for them to carry this country, came with their hats in their hands, knocking at the doors of Liberal members and asking them to form a Union Government to carry on the war. A number of our friends joined them. With the same degree of assurance that has been shown by hon. gentlemen who left the Liberal party in order to join and support Union Government, I could give equally good reasons for the stand I took in not giving my support to Union Government and its successor. I did not believe Union Government was necessary at that time; I do not believe it is necessary now. I have no quarrel with our friends who left the Liberal party and joined the forces of the Government; their action is a matter for themselves to consider. While that Union Government remained in existence, it was a matter for themselves and their conscience what they should do with regard to it. Now that Union Government has absolutely gone, now that it is dissipated into thin air and a new Government has been formed, it is entirely up to them and their consciences to say what their duty is in regard to the changed situation.

I have listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure, and, I may say, with amusement, to some of the arguments adduced by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the situation. A number of speakers who have delivered addresses on this subject have told us, and, through Parliament, have told the country, why they are supporting the present Administration. For instance, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said that he was supporting the present Administration, because the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) had nailed his colours to the mast and was standing for the continuation of high protection in this country. He was followed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and a number of other hon. gentlemen, whose speeches I have before me, but I do not want to take up the time of the House in quoting from them. One group of the supporters of the Administration say: "We are supporters of the present Administration, because it is the Government and party of high protection, of continuing in force in the Dominion the highest possible protection in the interest of Canadan manufacturers;" but the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), who occupied the attention of the House the other day, told us that he was supporting the present Government because it was a Government of low tariff in this country. He quoted page after page to show that the tariff of the present Administration was lower than that of the old Liberal party, and he said that he was a Liberal and was supporting this Government because it was bringing into force a Liberal tariff and platform in Canada. What is true of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River is true of a number of other hon. gentlemen who spoke in this debate. Through different courses, different arguments and different avenues, these hon. gentlemen came to the one conclusion, namely, that the best course was to keep the Government, and, therefore, themselves, in power for another year or two, whereas if they went to the country, they would not come back.

At the time Union Government was formed, a number of very estimable gentlemen joined that Government; a few of them still continue with it, and the others have retired. One of the first to retire from that Government was the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I have no doubt that he, along with other hon. gentlemen who had formerly been allied with the Liberal party, joined that Government, according to the evidence that has been given by himself and other members who have since retired, for a certain purpose and a certain definite length of time. When that time expired, they concluded that their contract had expired, and they left the Government. Ever since that hon. gentleman conscientiously left that Government, as I believe he conscientiously entered it, the guns of criticism

of my hon. friends opposite have been levelled at him because, as they say, he did not do anything and did not continue to carry on in the interest of the people while he was a member of the Government. That is a most unjust and unwarranted criticism of the hon. member for Marquette. Soon after his retirement, the then Minister of Public Works made up his mind that he could no longer remain in the Government led by the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and he retired and took a position as chairman of the Railway Board. Another hon. gentleman, one who had taken a very prominent part in the administration of affairs of this country—and personally I want to give him credit for the great work he did as Minister of Finance in the Government at the time—worked with and remained in the Government until after the war, and then made up his mind that he would retire. He delivered an address in this House, a sort of valedictory, and he wound up that eloquent speech by saying to his friends: "In so far as I am concerned, I am going out of the Government, but I advise you, my friends, to carry on, carry on."

That expression has since become a by-word in the Dominion of Canada. My hon. friends opposite did not require any advice from the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) to carry on; it was their intention to carry on until the people, when an opportunity arose, kicked them out of office. My hon. friend, when he was advising his friends to carry on, retired himself and took no further responsibility as regards the Government. His action reminds me of the story of that eminent general who, after he had ranged his soldiers all in line when a battle was imminent, gave them this instruction: "You must face the foe and remain until your last shell is fired—and then run for your lives. I, being a little footsore and weary, will run now." My hon. friend, when he gave his advice to his friends to carry on, had not the hardihood, the courage, to face the people of this Dominion, to attempt to carry on the Government, when he knew the people of Ontario and the other provinces were absolutely opposed to the Government carrying on and that the Government did not have the confidence of the people in carrying on.

The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Mewburn) also withdrew; so did the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell). If we can believe the interviews as reported in the press, the hon. member for Durham has withdrawn from this House entirely except that he will be here to guide my right hon. friend when international matters are before the House. I am sure my hon. friends must appreciate the assistance that is promised them by the hon. member for Durham, and I suppose that after this session the hon. member will be able to retire, having sufficient confidence in the ability of the Minister of Justice to deal with international affairs when they come up in the House. These hon. gentlemen have all retired. Now, the question at once arises: if these gentlemen were right in retiring from the Government, were right in the statements they made in regard to the situation, were right in saying they had fulfilled their contract, are not the other gentlemen who went into the Government under the same contract staying beyond their contract? Are they not overstaying tenants, and should not the people be given an opportunity of speaking on the question whether they should remain or not?

My hon. friend from Brantford used the argument that he was not going to support this amendment because he did not believe in letting old things go for something new. He did not believe in letting go of power, and letting anybody else come in to govern the affairs of this country. He did not believe in giving the people an opportunity of speaking their mind. He wanted this Government to carry on as long as possible, without giving the people an opportunity of deciding upon the very question that is before this Parliament. My hon. friend says: We are in power now, and I want the Government to hold on to power; the people should be willing for us to do so. My hon. friend must know that the people of this Dominion are simply crying for an opportunity to let this Government go. Perhaps my hon. friend has heard the story of the two Irishmen who went out to catch wildcats. One decided to go up the tree and drive the cat down, leaving the other man on the ground to catch the cat. Well, he drove the cat down, and the man below grabbed it. After a while the Irishman up in the tree says: "Do you want me to come down and help hold it?" "No," said the other, "come down and help me let it go." That is exactly what the people of this country want; they want to let this Government go, and I believe they should be given the opportunity at an early date.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have differed considerably in their reasons why they

should support the Government. One says he will support it because it is a government of high tariff; another says he will support it because it is a government of low tariff; another says we should not go to the country now because owing to the very strong feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction in the country, the people would not be sufficiently sane to cast a reasonable vote in an election; another hon. gentleman says, the government should not go to the people, because it has guided the ship of state so well during its term of office that there is no unrest in this country, and therefore we do not want an election. That is how my hon. friends differ in their reasoning, but the reasoning of them all leads to the same conclusion, and that is to hold on to office.

A responsible government, as its name implies, must mean responsibility to the people, and no government is justified in carrying on the affairs of the country without having reasonable cause to believe they have the support and enjoy the confidence of the people of the country. The ministers who occupy seats in the Cabinet should represent the feelings of the people of their constituencies and the provinces they represent. Let us see for a moment whether or not the members of the present Administration can have any hope or reason to believe they enjoy the confidence of the people and the sections of the country they represent.

Let me take first my right hon. friend, who represents a western constituency, and hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). Is it possible that either of these gentlemen would have the courage to say that they represent the feeling of the people of the West on the tariff question in this country? Is it possible that my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization could say he represents the present feeling of the people of Saskatchewan in regard to public affairs in this country? In view of the reception he got when going through his native province a few weeks ago, where in spite of the high positions he had occupied in that province for so many years he could not get a hearing to discuss the problems of the day, is it possible that he would have the courage to stand up in this Parliament or elsewhere and say that in the government of this country he expressed or reflected the feeling of the people of Saskatchewan? Not so, and therefore I say that if my hon. friend understood what I believe to be his moral and bounden duty under our constitution he would go back to his province and hand in his resignation saying: I served you during the war, as I promised, but now you have not confidence in the Government I am supporting, and therefore I cannot continue in office any longer. That would be the brave and courageous thing to do. But no, my hon. friend is tenaciously hanging on to office, in spite of his friends in the province of Saskatchewan or anywhere else in this Dominion.

Would my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Spinney), a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect, say that in his position in the Government to-day he reflects the majority view of the people of the county of Yarmouth in the old province of Nova Scotia? Does he say, or would any one believe from his actions, that the people of the county of Yarmouth are satisfied to see my hon. friend supporting this Tory government when he for years was a part and parcel of the Liberal party in that county? While my hon. friend was elected to suport the Union Government I am very much mistaken, from the reports I hear, if he reflects the majority opinion of the old Liberal county of Yarmouth in supporting this present Tory Administration.

Let us take another example. Would any one in this Dominion or wherever the English language is used or known, say that for one moment the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) enjoyed the confidence of the people of the province of Quebec? Not a constituency in the province of Quebec would elect the hon. gentleman; yet, according to the letter of the constitution, that gentleman is forced upon the people of the province of Quebec and has to be their representative in the government of this country. It is absolutely opposed to the unwritten law of our constitution, and it should not be tolerated for one moment in a democratic country or in a free parliament.

Now I want to say a word or two about my hon. friend from the city of St. John, the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore), who, I regret, is not in his seat. It was very unfortunate for the province of New Brunswick, of which province I have the honour to represent one constituency, that it was so long without Cabinet representation. The interests of the Maritime Provinces were disregarded for many, many months by this

Government until there was a very strong agitation down there for increased representation in the Government. My hon. friend from St. John was selected. Personally, I have no fault to find with the hon. gentleman, although I may say that after being elected for the great city of St. John, where, for the purpose of carrying the constituency, he promised everything in the way of harbour improvements that could possibly be thought of. He is not satisfied with that but goes down to the sister city of Halifax, and in a day or two builds a new railway station at the terminals in that city. He flits away to Cape Breton, nationalizes the Port of Sydney, and on his way back stops off for Sunday afternoon in the garden city of Moncton, where he builds a post office. Elsewhere in New Brunswick he evinces great interest in the public welfare. I sincerely wish my hon. friend every success in his endeavour to do something to further the interests of the Maritime Provinces, and in some degree to compensate for the negligence that has been shown in regard to that part of Canada during the past few years by this Government. One would naturally suppose that I should compliment my hon. friend and say that at least one member has the support and confidence of his own constituency in the province of New Brunswick. I regret, however, that the hon. gentleman is only a living example of the proverb that evil communications corrupt good manners. He has been only a few months in the company of his colleagues opposite, and we find now that the people of New Brunswick, and particularly of the City of St. John, have lost confidence even in himself. I regret that fact very much, because I had hoped that my hon. friend would make a strong minister, would bring light to bear upon the Government, and would see to it that the province of New Brunswick and the Maritime Provinces as a whole would get some reasonably decent treatment from the Government in the way of expenditure on public works.

But, Sir, I have in my hand a newspaper clipping which I shall read to the House. I have no desire to detain the House at any length reading newspaper extracts, because I have not always the highest regard for what newspapers say, particularly on political matters, for the reason that one party paper will say one thing and another something different; and if I were to quote from a Liberal newspaper, notwithstanding the truth of the statement I might cite, I should not expect it to have very great effect in this House or in the country. But I hold in my hand an article clipped from a newspaper which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) must realize has been for a great many years one of the strongest influences in the province of New Brunswick along Conservative lines and in the interests of the Conservative party. From the time my hon. friend occupied a seat in Parliament and graced it as one of the representatives of the province, that newspaper has been a Conservative advocate; and while it is under a new title it is but the same newspaper that always gave strong and hearty support to the Conservative party. It gave considerable influential assistance to my hon. friend at the by-election held in St. John a few months ago. But how quickly changes come about! How quickly the people are beginning to see that the Government no longer has the confidence of the Canadian electorate! If hon. members knew the St. John Standard as well as I know it, they would almost blush to think that it should criticise, even in the slightest degree, my hon. friend who now occupies a seat on the Treasury Benches. But it is not satisfied with criticising the Minister of Customs; it goes further and takes to task the Prime Minister himself (Hon. Mr. Meighen) for his conduct of the affairs of the country. Let me read, if I may, an editorial taken from that newspaper under date of Thursday, February 17, only three days after my hon. friend who was elected in the City of St. John took his seat in this House. This editorial is headed: "Indifference or Dishonesty?" You will note the interrogation. It proceeds:

> Individual experience is the sure foundation on which may be based any opinion of the business integrity of an individual or organization. And on such basis The Standard has tried and has found wanting those in the employ of the Federal Government, who control the business affairs of this country. Our experience may or may not be a criterion of the whole administration, but it is sufficient to create, in our case at least, a decided impression that the business principles of those now in charge are neither honest nor honourable. Possibly the circumstances leading to such a conclusion are due entirely to the apparent attitude of subordinates in the executive offices. This, however, is difficult of belief, in view of the fact that the circumstances have ben made known in detail to at least three present ministers of the Crown, and that, so far as The Standard has been able to learn, not one of these has taken any definite action toward the application of the first principles of fair play. Apparently these ministers and their subordin-

ates are content to violate their own written contracts, to defraud a business house of payments due on such contracts, to take shelter behind obsolete legislation which can apparently be disregarded for the financial gain of the Government, and by red tape and departmental delay to prevent the transfer to the Court of matters in dispute. The Standard to-day charges the Borden-Meighen administration through its subordinates with violation of written contracts, with unfair and dishonest retention of money due for services performed, and it charges the Secretary of State and the Minister of Railways with failure to perform the duties of their respective offices in bringing to a settlement matters which have repeatedly been referred to them for attention. It asserts, too, that the Premier himself, and the Minister of Customs have been negligent in the same matter, and are, from the experience of The Standard, responsible, though in a lesser degree, for the dishonesty and dishonourable neglect of their subordinates.

If, as is suspected by many, the departmental offices at Ottawa are filled with employes who spend their time in attempting to discredit the present Government, the matter is easy of solution. This, however, is difficult of belief in view of all the circumstances. And it is increasingly hard to understand—by this paper at least—how such a Government can lay claim to popular support, when its own routine business affairs are marked by such a lack of ordinary honesty or integrity.

If the Premier or any members of his Cabinet are desirous of further information or evidence along this line, The Standard will be pleased to furnish it.

As I said, this editorial is from the leading Conservative newspaper in New Brunswick,—not merely one of the leading newspapers, but the newspaper—and that is the condition of affairs in that province at the present time. If I were so inclined I could take the same paper during the last week or two and read columns of criticism of this Government. I do not purpose to do so, because it deals with a personal matter between the Conservative party and the appointment of an hon. gentleman to the other House. I am not here to criticise the appointment in any way whatever, but I do say that the present Administration has lost the confidence of the people of New Brunswick, as is palpable on every hand and as is fully reflected in the editorial I have just read.

We have been told during this debate that there should be a general election, and many reasons have been advanced in support of this contention as well as against it. Precedents have been cited by hon. gentlemen on both sides, by those, on the one hand, who claim that an election should be held and, on the other hand, by those who argue that an election is unnecessary at the present time. Hon. members have referred for precedents to England, to Australia, to New Zealand, and to other Parliaments in their endeavour to convince this Government that they should appeal to the people. I do not intend to go far afield for precedents in this matter; I need not go further than our own Dominion, for the precedent that has been established in our own country is quite good enough for me. It impresses me and must impress hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that the time is now ripe for a general election. Let me review just for a moment the condition of affairs in the Dominion of Canada from the year 1891 to the year 1896. There we had, after the death of Sir John Macdonald, a succession of governments being formed almost every week or every month, and you did not know from day to day when a new government might be formed. But, quite in keeping with Tory doctrines and traditions, they insisted on carrying on from one year to another and in one session, I think in 1896, the very day Parliament was opened seven ministers resigned from the Cabinet simultaneously.

They decided to carry on, and to carry on at all hazards. During those years, and particularly the years 1895 and 1896—any person who remembers that period will recall the facts, and if they do not remember all they have to do is to read the history of that time—hard times prevailed, there was unrest, and dissatisfaction. And, Sir, what happened? As my hon. friend from Red Deer so well expressed it yesterday, in 1896 the Government were at last driven to the people—and having been in office fourteen years eleven months and thirty days—one day before the expiration of the term for which Parliament was elected. They were forced to the people, and on the twenty-third of June, 1896, a general election took place. Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power as a result of that general election. Immediately afterwards the people settled down and went to work, and, following 1896, we had the most prosperous times that we have ever had since Confederation.

Sir, the situation to-day in Canada is absolutely on a par with what it was in 1896 when the Tory government of that day were driven to the people. When they appealed to the electorate the people took great pains to drive them out of office and I believe the same fate will befall my hon. friends opposite when they follow that example in the very near future. Now, Sir, you do not want any stronger or any better precedent than the one I have cited. The

people of that day were despondent and discouraged until the opportunity was given them of changing the administration. Irrespective of what the result would be if an election were brought on at the present time, it is principles that count. The Prime Minister says the leader of the Opposition thinks the people of Canada are pining for him to come into office and carry on the affairs of government. Let me say to my right hon. friend that Canada might get along without much pining if he were not in office. It might exist if any hon. gentlemen were not in the House at all. It is not men that count but principles, and the people of Canada at the present time are awaiting the opportunity of expressing their opinion upon principles when a general election takes place.

The Prime Minister says there is no demand for a general election. My hon. friends opposite say: We have consulted our constituents and they do not want an election. They shudder at the thought and raise their hands in holy horror of the idea of an election being brought on at the present time. Well, Sir, there is one class of people that has made no concealment of its feelings in regard to a call for a general election, a class of people whose sentiments should appeal above all others to our patriotic friends opposite—I refer to the returned soldiers. They are demanding an election at the present time. In 1917, when the soldiers in the trenches were calling for assistance, hon. gentlemen opposite placed the Military Service Act upon the statute books of Canada. Instead of the provisions of that Act being carried out as intended, the opposite was the case. A better title for it would have been the Exemptions Act, because instead of securing recruits for our military forces exemptions from service were the order of the day. However, the fact is the returned soldiers are now calling for a general election and surely hon. gentlemen opposite will heed the call. They will not turn a deaf ear to the demand of some four hundred and fifteen thousand men that they should be given an opportunity of expressing themselves at the poll. I hold in my hand, Sir, a copy of a telegram that was sent from this city on the twenty-seventh of May, 1920, by Mr. R. B. Maxwell, Dominion President of the Great War Veterans' Association. The press despatch from which the telegram is taken says:

R. B. Maxwell of Winnipeg, Dominion President of the G.W.V.A. who has been here several days investigating the political situation, tonight issued the following message to the 776 branches of the Association throughout the Dominion.

The telegram itself reads as follows:

From knowledge gained of political and economic conditions in Canada during three years' effort on the part of the Great War Veterans Association to obtain equitable reconstruction legislation, I deem it my duty to urge upon you the necessity of an early general election. The time has arrived for the people to declare themselves on the vital questions of the day. I therefore call upon you in defence of the basic principles upon which this Association was founded, to assemble in mass meeting with your fellow citizens and secure without delay an unmistakable expression of the wishes of the people in regard to the necessity of a general election.

That message, Sir, went from the President of the Great War Veterans Association who represents seven hundred and seventy-six branches of that organization. Of the five hundred thousand men who went overseas unfortunately some fifty or sixty thousand did not return but the other four hundred and forty thousand, or approximately that number, are back in Canada and they have been knocking at the door of the Government for reasonable treatment. They claim that they have not received the treatment they should have received from the Government, and as a last resort the President of the Association comes forward and sends out his telegram asking the whole of the branches of the organization to get together and demand a general election so that they may have an opportunity of expressing their views through the ballot box, a privilege they have not had for many years in Canada.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth): Might I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. COPP: I shall be delighted.

Mr. MORPHY: Will my hon. friend kindly tell the House how many public meetings were held on the request of Mr. Maxwell that public meetings be held throughout the country? I am told that none were held.

An Hon. MEMBER: Then why ask the question?

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend asked me a question and has supplied the answer himself. Let me say to him that I do not know how many meetings of branches of this organization have been held, but I would ask him if he does not give credence to the telegram sent by Mr. Maxwell, as President of the Great War Veterans Association.

Mr. MORPHY: That is not the question. I want to know what has been the effect of his appeal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COPP: Give the hon. gentleman all the rope he wants.

Mr. MORPHY: Answer my question please.

Mr. BUREAU: No cross-examination.

Mr. COPP: I have not in my possession a report of the doings of the Great War Veterans Association. However, my hon. friend need not attempt to argue that the Great War Veterans Association is not an organization that should not be given every consideration by this Government as well as by the people at large. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this organization is to-day demanding a general election and I say the Government are not doing justice to themselves or to the country when they turn a deaf ear to that demand.

Now, Sir, I had intended to say something about railway facilities in the Maritime Provinces and matters in connection therewith, but I find that I have already spoken at greater length than I intended. Before resuming my seat, however, I wish to return for a moment to the observations of the Minister of Militia last evening. That hon. gentleman took a very great deal of pains to tell the House that the Liberal Party had been broken up and that there was nothing but a remnant of it left.

He took occasion, Sir, to quote some figures to show that that was correct, and he appeared to claim a great deal of credit, and was applauded very vigorously by my hon. friends opposite, in regard to it. I have already referred to the fact that in 1917 a very large number of Liberals supported the Union Government, but in 1919 my hon. friend had the evidence before him in the report of the Liberal Convention held in Ottawa in August of that year that that support had been withdrawn. He told us that we had only two Liberal representatives west of the Great Lakes.

Mr. EDWARDS: In the House.

Mr. COPP: Let me say to my hon. friend that in spite of the fact that we have only two representatives west of the Great Lakes in the House of Commons, we have a strong and virile Liberal party in the great West —in the province from which my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization comes and in the neighbouring provinces, as was shown at the Liberal convention last August. Would my hon. friend for one moment argue that Hon. T. C. Norris, Hon. Edward Brown and Hon. Dr. R. S. Thornton, who were here representing the province of Manitoba, do not reflect Liberal sentiment in that province? Would my hon. friend say the same in regard to the Premier of Saskatchewan, Hon. George Langley, and Hon. R. J. Gordon, who were here to represent their province at that convention? And would he say that Hon. George Langley has not any following in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time? Mr. Langley was the very man who stood up in that convention and moved the tariff resolutions that became part of the Liberal platform that we are prepared to go to the country on.

Mr. CALDER: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is the hon. minister speaking in earnest?

Mr. CALDER: Is my hon. friend aware of the fact that Hon. George Langley made the statement that the most unfortunate thing that could happen to Canada would be that the hon. the leader of the Opposition and his friends should come into power?

Mr. COPP: No, I have no knowledge of such a statement, and my hon. friend has no knowledge of it.

Mr. CALDER: Oh, yes.

Mr. COPP: He said that about my hon. friend. I want to say to him, as he presumes to speak for the province of Saskatchewan, that I do not believe he can stand in his place and give me the name of a single Liberal Unionist who supported him in his constituency of Moosejaw in 1917 who will support him to-day—not one man. If he has one name, Sir, let him be courageous enough to give it to the House. I repeat that not one Liberal Unionist who supported my hon. friend in 1917 will follow him to-day.

Mr. CALDER: That is cheap talk.

Mr. CHISHOLM: You will not find it cheap.

Mr. COPP: Will my hon. friend dare assert that Hon. John Oliver, Hon. Mr. King and Hon. Mr. Farris, who represented the province of British Columbia at the Liberal convention, did not reflect Liberal

opinion in their province? But let me come down to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do not skip Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend says, "Do not skip Ontario." My hon. friend will be busy enough in Ontario at the next general election. He will be lucky if the party of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) does not carry away so many Tory seats from my hon. friend's party in Ontario that neither he nor any of his associates will again be returned to this House.

But let me go down to the Maritime Provinces. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) took great comfort in saying that the Maritime Provinces had only eleven members here to support the Opposition. Let me say to my hon. friend that from the province of Nova Scotia alone we have to-day four representatives on this side of the House, and if it had not been for the manipulations under the Military Voters' Act we would have nine members from that province. Let me say further in regard to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island: Look well to yourselves and never mind the Liberal party. If my hon. friends will only give the people an opportunity of expressing their views they will very soon see where the representation will come from. They will see that the Maritime Provinces, the great West, and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario will vote want of confidence in this Government with such an overwhelming majority as has never yet been recorded in the history of the Dominion. That is what will happen.

In conclusion, let me say to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, that when he speaks of the "remnants" of the Liberal party, those "remnants," as soon as an appeal is made to the country—and the sooner the better—will be back here doing business at the stand now occupied by himself and his friends.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, since the legions on the other side seem to have faded away, I will gladly resume the debate. May I at the outset extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address on the very excellent way in which they acquitted themselves of that duty? May I also extend my hearty congratulations to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on the position which he has attained, although in his case there is a certain feeling of sympathy mingled with my congratulations? Amidst some outstanding imperfections my right hon. friend possesses many good qualities, and he certainly displayed wonderful courage when he consented to be the sacrificial lamb after the right hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) who was elected in Leeds in 1917 refused to play the leading part in what has become a funeral procession.

Sir, we have met this session under very special circumstances—circumstances upon which I wish to briefly dwell, and which have compelled my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) to move the amendment which we are now discussing. That amendment is a direct demand on this Parliament to uphold honour in public life. It is an assertion of the will of the people of Canada never to abdicate the position of master to take up the duty of servant. As that great exponent of British Liberalism, Mr. Asquith, said on a memorable occasion: "Democracy implies that the will of the people must prevail." The House of Commons must reflect the opinion of the country and the national will. Parliament and the people must be of one mind, and when they cease to agree power should revert to the force that dispensed it. We have to-day in this country a Government that pretends to govern, and a Parliament that pretends to legislate, for unmistakable signs and innumerable evidences have shown very clearly that public confidence, the mainspring, the life breath, of Government and legislation, has withdrawn equally from the one and from the other. The present Government is at this moment in the most humiliating and disgraceful position which any government has held in this country since the days of what has become known as the "nest of traitors," and when they resort to quibbling and contrivances of procedure for the purpose of clinging to office until 1922; when they resort to subterfuges, even dignified under the name of party strategy; and when they do that under the pretence that there is unrest in this country, they are delivering against themselves a judgment which the country needs only to register when the proper time comes. This government measures up to the well-known definition of Toryism: "Distrust of the people qualified by fear." The statement that it will not yield to public opinion but will go to the full limit of its time is a challenge that will be taken up.

The amendment of my hon. leader and the denial of the right of the present Parliament to legislate are justified on three main grounds. First, the election of 1917 was held and a majority obtained under the special conditions of the war, by means of a franchise which was specially framed for what was described as the only purpose of the election, and was for the duration of the war. Second, since this election a new reign has been inaugurated; a new Administration has been formed; a new Prime Minister has been appointed; a new party has been created, and new questions have arisen which were not only submitted to the electorate, but were specifically excluded from their consideration and from their verdict. Third, this Government and Parliament do not possess the confidence of the people of this country; and cogent evidence has been shown not only of the swinging of the pendulum, but of a deeply rooted national distrust in the ministerial leaders. The speakers who have preceded me have related extensively the conditions under which the last election was held. I shall not go over the ground again; I shall not quote the written and spoken pledges of the members of the Government, from the right hon. Prime Minister down to the last member of the Administration. An Election Act was passed picking the electors who were to select the Administration. The Prime Minister of that time asked the people of Canada to suspend for the time being all their political views and the consideration of all questions which were controversial between the parties, and a Union Government was formed with the distinct understanding that it was only to last for the duration of the war. Thousands of Liberals voted for the hon gentlemen opposite, believing in the sincerity of those pledges. Those who voted against the Government were branded as disloyal, as being allies of the Kaiser, as not being good Canadians—because it was pointed out that the only issue was the carrying on of the war; that all the other issues had been temporarily suspended. It was stated that no loyal Canadian, Mr. Speaker, could vote otherwise than for the Union Government, however strong, however divergent, may have been their views on ordinary political questions. My hon. friends opposite cannot deny that; there is not one of them that did not say so. The electors of Canada know that, and the continuance in office of the present Government under the circumstances, constitutes a gross and palpable injustice to Canadian democracy. That is the very reason why so many men in this country who would be inclined otherwise to support my right hon. friend are opposed to his continuance in office, because as between him and public morality and national honour, they choose the latter. Take the case of the soldiers—it is the most glaring one. Thousands of young Canadians voted for this Government because circulars were freely sent to all the military camps in France, Britain and Canada, even in the United States, and to the troops in the trenches, telling those young men that this was a war election; that the only issue was selective conscription; that the only question was the carrying on of the war; that the mandate they were called upon to give was a mandate for that purpose and no other, and that there would be another election when the war was over. In many cases the soldiers did not know who were the candidates to whom they were giving their suffrage. Indeed, in the Yukon Territory the votes of the soldiers were registered before there was any candidate in the field. Fourteen members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who had been defeated in Canada sit in this Parliament to-day by virtue of the soldiers' vote. I do not protest against the soldiers having exercised their right to vote. When I used the same argument in the city of Peterborough, I was taken to task by some newspapers, and the Montreal Gazette said that I had protested against the votes given to the soldiers, though paying me the compliment that I was generally more careful in my words. Sir, I do not and did not complain about the votes of the soldiers. The war is over; those issues are past; the only ones who want to keep them alive are the members of the present Government, who refuse to elect a peace Parliament, and who remain in office by virtue of a mandate given to a war Parliament. What I said in Peterborough and what I say in this House is that, to the soldiers of Canada who gave a vote under such unprecedented and special circumstances, on their being told that they were giving that vote for a special time and a special purpose, it is very unfair to use and abuse that mandate for the settlement of other questions, especially when those young men from one end of the country to the other are asking

the Government to give them an opportunity and the right to vote on the domestic questions of Canada. I do not wish to be understood as stating that the Government has no right to legislate on anything that, at the time of the election, it did not explicitly declare that it would deal with. The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) put up a man of straw to knock him down when he referred to that matter, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), in labouring extensively on that topic and quoting Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other constitutional authorities to that effect, was losing his time, as nobody will deny what he attempted to prove. But when a government specifically state that they will not deal with particular matters or things which are in controversy between the parties, when upon that assumption thousands of Liberals vote for that government, and when now, in spite of that pledge and declaration, they proceed to deal with and legislate upon matters which they themselves specifically excluded from the verdict they asked for from the electorate, I cannot comprehend the ethics or sense of honour of men who would do that in the face of such declarations. The question is not so much one of power or legal right, it is one of public morality, of common honesty. The action of the Government in this regard is a gross breach of faith, as gross a breach of faith as ever disgraced the political history of this country, and made all the more gross by the fact that the men who are guilty of it claim the law and the Constitution as their defence. It is a well known fact that the cleverest deceivers usually manage to keep within the four corners of the law. It is to be regretted that Canadian public men put themselves in the position of a man who will lure on a friend to make a bet and then refuse to pay, because the debt is not recoverable at law.

The second point of my argument is that we have confronting us to-day a new Administration, a new party, a new Prime Minister, and a new ministry, none of which has ever received the endorsation of the Canadian people. Immediately after the close of last session, there was announced to the Canadian public the setting of a star and the rising of a new one. It was at the same time announced to the world that the Canadian Unionist party had passed out of existence and that a new party had taken its place. The other day the Prime Minister claimed that this new party is the legitimate descendant of the former party. I quite admit that it is the descendant of the other, but I have my doubts as to its legitimacy. Legitimate children, as a rule, are proud to bear the name of their father. The new party was shy, if not ashamed, to go throughout the world retaining the name of its generator, and the hyphenated appellation of "National Liberal and Conservative," which means everything on earth and, for that reason, nothing at all, was used. I admit that there was not avery discernible solution of continuity between the Unionist party and this one. The new party, however, was cut out, drafted, painted red, white and blue, and varnished with the blessings and good wishes of the special interests which always controlled its predecessor. The former member for Peterborough West, to whom I give credit for being one man who kept his pledge to his electors, asserted that the National Liberal and Conservative party, like Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin, was not born, it "growed." Lord Hugh Cecil, speaking a few days ago to his constituents, intimating that he would sit on the Opposition side of the House with his distinguished brother, used these words:

> Parties, like poets, are born, not made. They arise out of circumstances, spontaneously, not out of plans and plots.

If the British statesman is right and a party cannot arise out of plans and plots, I wonder what is the real character of the aggregation that controls the Government to-day. The Government and the ministerial press proclaimed to the world that a new party had been formed. When the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), quoted as an excuse to refuse an election, the precedent of Sir John Macdonald being replaced by Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and Sir Charles Tupper; that of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), being replaced by Mr. Murray; that of Mr. Walter Scott being replaced by Mr. William Martin; that of Sir Lomer Gouin being replaced by Mr. Taschereau, without a general election being held; they forgot to mention, or rather took good care not to mention, that in each one of those cases there was only a change in leadership, and in no case was there a new party or a new programme.

Moreover, the ministry which is on the treasury benches is far from being the ministry to which a mandate was given in 1917. The men who were in the ministry of 1917 formed a fairly able combination. Indeed, we were told at the time that it was a combination of the best brains

of the country. But surely not even the most sanguine supporter of the present ministry would make such a claim in favour of this Administration. Most of the ministers who gave prestige to the Unionist Administration have withdrawn, and their places have been taken by gentlemen whose main qualifications for office were that they occupied seats where there was less danger of losing an election than in others. The present Cabinet is notable more by the men who are not now of it than by those who are in it. It is a Cabinet of shreds and patches, and if the few additions which are mentioned in the papers as likely to be made in the near future are made, they will serve only to magnify the oddness of the complexion and the preposterous appearance of the crazy-work. The most ingenious patching will not suffice to make the old Tory-Unionist Government garment cover our large national limbs. Patching serves only to display more conspicuously the imperfections of its cut and texture.

The right hon. Prime Minister claimed the other day that this Administration is young, having been returned to office in 1917. I will point out the numerous changes that have been made in the Cabinet since that day; I will point out the striking difference between what it is to-day and what it was two years ago, and perhaps my right hon. friend will permit me to apply to his ministry these words of the great satirist Juvenal: Facies tua computat annos—"Your very face betrays your age." Before leaving this subject I have a word or two to address to the very, very few gentlemen who still describe themselves as Liberals and form an appendage to this reactionary Administration. One of these gentlemen proclaimed yesterday his articles of faith. Now—I am going to speak my mind very frankly—as between an insincere Liberal and a candid Tory, give me the Tory every time. It does not cheapen the political currency. It does not degrade the morality of our public life. Sir, Liberalism is not, and cannot be, represented in this Cabinet or elsewhere by men who in recent years have been on every side of every public question, and never loyal to any. Monsieur Foucher, a Prime Minister under Napoleon, was said to have taken at various times seven different and contradictory oaths of allegiance. I think some Canadian public men could quite easily rival that record without seriously hurting their convictions. In this connection I desire to quote the words of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) at Saskatoon. I shall quote from what hon. gentlemen opposite will regard as a very authoritative newspaper the Ottawa Journal, of November 13, 1920:

> Mr. Calder said that three years ago he did not understand the tariff question as well as he did at the present time, for the reason that he had never had occasion to study it. "I was," he said, "more or less of a parrot, just as other people are parrots. I got up in our Legislature and advocated free fertilizers when I did not know the first thing about it, and forty other members knew no more."

My hon. friend said he was a parrot, and did not know anything about the tariff. I ask you, Sir, in what light the hon. gentleman appears when his leader, the right hon. Prime Minister, said in his speech the other day that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization is and always has been consistent. The only meaning could be that he was still consistently —a parrot; he still repeats and registers his master's voice—only the master has changed. In Moosejaw, my hon. friend said that he was a Liberal, but not a Mackenzie King Liberal. Sir, Liberalism is a creed, it is a doctrine, it is a set of principles, but if my hon. friend wishes to refer to the Liberals in this House or in this country as King Liberals, and at the same time claims that he is still a Liberal, the only inference is that he is a Meighen Liberal, which is a species unknown both to zoology and common sense. Why, when my hon. friend was in the West singing a love duet with the right hon. the Prime Minister—I admit this is not in the newspapers, but it was repeated to me by many Liberals in Regina and other western cities—sitting around the dinner table he told the people there: "The Liberals in the House of Commons are not serious about an election. They do not want an election.

"There are members in the House who told me last year that if the Government was in danger of being defeated they would absent themselves when the division came." Sir, on behalf of the members of this side of the House, I ask my hon. friend as a gentleman to substantiate that slanderous statement. Let my hon. friend or any other gentleman give the name of any member who said that. Even now press correspondents are saying that we are not serious about asking for an election; yet in the very next column they stultify themselves by asserting that we on this side

of the House are refusing pairs, are most unfair, and are willing to take any sort of advantage to defeat the Government. Could two statements be more contradictory? The one statement answers the other. The people of Canada will be able to judge of the sincerity of those who say these things.

The third reason in favour of the amendment is that this Government is no longer in harmony with public opinion and has utterly lost the confidence of the country. Indeed, it has not only lost the country's confidence; it has earned its contempt. No government has the moral right to pass legislation under such circumstances. The result of the by-elections cannot be misread; they are bold, definite and unequivocal. The Canadian people have made it clear that they want a new government. They will not let the country pass through two more years of dishonourable history in order to allow a group of political gentlemen to show their consistency in their vices as well as in their virtues, and to gratify the human disinclination of my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Guthrie), to become once more a private man. As my hon. friend the member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), pointed out in the course of his admirable speech, out of fifteen elections held since 1917 the Government lost ten and won only five, but in each of these five in glorious victories they had themselves selected the constituencies; and, in four of the five, Cabinet ministers were candidates. Every time an election was forced upon this Government by the natural course of events they have been overwhelmingly defeated. Yet, Heaven nows the expedients to which they resorted in order to check the threatening adverse march of events. My right hon. friend the new Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), has always been noted for the cleverness of his electoral devices and he has worked out a new scheme. He is running his elections on the instalment plan. Last year seven elections were held on the same day. In two of the constituencies members of the Government were candidates, and the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Tolmie), were elected. But on the same day there was an election in Glengarry, there was one in Assiniboia, there was one in Victoria and Carleton, and there was one in the good constituency known as Quebec East; and in every one of these the Government was snowed under by overwhelming majorities. In the County of Prince, Prince Edward Island, my hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), was elected by acclamation. In the county of North Ontario the election was postponed owing to the death of one of the candidates, but the Government was defeated when the election was held. This year, under the new business methods of the new Prime Minister, instead of having the by-elections on the same date, as has always been the custom, and as is only proper, we are having them in slices; as I say, it is the instalment plan, and it is being operated in a very irregular manner; the debt that is overdue is not given preference over the new one. The county of East Elgin became vacant by the death of the sitting member on February 14, 1920; the election was held on November 22, 1920, nine months afterwards. Yet the county of St. James Montreal had become vacant at about the same time, and the election was held immediately. The county of Peterborough became vacant by Mr. Burnham's resignation on July 15, 1920, and the election was held on February 7, 1921. Yet at the same time, in the middle of July, 1920, the county of Yale became vacant by Mr. Burrell's appointment to public office and the election was held on November 22, 1920. The two counties of St. John and Colchester became vacant on the 16th and 13th July, 1920, respectively, and the elections in these constituencies were held November 22, 1920. Why this difference in the treatment accorded East Elgin and Peterborough as compared with others. And we are now told—at least I have read in the Montreal Gazette—that an election may be held pretty soon in the county of York-Sunbury which is actually vacant; but as regards the county of Yamaska, it is said that the province of Quebec is so largely represented in Parliament that there is no need of an election in that constituency. When an election is over in one constituency the electoral machine of the Government is transferred to another place. East Elgin and Peterborough have witnessed and have withstood the tremendous and costly experiment of the new organization which my right hon. friend referred to in his speech, so much so that the honest people in these two important ridings were asking themselves with amazement the question: "Where does the money come from?" But the Government's machinery was of no avail, and public opinion asserted itself in a ringing man-

ner against this discredited Administration. Hon. gentlemen opposite are now trying to minimize the importance of these elections. Indeed, my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), stated, amidst the cheers of his followers on the other side, that the election in Peterborough constituted a mandate to the Government to carry on, to use the stereotyped words of the former member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White). I shall not discuss this further than to express the hope that my right hon. friend was more logical and displayed more common sense when he represented our country at the League of Nations recently. The Prime Minister, the ministerial candidate in Peterborough, and all the ministerial forces, claimed that the issue of the election was the tariff policy. Am I right in stating that? We stated that the issue was the usurpation by this Government of administrative power, and that this Parliament had outlived its existence and its mandate. On this issue the member from West Peterborough, (Mr. Gordon), fought and won. Now the Prime Minister states, with great satisfaction, that the verdict was not against the tariff. The Minister of Justice follows and declares that the verdict was not against the right of the Government to continue in office. These were the two issues according to them. Who is right, the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice? Was the verdict against the tariff policy of the Government or, to use their own words, against its right to carry on. Hon. gentlemen opposite are entitled to their choice but they must, at least, reconcile their views in the matter. The only alternative would be that the verdict is against the new Prime Minister personally, and is simply a notification that the electors do not want him. Sir, the Prime Minister went to Peterborough and said that the election was most important, that the return of the Government candidate was imperative, that all eyes in Canada were cast on Peterborough. He said the same thing in East Elgin. Why should he now try to take all those Canadian eyes off Peterborough and East Elgin? The result doubtless does not substantiate the statement which my right hon. friend made in my own province in the city of Sherbrooke, that the Liberal party outside of the province of Quebec was extinct. He has to modify his tune in that respect. Still even the Minister of Militia had the temerity to make this wicked assertion. There is one party in this country to-day which is extinct. It has practically disappeared from the Provincial Administration of all the provinces of Canada, and in this Federal arena it has taken concealment under a new equivocal name. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) also went to Peterborough, and again the eyes of all Canadians were described as being cast in the direction of that now famous constituency. The right hon. gentleman even said—I read it in the press; the defeat of the Government candidate would be the first drop of poison. I gave credit to my right hon. friend that he was sincere, and he obviously showed the effect of that drop of poison on his political constitution when, instead of defending the Government in this very dangerous period, that great parliamentary fighter of so many battles used his time to advocate the League of Nations before a House which is unanimously in favour of that great organization. The electors of those various constituencies have clearly expressed the determination of the people of Canada to restore true responsible Governmment and to be ruled by men who are elected by the people in a normal and constitutional way. Yet the Prime Minister states that he will not yield to this public intimation. The Salvation Army says of all mankind that a man may be down, he is never out. But my right hon. friend is wrong when he thinks this is also true of the Government. When a Government is down it has to go out. It is important that it should be so. When it is obvious that a Government does not command the support of the majority of the people, its decisions carry no influence, it has no more authority. Individual members cannot speak here with authority when everybody knows that they no longer speak the voice of their constituents, that their tenure in this Parliament is precarious. Such a thing does not make for the dignity of parliamentary institutions. It reduces the House of Commons to the level of a mock parliament, and patriotic statesmen have no right to inflict that on a great country. It does not make either for independence or freedom of action. The member who knows that he cannot secure the renewal of his constituents' mandate is tempted to support the existing Government in everything through thick and thin, because he knows that when they cease to swim he will have to sink. Rather

than swimming in a hazy obscurity he is tempted to avoid anything that may bring down the Government however divergent from theirs may be his views on the particular subject under discussion. The worse the prospects for the Government afforded by an election the surer is the pressure exercised on individual weakness. I do not hesitate to say that the votes cast by many hon. gentleman when a division comes will not mean confidence in the Government so much as confidence in themselves to retain a little longer seats which are already moving away from under them. I am sure the Minister of Militia appreciates that feeling. The Prime Minister said that his Government has the confidence of a majority in this House and that so long as he retains that majority he has a constitutional right to carry on. I shall endeavour to show that that position is unsound, and that the Government must also command the support of the majority of the people.

But, Sir, can my right hon. friend say that he has still a majority in this House which allows him to rule with honour and dignity. The majority of seventy in 1917 has dwindled to twenty, probably to fifteen to-day. And yet the hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) has the gall—I do not know whether that is a good English word—to refer to us as a "remnant." Remnant! Remnant! What is the hon. gentleman himself? What is the Government that faces us in this House? Remnant! The only "remnant" that I see is this Government, which had a majority of seventy, three years ago and which is now struggling to keep a bare majority, and being unable to do it by the ordinary way of electoral victories, is adopting the rather humiliating process of trying to get recruits from the ranks of its opponents by methods which I do not care to describe, in order to postpone the shameful defeat that awaits it at the polls. I hurl back in the Minister of Militia's face this mean appellation that he applied to the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is exceeding the proprieties of debate when he accuses another hon. member of applying a "mean appellation." I think that upon reflection he will realize the impropriety of the expression and will withdraw it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will with pleasure withdraw the remark, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour knows that I am not an adept in the use of the English language. As I said, the majority of seventy of three years ago has dwindled to about twenty to-day. Cabinet reorganization cannot be undertaken, the best men in the party cannot be called to the Council table lest the dangerous adventure of by-elections conduces to a still greater reduction of that majority. Yet reorganization is badly needed. Friends and panegyrists of the Prime Minister in the press state that he is practically alone in the Cabinet. I would not like to say that, and I hope I have not hurt the feelings of any of the members of the Cabinet in repeating the statement. It is the ministerial press that says that my right hon. friend is the one man in this Administration, and that he is surrounded by gentlemen of whom we might say, after the manner of a former British Prime Minister, that they are all ciphers, he being the unit that gives value to them. I do not agree with that statement, far from it, and I am free to confess that if I had been given a vote—and I hope my right hon. friend will permit me to say so—when the selection of a new Prime Minister was made, there is one gentleman in the Cabinet whom I would have voted for rather than for my right hon. friend. I will not name him,—so every other minister may think that he is the man. I would make only one exception—I beseech my hon. friend the Minister of Militia not to think so. I have quoted the statement which is made by newspapers friendly to the Government. Is it in the interests of the good administration of this country that a Government should be so weak and impotent? After having stated for the last two years that we had in Ottawa a Government without a leader—that is what the Montreal Gazette and the Montreal Star used to say very frequently—shall we have the misfortune now to have a leader without a Government?

Other expedients are used to preserve that vanishing majority. The other day, during the speech of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) your honour ruled that he was bound to describe the right hon. gentleman who was elected in Leeds in 1917 as "the member for Leeds." Still I do not hesitate to say that this right hon. gentleman under the law has forfeited his right to his seat. What is the law on this matter? Section 15, chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, reads, in part, as follows:

If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or performs any service for the Government of Canada, or

for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid . . . . the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated and his election shall thenceforth be null and void.

The preamble of the schedule to the Act which was passed last year concerning the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway provides that one of the parties to the agreement is called the Government; and clause 6 of this schedule, which forms part of the Act provides:

That the value of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall be determined by a Board of three arbitrators, one to be appointed by the Government.

And the first sentence of clause 21 of the schedule reads as follows:

Each of the parties to this agreement shall pay its own costs of and in connection with the arbitration subsequent to the date of this agreement, including the remuneration of the arbitrator appointed by it.

The amount of the remuneration is not fixed in the law, but it is specifically stated that the arbitrator who shall act in the matter shall be remunerated by the Government. I say, Sir, that under the circumstances there should have been an election in Leeds and that there should be a member from that constituency voting on the amendment to the Address.

There is another matter to which I wish to direct your attention, Mr. Speaker. On July 21, 1920, the hon. member for Ste. Antoine, Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames), delivered a very eloquent address before the Empire Parliamentary Association in London on "The Dominions and the League of Nations." This address was printed, and I have a copy of it in my hand. With your permission, I will read the following words from page 5:

Now, I have just returned from a hurried visit to Canada. Mr. Balfour has alluded to the double capacity which I occupied at that time, and for the moment still occupy. For sixteen years I have been the representative of Western Montreal in the Canadian House of Commons. My resignation is in the hands of the Speaker because I have found that my new work is quite enough to occupy all the time and attention that I am capable of giving to it.

This was on July 21, 1920. Why should the electors of St. Antoine, Montreal, be disfranchised? Why has the resignation of Sir Herbert Ames been kept secret and withheld? I am sure that it must have been intercepted on its way to Your Honour, because you could not have it in your hands without acting upon it—but that is always the humiliating method of avoiding an election and evading a defeat. Shall this be permitted to continue? Will the Canadian people stand for that much longer? Sir, the Government does not own the people of Canada, body and soul, by feudal right.

My right hon. friend, in his characteristic way, discarded as ridiculous and unworthy of attention the argument that the Government must not only have the support of a majority in the House, but must also have the confidence of the people, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) followed in the same vein. I take issue with my right hon. friend and these hon. gentlemen. It is in direct violation of the spirit and traditions of the British constitution that a Parliament should continue its existence when it is clear that it no longer represents, carries the support, or enjoys the confidence of the people. Against the opinion of the Canadian Prime Minister, who struggles frantically to remain in office against the will of the country—and the Minister of Militia issued yesterday a challenge that I shall now take up—I shall oppose the opinion of a great British Prime Minister, who, placed in similar though less unfavourable circumstances, deemed it his duty to let the people rule and select a government which had their confidence. To the Meighenian—if my hon. friend will permit me to use the expression—views of the duty of a constitutional Prime Minister, I shall oppose the Gladstonian standard. Mr. Gladstone had been returned to office at the election of 1868, and in 1873, two years before the expiration of the mandate of that parliament, seeing that the by-elections were going against the government, and that he did not carry any longer the support of the majority of the people of Britain, he dissolved Parliament and Mr. Disraeli was returned by a large majority. Mr. Gladstone took his seat in the British House of Commons as the leader of the Opposition, and you will permit me to read a few words which he uttered in his speech on the Address in the next session following the election. You will find those words at page 80 of the Debates of the British Parliament of March, 1874, volume 218:

My hon. friend seems to think that there is but one important element in the position of a government, and that is the numerical amount of its majority. Now, upon that point I join issue with my hon. friend. I think he fundamentally misunderstands the constitution of this country if he supposes that the actual majority that a government may possess in an existing House of Commons is sufficient to

give it more moral and political strength for the discharge of its arduous duties, after it has become apparent or when it is becoming clear that the possession of that majority is not agreeable to the sense and the convictions of the country. Now, Sir, there is the whole difference between my hon. friend and myself.

Further, on page 81, he says:

Because in this country we watch the signs and currents of public opinion. We recognize the general title of the country to be governed in conformity with its wishes and its intelligence; and the mere possession of a parliamentary majority, satisfactory as it is when it is a true indication of the actual current of feeling and opinion of the country, is no adequate support and no adequate warrant for the continuance of a government in office if it has become clear, or when there is reasonable ground for supposing that the desires of the country are in an opposite direction.

On page 84 here is what he says:

Yet, as an Englishman, as one attached to the institutions of the country, and as one who held an office which bound him to regard the principles of the constitution, I cannot regret a dissolution which has given to the people of this country an opportunity of pronouncing their opinion upon the conduct of affairs, though I think the judgment which has been passed is an erroneous one.

Gladstone spoke as an Englishman and I commend his words to both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia and Defence. They are repeated by one who is not an Englishman, who has not one drop of Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins, but who is a true lover and admirer of British principles and who wants to uphold them in this country.

Later on in that session, Mr. Gladstone was still being attacked in the British House of Commons for having so dissolved Parliament two years before the expiration of his Parliamentary term and so brought on an election in which he was defeated. I wish to quote only a very few words which the House will find on page 1126 of the same volume of the British Hansard. Mr. Gladstone said:

Therefore, my regret is, not that the dissolution took place when it did, but that it did not take place before, for I am not willing to hold office under any circumstances, with a minority either in this House or the country. It is repugnant to my feelings, and not compatible with the best interests of the country that a Government should continue to govern, even with a numerical majority, when its strength is falling away, and when there are daily increasing evidences that it no longer represents the will and opinions of the constituencies. That is the regret of which I have to make a frank expression. Had I known as well as I know now what was to take place, it would not have been upon the 24th of January or the 24th of December, nor upon any day in January or December, but at a much earlier period, that my colleagues and myself would have advised the Crown to dissolve.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) the other day, and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) yesterday stated that the opinions which we have quoted in this debate were the opinions of men who were out and wanted to go in, in which, they said, they were like members on this side. The words of Mr. Gladstone were uttered after the election, not for the purpose of getting in, as those hon. gentlemen said, but to explain why he had advised the Crown to dissolve, namely, because it was made clear to him that the majority of the people of the country were opposed to his continuing in office. This is the first precedent.

The Minister of Militia and Defence quoted as a precedent the Government of 1892 to 1895 when Mr. Gladstone had withdrawn and had been replaced by Lord Rosebery. It is true Mr. John Redmond presented to the British House of Commons a motion asking for dissolution of Parliament in 1895, but at that time, what were the conditions? The British Parliament had three years of existence, and out of, I think, nine by-elections which had taken place, the Government had gained and had lost and the net gain to the Opposition was only three seats in the House of Commons. Is there any similarity to the position of a Government which had a majority of seventy in this House, which majority is reduced to twenty-three? Yet, this is what Mr. Balfour said in the British House of Commons on that occasion:

I have never observed in the history of this country that any party or any Government have gained credit for hanging on to office in the vulgar sense, without power, and with only the insignia of office—for hanging on to their places when they were deprived of all real influence over the course of events, and when the general trend of opinion was against them. Under such circumstances, a Government may possibly do good administrative work; it may possibly continue to hold its tenure of office for one month, two months, or even for a year or more, but you will never find, in the history of this country, that this had the result of increasing the credit of a Government with those in whose favour their fortunes must ultimately rest.

In 1895, Lord Salisbury was returned to power with a large majority, and in 1900, there was held that election which was referred to by the Minister of Militia and Defence as the "Khaki" election. This was during the latter part of the South African war. Two years afterwards, Lord Salisbury resigned and was replaced by Mr. Balfour, and then by-elections began to go against the Conservative or Unionist

administration of Britain. I will quote the words of two of the leading English statesmen of that time as I find their utterances recorded in volume 150 of the British Hansard. This is what Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said, as reported at page 71:

It is common for us to say, and it is true constitutionally, that the Minister of the Crown in this country is selected and appointed because he is the man who commands a majority in the House of Commons. But what does that mean? It means that the command of the majority of the House represents the feeling of the country. The moment the House of Commons gets out of touch and harmony with the country, then that plea for retaining office dissolves; and the right hon. gentleman has no right to entrench himself behind the confidence and support of his friends here after it is known to all mankind and to himself, as well as to any of them, that he has lost the confidence of the country. When I say it is known to himself, it is obviously so, because, if he was not aware he had lost the confidence of the country, why should he show any reluctance to appeal to the country and immensely strengthen his position by securing a favourable verdict from it?

In the same debate, at page 117, Sir Edward Gray is reported as making this statement, speaking of the right hon. Mr. Balfour:

Does he expect to get any good result in Parliament from prolonging the life of the present Government? The last election took place upon the war, and it could not have counted as an ordinary election. To all intents and purposes this House of Commons is ten years old. Does the Prime Minister suppose he can restore it to a vigorous and healthy condition now? He knows he cannot, and the House knows he cannot, because they know it is out of touch with the country as a whole. The longer the Government attempts to go on keeping the House of Commons working, the more they will damage the House of Commons as an institution, and the longer they go on, I sincerely hope and trust, the greater will be the resentment of the country when they have the courage to appeal to it.

My hon. friend the Minister of Militia slipped very quickly over this precendent, and he was in error in the last part of his statement with regard to it. These words were uttered in July 1905, and five months afterwards, on the 4th of December, 1905, two years before the expiration of the parliamentary term Mr. Balfour did not dissolve parliament but resigned his position as Prime Minister. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was called upon to form a ministry on the 5th of December, 1905. The elections were held in January, 1906, and the government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was returned by a large majority. There is one feature, however, of the precendents quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia with reference to the government of Lord Rosebery in 1895, and the government of Mr. Balfour in 1905 which will be followed in this country, and it is this: Both these governments were defeated and swept out of office when the electors had a chance to pronounce their opinion. I have quoted the opinion of leaders in the public life of Great Britain, and I may say that on the principle there is no difference of opinion. They may have differed as to whether the circumstances at different periods justified the application of the principle, but on the principle itself they all agreed. I shall now quote the opinion of constitutional writers. I call your attention to what Sir William Anson says in his "Law and Custom of the Constitution" at page 372:

We must not forget that the possible violation of the laws is not the only reason why a Ministry should retire when it is shown to have lost the confidence of the House or the country. Ministers are not only Ministers of the Queen, they represent the public opinion of the United Kingdom; when they cease to impersonate public opinion they become a mere group of personages who must stand or fall by the prudence of their action. They may have to deal with disorders at home or hostile manifestations abroad; they will have to meet these with the knowledge that they have not the confidence or support of the country; and their opponents at home and abroad would know this too.

Professor Dicey in his "Law of the Constitution" says:

The reason why the House can, in accordance with the constitution, be deprived of existence is that an occasion has arisen on which there is fair reason to suppose that the opinion of the House is not the opinion of the electors. A dissolution is allowable or necessary whenever the wishes of the Legislature are or may fairly be presumed to be different from the wishes of the nation . . . . The essential point to notice is the principle that the authority which ultimately determines the right of a Cabinet to retain office is the nation. The authority of the House of Commons is derived from its representing the will of the nation, and the chief object of a dissolution is to ascertain that the will of Parliament coincides with the will of the nation . . . . The precedents show that in modern times the rules as to the dissolution of Parliament are like other conventions of the Constitution, intended to secure the ultimate supremacy of the electorate as the true political authority of the State.

The constitutional historian, Mr. J. R. Green, writes as follows:

A minister availing himself of the temper of a parliament elected in some moment of popular panic, and refusing to appeal to the country would be, even if legal, a criminal.

I would advise my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, if he were here, to be

more careful in issuing challenges. Of course, I cannot quote an instance which is analogous to the present, of a government changing its membership, forming a new administration, selecting a new leader, forming a new party, formulating a new platform, as was done in July, 1920, and not going to the country. There is nothing similar in British history, because it never was done. My hon. friend, if I may be allowed to call him so, though he is no longer a member of this House, the late member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), said:

> There is no precedent in history of a group of men holding up two parties and running away with the government.

Those words are not mine but they will serve to show that it is rather difficult to find a situation quite identical to the present one. I will quote another instance, a very recent one, which took place in one of the British dominions. Last year, I think it was in May or June, 1920, General Smuts, the prime minister of South Africa, was returned to office under peculiar circumstances at a general election. He was the leader of a party called the South African party.

That party elected 44 members to the House. There was the Nationalist party under General Hertzog, which also secured 44 seats in the House of Representatives. There was another party, the Unionist party, under Sir Thomas Smart, which elected 25 members. And finally there was the Labour party with a membership of 21. General Smuts had no majority over all the other parties combined, but he succeeded in enlisting the support of the Unionist party, and to a large extent of the Labour party, and managed to carry on the affairs of the Commonwealth without any great difficulty. Indeed, he had a good majority in the House. But after the session was over he considered that those conditions were rather precarious and he tried to form an alliance with the Nationalist party. A conference was held, but the extremists of the Nationalist party could not modify their views to a sufficient extent to allow General Smuts and themselves to co-operate. Then he made an appeal to Sir Thomas Smart of the Unionist party and succeeded in forming a new permanent party which has retained the name of the South African party but of which Sir Thomas Smart and his Unionist followers are members. General Smuts had a majority in the House of Representatives of South Africa. But what did General Smuts do? He had no mandate from the people of South Africa to carry on the affairs of the country with a new party formed of a combination of the South African party and the Unionist party. General Smuts is a Liberal; General Smuts is a statesman; General Smuts is a great British constitutionalist; and he found that it was his duty to secure a mandate from the people of South Africa. Yet, from his point of view, it was a dangerous course to pursue; it was a very close fight. But it is always safer to trust the people, and General Smuts to-day is Premier of South Africa, and when he proceeds to the Imperial Conference in June he will go there speaking in no unmistakable way as the representative of the South African people.

This leads me to say a word or two with regard to the Imperial Conference. The conference has been heralded, promised, postponed, and finally called. It is to be a gathering of momentous importance. The destinies of Canada, the national status of Canada, and questions of most vital and sacred interest to this nation, are to be discussed. Problems of extreme gravity, the solution of which may involve tremendous responsibility on our part, will be brought before that conference. Just to show that I am not exaggerating, I shall read the very words that are used in the calling together of this conference. Here they are:

> The Dominions are invited to attend the Imperial Conference in June on the lines of the Imperial War Cabinet Meetings which took place in 1917 and 1918, to deal with the many urgent problems of common interest which call for the co-ordination of policy and action by the different governments of the Empire.

From the speech from the Throne delivered a few days ago in the British Parliament I extract the following words:

> I hope the Prime Ministers of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland, as well as the representatives of India, will be able to visit London during the coming summer. I am confident that discussions that will take place during their visits will be of the utmost value in bringing about co-ordination, both in the external and internal policy of the Empire.

Mr. Lloyd George, the British Premier, speaking in the House of Commons, is reported in the Montreal Star, of February 16, 1921, as follows:

> Mr. Lloyd George speaking in the House last evening declared that it was too much to ask of these small Islands that they undertake the whole burden of the defence of a gigantic Empire in every sea, and that at the forthcoming conference of Prime Ministers of the Dominions in London the whole problem of Imperial Defence must be considered. There must

be, the Prime Miister went on, co-ordination not only between the various services, but between the several parts of the Empire. Mr. Lloyd George stated that the Conference of Empire Premiers to be held in London in June will be the most momentous event in the history of the Empire.

Now, Sir, after having read that extract, standing here to-day in this Canadian Parliament, fully conscious of the responsibility that attaches to my words, I emphatically state that the gentlemen who pretend to govern Canada at the present time have no right to represent our country at that conference, because they do not enjoy its confidence and are not entitled to speak the national voice; and we will not consider ourselves bound, either legally or morally, by any decision or agreement which they may reach there. It may be said that any such decision will have to be ratified by the Parliament of Canada before it can become binding. But, Sir, the deliberations and discussions that precede the decision are important, and Canadians have the right to confer, deliberate, and discuss matters with the statesmen of the various sister nations of the British Commonwealth, through representatives who carry the support and enjoy the confidence of our people. It has been stated in the press, and indeed my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice clearly suggested it in this House last year, that representatives of the Opposition might be invited to attend the conference as associates of those representing the Government. Sir, I do not hesitate to say—and I know that in this statement I voice the views of my hon. leader in this respect—that no such proposal can be entertained. It would be a mere subterfuge for the purpose of giving to the Government a semblance of authority; it would be, on the part of the Opposition, the mere lending of itself to a violation of the rights of the people. The people of Canada have the right to be represented there by a Government which has its support and confidence. It has the right to be represented by men delegated by a Parliament which has a clear mandate, and has been elected in a regular and constitutional way. What authority and influence is attached to the representatives who would propose to negotiate in the name of a country which loses no opportunity of repudiating them with all the power of which it is capable? You would not negotiate on a weak foundation, or rather on no foundation at all, and the other parties to the negotiations know the political conditions prevailing in this country. Will you let me read what the Canadian correspondent of the London Times, a Tory if I am not mistaken, sent to that paper and which appeared in the Times edition of January 7th:

Empire Peace Cabinet—Strong Canadian Opinions.

(From our Canadian correspondent.)

The Prime Minister of the Dominion will not discuss the attitude of Canada toward proposals which may be submitted to the meeting of Empire Prime Ministers in June next. Mr. Meighen succeeded to office only a few months ago. Since then there has been a re-organization of the Cabinet, and another re-organization is imminent.

It follows from all this that there is nothing very constructive in proposals from Canada for the Empire Peace Cabinet. No doubt naval defence will be considered, but for the time Canada is reluctant to shoulder new or heavy obligations. The political outlook is uncertain, the government is troubled by the difficulty and complexity of domestic problems, and ministers have still to determine their own attitude towards many questions of national as well as of Imperial concern.

I say, Sir, that it is the clear duty of the Government to let the people elect a new Parliament, select a Government which possesses its confidence, before any gentlemen undertake to proceed to the Imperial Conference and speak on behalf of Canada. Let us set our own house in order before undertaking to rebuild the British Empire or attempting to modify the constitutional structure of other nations. Let us first purify our own political atmosphere and clear away this abnormal parliament which in no way reflects the safe, sane, sober and normal opinion of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken much too long, although I would like to express now my views about some of the matters which are to come up at the Imperial Conference. I believe, however, that having by an amendment challenged the right of this Parliament to legislate under the circumstances, we must first take the sense of the House before discussing the problems of the day. I was surprised to hear some gentlemen in this House blame the leader of the Opposition for having acted as he did. I would simply advise them to consult Bourinot, page 97, and they will see that the course followed by the leader of the Opposition was the legal and constitutional course to adopt.

In bringing my remarks to a conclusion I appeal to hon. gentlemen—though I am not greatly confident that my appeal will be heeded by all—to yield to the clamour

of the people and restore to the Canadian democracy full control over its political institutions. Members of the Government, especially the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, have told us on previous occasions, have painted a very deplorable picture, of the arduous duties of Ministers of the Crown, of how much work they have to do and the sacrifices they have made. Sir, the people everywhere feel that the crown of martyrdom is too heavy for my right hon. friend and his associates. They all want to give them a rest. I invite the Prime Minister to recall those words of Lincoln which would certainly apply to our present political situation:

> In this age and in this country public sentiment is everything. With it nothing can fail, against it nothing can succeed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two references in the speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) make it highly essential, I think, that the position of the Chair should be stated clearly and beyond all question. First with respect to the ruling given by the Chair when the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was speaking. That ruling merely had reference to the well-known rule of the House that an hon. member alluding in debate to another hon. member should do so as the member for a certain constituency, and not refer to him by name. My ruling on that occasion had no reference whatever to the point as to whether the late Minister of Finance is or is not a member of this House. In any event the ruling of the Chair would have no bearing upon that question; but inasmuch as there is no official intimation before me that the seat in question has been vacated I felt that even although the subject might be open to question it was far better to refer to the late Minister of Finance as the member for Leeds.

The second reference to which I wish to allude has to do with the statement credited to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) that his resignation was in the Speaker's hands. The House will at once realize that it would never do for the impression to go abroad that the Speaker was a party to withholding a document of that character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I therefore deem it my duty to make it clear to the House that I have not in my possession the resignation of the member for St. Antoine nor have I ever received a document which was, or which purported to be, the resignation of his seat in this House. I thought it undesirable to interrupt the hon. member for Quebec East while he was speaking, but I felt that at the earliest possible moment the House should be apprised of these facts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I desire to repeat what I said in the course of my speech that I knew that such resignation had not reached Your Honour's hands, and it must have been withheld on its way.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, the brilliant lawyer and parliamentarian who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lapointe) occupied many minutes of the time of the House in recalling the deeds of some of my ancestors many of whom have been dead for fifty years. It was intensely interesting to me to hear what these fine fellows did but I am more interested to-day in the question, "Where are we going from here, and what are we going to do?" than in what other men did fifty years ago. If there ever was a time when the people are asking "Where are we going from here, what is your platform?" it is to-day? They are asking these questions in a manner more intensely earnest than ever before.

Following the time honoured custom, Sir, permit me to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. They did their work ably, conscientiously and effectively, I should like to say to my hon. friend the mover of the Address (Mr. McIsaac) that from the first day he appeared in this House he always seemed to know his own mind, always knew the way he was going to vote, and loyally followed his leader. Perhaps being more of a pathfinder myself, I can appreciate what loyalty and service of this kind mean better than some others; therefore I congratulate the hon. gentleman and his constituents, and I hope that he will be long spared to represent them and to support his leader loyally in this House.

To my hon. friend the seconder of the Address (Mr. MacKelvie) I wish to convey my opinion that his speech was the most eloquent maiden effort that I have yet heard; and that I was not alone in thinking this is apparent from the words of the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) who twitted my hon. friend slightly on falling under the influence of the apple. It is well known,

I think, to all hon. members who have long been in this House that the hon. member from Cape Breton has himself for many years been under the subtle influence of iron and steel in his own province, and apparently that was his Scotch way of complimenting the hon. member for Yale.

To my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) I would say that he has reached his high office through no assistance of mine—not wittingly at least. But, on the other hand, I am very glad to be able to congratulate him and Canada and myself on his becoming Prime Minister. If ever there was a time when the people were looking for clean-cut, open-hearted talking so that they can get at the facts, in my judgment, Sir, it is now. From the first day that my right hon. friend became leader of this Government there was no doubt in my mind where he stood on the tariff question, and I do not think there was any doubt in the minds of any other Canadians. I believe that his unequivocal stand has had a good effect all over the country, because the people are looking for the truth. And at least his definite announcement of where he stood on the tariff question cleared away any doubts in my own mind on the subject, and I stand before you to-day, Sir, transformed, so far as Canada is concerned, from the nebulous free trader of a year ago, into as clean-cut and as unequivocal a protectionist on principle as the right hon. the leader of the Government himself.

It might not be without interest to some hon. members to follow the steps by which I reached this conclusion. It was quite unexpected in my own mind. In fact, the statement of the right hon. the leader of the Government came to me as a direct challenge, which I accepted as such, and I started out to collect a bundle of facts with which to bombard the right hon. gentleman this session, but I had not got very far in my search before I discovered that I was collecting two sets of facts. I found, almost without exception, that it was hard to discover a first class political economist who did not, at least in theory, agree with the principles of free trade. On the other hand, I found, with one notable exception —my native land—that practically the whole civilized world was protectionist. That, to my mind, was just as much a fact as the other, and had to be dealt with as such. I started in to find the reasons for that condition of affairs, and for a while I put it down to original sin and went on building up my platform. I got quite a bundle of facts bolstering up my free trade platform, but when I turned them over I found original sin there, and something told me that if I came to this House with such a theory I would get punctured. So I had to find some better reason, and the conclusion I came to was that men do not accept free trade principles for about the same reason that they do not practice religion. But it is the fact, that they are afraid to do so, and the reasons of their fear are so real and so apparent that to refuse to acknowledge them is to be irrational. People still lock their doors when they go away. There is a reason for it—there are thugs in the world. But it took me some time to reach that conclusion—and after the most eloquent speech of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) yesterday, I think hon. members will understand what I was up against, because free trade, whatever else it has been, whether it is right or whether it is wrong, has undoubtedly been a great success in England.

But I had to find out why all other countries had not adopted something which has been such a great success in England, and for a while I was stuck, but eventually I played that old children's game which my grandchildren are now starting to play —I pretended. I pretended first I was a Frenchman—I stepped across the Atlantic and I looked at the world from the other side; then I pretended I was a German; later on I pretended I was an American; later than that I pretended I was a Canadian; later even than that I pretended I was a Canadian farmer; later even than that I pretended I was a Canadian manufacturer; later even than that, Mr. Speaker, I imagined I was a Canadian statesman; and, last of all, I stepped out of those shoes and got into the shoes of a man of the world—I tried to look at the world from the shoes of a man of the world in a world of men, and the results were extraordinary.

The first great discovery I made was that for thirty long years I had been looking at the question of free trade, thinking the group thoughts of the men with whom I was raised in my early days, and whose interest, I can now clearly see, it was to be free traders. For thirty years I had been thinking on this subject as an Englishman rather than as a Canadian. And the next great discovery I

made was that while free trade was undoubtedly to the best interests of the British people themselves, it by no means followed that it was in the best interests of the people of other countries differently situated.

Another point of view was brought to my attention during my plan of campaign. It did not come in a day, it did not come in a week, it did not come in a month; it took time to reach my present conclusions. I wondered where we were going from here, because my constituents are going to ask that question. I will have to answer it, and every hon. gentleman in this House will have to answer it. I thought, now, looking back over the ages, what has been the progress of men as men. We are undoubtedly better off to-day than our cave-dwelling ancestors were; no sane men in this age would like to exchange places with them. It is a long step from Stonehenge to Westminster; it is a long step from the trade and commerce of Lower Canada, where rum was the chief article of barter, to this honourable House, with its stringent dry laws. We have passed over a very hard road, but we have made very real progress. I do not know whether I ever told you the story before, Mr. Speaker, but once on leave I was invited to Scotland. Almost the first thing, my host, being a Scotchman, pointed out to me, with some considerable detail—more than I thought was necessary at the time—was the battlefield of Bannockburn. He said: "This is where my ancestors whaled the stuffing out of yours." But I had just come from the other side, where Scotchmen and Englishmen and Canadians and Frenchmen and Australians and New Zealanders were standing shoulder to shoulder. The English and the Scotch had had their fight and had shaken hands, and now they were fighting in a common cause.

That, Mr. Speaker, has been the history of the progress of the world. What is the lesson of the war? It is absolutely this, that no country, no matter how big or how well organized, can to-day stand alone. Every soldier who left Canada knows deep down in his heart that Canada alone could not have won the war. Great Britain alone could not have won the war; every soldier who fought over there knows it, just as he knows that no country can to-day stand alone. We passed that stage years ago.

It is here, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make a reference to a remark made by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who, I regret to say, is not at the moment in his seat. The hon. gentleman says that Canada never will do this and never will do that, but the time has long since passed when he or any other member can say what Canada never will do or never shall do. The member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), who is not now in his seat, I regret to say, asked the right hon. leader of the Government the other day what certain words of Lloyd George meant. I say to him that the words of Lloyd George mean exactly what they say, and the sooner he or other hon. gentlemen who have aspirations to leadership in this country find that out, the better—it is their job. There is no excuse for ignorance in this matter; you can find it out for a five cent stamp, and they will be glad to tell you.

Now, with the permission of the House, I wish to read a short extract from an article which is entitled "The Yellow Peril." The writer says:

> Let us take the broadest possible view of the racial map of the globe as it existed before the recent war. Out of a total number of human beings amounting to 1,700,000,000, 550,000,000 were white, 1,150,000,000 were coloured. Thus the coloured races out-numbered the whites more than two to one. The white world consists of Europe, North America, the southern part of South America, the Siberian portion of Asia, and Australasia. The coloured world consists of the bulk of Asia, virtually the whole of Africa, and most of Central and South America.

This is the point to which I wish to direct attention:

> The great bulk of the white race is concentrated in the European continent, and in 1914, before the war, the population of Europe was approximately 450,000,000. Four-fifths of the entire white race lives on less than one-fifth of the white world's territorial area. The remaining one-fifth is scattered to the ends of the earth, doing their best to hold the tide of colour. A century ago the impulse of the white race rolled aggressively eastward; precisely the opposite condition now prevails. The white races are more or less in an attitude of defence against the tremendous wave that is beating on their shores, a wave that is likely to become more tremendous now that the yellow races have learned so much in the course of our lamentable war.

I leave to the imagination of hon. gentlemen what will happen to this continent of America if the powerful white races of Europe are permitted to disintegrate. Four hundred and fifty millions live there; one hundred millions, odd, live here. What will happen? Millions of these colored men to-day

are on the move. At least sixty millions of them are among the most efficient and modern fighters in the world. Mr. Speaker, I claim no great superiority for the white race. For the existence of every one of the great religions, including the Christian, under whose flag I have the honour to stand to-night, the white man is indebted to men of colour—and it owes them much besides. On the other hand, the white race can give much to the coloured races. I could not help thinking when my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was speaking on the League of Nations, that if we could only have with us to-day that learned and distinguished Chinaman to whom he referred, he would agree that it would be far better if we could bring his people up to our standard rather than that they should bring ours down to theirs.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind—and I believe there is not the slightest doubt in the mind of any thinking man—that one more war like the last, or one more fight between the white races, will settle this civilization and settle it for good. While I am quite sure that the interests of Canada, of the United States, of England, of Europe, are absolutely one, it does not matter what I believe or what I think; it is what the other fellow thinks and believes that counts. So far as we are concerned, Canada is to-day a nation. The time is coming, and it is not in the far distant future, when Canada will have to make up her mind whether she will take the white man's road, with or without the assistance of America, just as she did in the war.

This brings me to the question of the markets of the world, about which we have heard so much during this debate. My hon. friend from Marquette looks with longing eyes to the big market to the south of us. So do I, and God grant that he will be able to build up a good big trade down there; it is a thing we all want to do. He says they have 120,000,000 people down there and hope to have 200,000,000 in so many years. But let us have a look at Europe. There is a market there, too, for she has 400,000,000 people to-day—not to-morrow or at some distant time in the future—400,000,000 people who need everything that this country produces in order that they may be brought back to normal conditions. If we permit them to disintegrate, we are ruined; the white race is ruined. Is not that a market worth cultivating, too? Is not the cultivation of that market a job worthy of any man or of any nation? I think so. Let me tell the House about that little island across the sea whose success was so ably presented yesterday by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). That little island to-day produces for export practically nothing but coal; the reason why she can send her ships to all parts of the world and bring back produce is that she can load her ships both ways, and she is the only country on earth that can do that. That is what ruined Germany. Germany tried to grow wheat and to force her manufactured goods on other countries. She gave three years' credit to niggers because she could not afford to take their products back. What would become of our wheat if England were to produce wheat? As I have said, England produces for export practically nothing but coal; she sacrificed the development of her agricultural industry because she wanted to become a manufacturing nation with world-wide markets. It is or has been in her interest to have free trade. Let us take a look at this big market to the south of us. It is not a little island twenty-one miles away from a market of 400,000,000 white men, but it is a large continent producing almost everything that modern man requires, with the exception of tea and coffee. I can think of no other product that man wants that she does not produce in quantities. Which of these countries is likely, in the ordinary course of events, to be the best market for this country, and which country has been the best in the past? Without bothering the House with a lot of figures which I obtained from the statistical office and which, with the permission of the House, I will place on Hansard, I will briefly state that the exports in the last twenty years from Canada to Great Britain exceeded the exports from Canada to the United States by $1,807,604,367. That is the history of the past.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. gentleman that it is only with the unanimous consent of the House that a set of figures can be placed on Hansard if they are not read in the House. I will, therefore, ask the House if the hon. member may have leave to place the figures on Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. ANDREWS: This is the statement:

Canadian exports, 1868 to 1920; with portions sent to United Kingdom, United States and other countries.

Fiscal Years	Total Merchandise, the Produce of Canada			
	United Kingdom	United States	Other Countries	Total
	$ 1	$ 2	$	$
1868	17,905,808	22,387,846	5,249,523	45,543,177
1869	20,486,389	23,640,188	5,196,727	49,323,304
1870	22,512,991	27,398,930	6,169,271	56,081,192
1871	21,733,556	26,715,690	6,732,110	55,181,356
1872	25,223,785	29,984,440	7,735,802	62,944,027
1873	31,402,234	33,421,725	8,421,647	73,245,606
1874	35,769,190	30,380,556	7,777,002	73,926,748
1875	34,199,134	25,683,818	7,607,941	67,490,893
1876	34,379,005	27,451,150	8,031,694	69,861,849
1877	35,491,671	22,160,666	8,212,543	65,864,880
1878	35,861,110	22,131,343	7,747,681	65,740,134
1879	29,393,424	23,149,909	7,546,245	60,089,578
1880	35,208,031	26,762,705	8,125,455	70,096,191
1881	42,637,219	31,015,109	7,269,051	80,921,379
1882	39,816,813	41,687,638	8,538,260	90,042,711
1883	39,538,067	36,096,501	8,651,139	84,285,707
1884	37,410,870	31,631,622	8,089,587	77,132,079
1885	36,479,051	32,618,593	7,085,874	76,183,518
1886	36,694,263	31,503,292	6,777,951	74,975,506
1887	38,714,331	32,273,033	6,976,656	77,964,020
1888	33,648,284	37,323,161	7,326,305	78,297,750
1889	33,504,281	36,449,288	7,248,235	77,201,804
1890	41,499,149	33,291,207	7,545,158	82,335,514
1891	43,243,784	34,829,436	7,684,524	85,757,744
1892	54,949,055	31,317,857	9,417,341	95,684,253
1893	58,409,606	33,813,802	9,783,082	102,006,490
1894	60,878,056	29,297,598	10,411,199	100,586,853
1895	57,903,564	32,303,773	9,321,014	99,528,351
1896	62,717,941	34,460,428	9,200,383	106,378,752
1897	69,533,852	39,717,057	10,434,501	119,685,410
1898	93,065,019	34,361,795	12,494,118	139,920,932
1899	85,113,681	34,766,955	12,920,626	132,801,262
1900	96,562,875	52,534,977	14,412,938	163,510,790
1901	92,857,525	67,983,673	16,590,188	177,431,386
1902	109,347,345	66,567,784	20,104,634	196,019,763
1903	125,199,980	67,766,367	21,435,327	214,401,674
1904	110,120,892	66,856,885	21,436,662	198,414,439
1905	97,114,867	70,426,765	23,313,314	190,854,946
1906	127,456,465	83,546,306	24,481,185	235,483,956
1907*	98,691,186	62,180,439	19,673,681	180,545,306
1908	126,194,124	90,814,871	29,951,973	246,960,968
1909	126,384,724	85,334,806	30,884,054	242,603,584
1910	139,482,945	104,199,675	35,564,931	279,247,551
1911	132,156,924	104,115,823	38,043,806	274,316,553
1912	147,240,413	102,041,222	40,942,222	290,223,857
1913	170,161,903	139,725,953	45,866,744	355,754,600
1914	215,253,969	163,372,825	52,961,645	431,588,439
1915	186,668,554	173,320,216	49,430,066	409,418,836
1916	451,852,399	201,106,488	88,651,751	741,610,638
1917	742,147,537	280,616,330	128,611,901	1,151,375,768
1918	845,480,069	417,233,287	277,314,432	1,540,027,788
1919	540,750,977	454,873,170	220,819,659	1,216,443,806
1920	489,152,637	464,028,183	286,311,278	1,239,492,098

*9 months ended March 31.

Total 1.—$5,073,715,435
Total 2.— 3,266,111,068

$1,807,604,367

There should be no difference of opinion as to which would be likely to become the best market—200,000,000 people against 400,000,000—and there would be no difference of opinion, except for two things. The first is the will of our people—we cannot do anything without their will—and the second is Canada's enthusiastic desire to remain a nation. I have endeavoured, as best I know how, to come to a sane conclusion, but I must at this point absolutely disagree with my hon. friends to my left. This pamphlet which I hold in my hand is called the "New National Policy as adopted by the Organized Farmers of Canada in the Farmers' platform drafted and issued by the Canadian Council of Agriculture at Winnipeg on November 29, 1918," and in it, at page 13, I find the following:

> By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

That is their platform, and while a year ago I would have jumped at it, today, I am not in favour of free trade in one year or five years with Great Britain or any other country on earth, without a quid pro quo. My reasons are briefly these. The whole foundation of our present society in Canada rests upon the tariff, and if we take away the tariff, the whole structure will fall down. I will support that contention by recounting one solitary statement of fact, given in sworn evidence before the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) this summer. If my memory serves me right, the subject under discussion was Yale locks, and the manager told the Minister of Finance that it cost him 40 per cent more to manufacture these locks in Canada than it did in the plant of the parent company in the United States. The Minister of Finance was apparently astonished and he asked: "How do you account for that?" Like a flash came the answer: "We have in the parent company in the United States one machine that cost $60,000 and which performs one function. It will perform that function for all the keys in Canada in one week and it will stand idle here for fifty-one weeks in the year." In other words, while you can have a $100,000 machine in a country with a population of 100,000,000, you cannot have a $100,000 machine in a country with a population of 8,000,000.

It has been said that the tariff has been abused, but that is no argument against the principle of protection. Even if the tariff has been abused, I have just this to say on that subject: We are still a nation of men; we are not absolutely at the mercy of all the organizations that like to put up prices. Like myself all the other members of the House have thought this matter out and I will, therefore, not take up a minute of the time of the House in discussing it; but I have just this to say, that while protection may not always protect and while it may have sometimes

been abused, as I believe it has, we are still a democratic people; we are self-contained, and when we make up our minds to get after these people, such a movement cannot be withstood and these people will stand at the bar of outraged public opinion. If any man is taking advantage of my patriotism or the patriotism of other Canadian men who desire to be self-reliant, then some day he will answer for his action.

In conclusion, free trade as practised in England has proved to be no panacea for unrest, no panacea for profiteering, and no panacea for war. In fact, I believe the fierce competition for foreign markets, which was so ably described yesterday, had a great deal to do with bringing about the war. Until a few years ago, it was almost universally believed that to maintain peace you had to prepare for war and to have big armaments. Some people believe it to-day, but millions of people know that it is a lie. Millions of women know that it is a lie; millions of soldiers know that it is a lie. We have had the biggest preparation for peace in the shape of war material, the world has ever seen, yet we have had the bloodiest war, and in the knowledge that it is no guarantee of peace, no panacea, lies, to my mind, the hope of the world. If you once get enough people making up their minds that a certain thing is desirable, they are going to get it; they always have got it, and when there are two roads, one leading to destruction and absolute annihilation—that is war—and some other road, if you can get enough people looking for that other road they will find it. Here is a ray of hope. Already there has been published in the last year a book by a Major Douglas. I have not the time nor the ability to review his book, but I have read it, and can commend it to every hon. gentleman in this House, and to every banker and every labouring man in this country. It is not Bolshevism; it is not Socialism; it does not pull down, but it does show a way whereby we can build up and avoid war.

I think the members of our Government who attended the Peace Conference have caught the spirit of this new day too. I listened with great joy to the eloquent words of the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when he told us that at this meeting of the League of Nations, Canada was there as a nation in reality and in truth, and that she was a stronger nation for her connection with the British Empire. I also listened to the words of the hon. member for Durham, the ex-President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who in no uncertain words said: "The world is on the march and Canada is in the van." Thank God for that. We are not hanging back and letting George do it.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment. I want to point out to hon. members that while we have hopes of a better day Douglas's plan is not yet in existence, and I am quite sure the millennium is not here; but we have got the amendment. That, I think, will bring almost any man out of the clouds. It did not take me very long to make up my mind what I was going to do with respect to it, but it did make me think a little bit just the same. I asked myself the questions: What are you here for? Who sent you? What is your job? And I came to the conclusion that I had been sent here under very definite instructions to carry out what was the real issue—the Conscription Act. I do not know what all my constituents thought on all the planks that have been carried out by the Government since, but on that one issue there is no doubt in the world where they stood, because it was the sole topic in my election. I came down here to help push that thing through with all my force, and I did it. I believed in it, and I have this to say about that Act. If we have another war, we will have conscription not only of the men from 18 to 25, but of every man in this country, and in saying that I have not the faintest doubt that I represent the overwhelming opinion among the men who fought in the war. This idea of letting a few men do it—"letting George do it"—is played out. The next thing that I came down to do, in my opinion, at least, was to see that the men who were crippled and the widows and orphans of the war got all this country could afford to pay them. I made up my mind to fight for them. The next thing—well, perhaps the less said about that the better.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that if ever there was a time when the people wanted to know what they were up against, it is now. The first requisite of an appeal to the country at the present time is a definite, clear-cut issue, and on the fiscal policy, if possible, so far as I am concerned. This the leader of the Opposition is apparently determined we shall not have. The next requisite to my mind, is a fair redistribution of seats. This the leader of the Opposition also firmly declines to have. If we do not have redistribution before the election we will have,

in effect, more people disfranchised five times over than were disfranchised in 1917. We should certainly have at least one or the other of these requisites, if not both, namely, a clear-cut issue and representation by population. I shall therefore vote against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM ASBURY BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I usually speak briefly, but I question very much whether I can conclude my remarks in the short space of time remaining before the House will adjourn for this sitting, but I do not object to making a start and then adjourning the debate. In the effort to condense my remarks I cannot avoid saying what has been said by other speakers in the debate, and that is a word of congratulation to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), I am going to say that I thought so highly of the Prime Minister at the time, not because I agreed with his policy or his past course, but of the man personally, that I sent him my congratulations while I was travelling west on the train. I want to say this of the Prime Minister, and it is something that has not been mentioned. He has demonstrated during the time I have been in parliament real industry, and in that respect he is an example especially to the younger men who come into this House, because if we do not display industry we will not get very far. The Prime Minister has been a remarkable example of tireless industry.

What I have arisen for is largely to explain my position. Still, I question very much whether there is any reason why I should explain it, because last year when sitting on the Government side of the House, I expressed my own views on public questions. In order to have more freedom, and especially since a new government, with a new leader, had been formed—I would not say a new policy had been announced—I felt I would be much freer in what has been termed No Man's Land. First of all, I want to say that from the beginning, and for months prior to the formation of the Union Government, I was an advocate of a Union Government, and when the Union Government was formed I supported it for the purposes for which it was formed, and that was for the conduct of the war. I agree entirely with the position that has been taken by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I went back from this city in 1917 to my constituency, and my old party friends supported me because I told them I was supporting conscription, and supporting Union Government, to carry out that policy and all other necessary war measures, but that in every other respect I was adhering to the principles I had always advocated in this House.

That is my position to-day, and for that reason I am not prepared to support the Government that has been constituted since the last session of Parliament. The people returned to power in 1917 a Government headed by the late Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). The Prime Minister who led that Government has resigned, and a new Prime Minister with a new policy and a new name for his party has assumed office. Now, holding the views I do, I cannot accept the policy of that party, though I have the very highest admiration for its leader. My judgment is that the people in 1917, when they voted for the candidates in that election, voted with a war mind. The war was the foremost question in their minds, and consequently their decision was based upon their desire to win the war, and with no thought whatever about the domestic problems that might develop as a result of the war. That being the case, the people should have an opportunity of expressing themselves on the policies that are uppermost at the present moment, the domestic questions that are engaging their attention just now. A Government that satisfied the people on war issues may not satisfy them on peace issues; they may differ entirely in their views in these two respects. As I said, I did not abandon the views I held in peace times; I consider that we have again reached the peace stage and I therefore, stand by the principles which I advocated in the past.

Another thing that we should keep in mind is the fact that spart from the selection of a new leader, the constitution of a new party, and the outlining of what has been called a new platform, there are other reasons, why the people should have an opportunity to express their views at the present time. The official Opposition has a new leader, and there has come into existence an entirely new party with a platform. Why should not the people be given an opportunity to express their opinion on the merits of the respective parties that exist to-day? May I say, at this juncture, that we have not had an election in Canada on purely domestic problems since 1911? Ten years have elapsed since we have had an election in which the issues of ordinary times could be discussed

and decided. The only election we have had between 1911 and the present date was the election of 1917, which was fought out entirely on a war issue, and it is very important at the present time that an election should be held. My attitude last session, to which I still adhere, was that it was possible to have a census and redistribution, and to have an election in 1921. I maintained that it was possible to do so if an effort had been made to expedite the census. We could have had early returns of the population of this country and could have had redistribution and an election. My statement at that time was to this effect:

> I believe it would be only necessary to have one session of Parliament following the present session before we could have redistribution and before an appeal could be made to the country on the basis of representation in accordance with the census of 1921.

I am going to be quite frank and say that if the Government give to me and to this House an assurance that they will carry out the purpose of the amendment to the amendment I shall be satisfied for the present. But I go further and say that no contentious questions should be brought up in this House until a redistribution bill has been drafted and we are ready to go to the country. I am put in this position: If I vote for the amendment to the amendment, I am practically saying, and I do say, that it is possible to have a redistribution this year, to have the census taken, and to have an election. But I know that the Government we have here at the present time must exist to formulate that redistribution, and they may come back and say: "We cannot guarantee that we can carry out what is asked for in the amendment to the amendment; it depends upon whether we have the support of the members."

Naturally, too, it depends upon whether they have my individual support; and I am not prepared to pledge my support to the Government or any party in this House on any question until I know what it is and exactly what is going to be discussed. The Budget debate will come up later if the Government decide to carry out their programme, and if they are going to carry out the policy they have outlined in the address, I am bound to differ from them and, therefore, to vote against them. But I know what will be said. It will be stated that if I want this redistribution before an election I must support the Government in order to get it. Now, I cannot go so far. The Government should give us an assurance of a real desire on their part to provide redistribution this year, to expedite the census, to have an election immediately, and to avoid during this session the discussion of all controversial questions, or give me freedom to act as I think best in the interests of the country.

I believe that Western Canada is entitled to increased representation at this time; but if I must support the Government on other questions in order to keep it in existence so that that representation may be provided, I am placed in a position in which I do not wish to remain. I am not going to tie myself up to any party on any question in order to have something done which I think is necessary at this particular time. I feel that the West would be deprived of its proper representation in this House for probably four or five years if we had not a redistribution, but I do not want to be tongue-tied or to be held down by any promise to support the Government until it decides to have a redistribution and go to the country. If it accepts the proposal that it should go to the country this year under the terms of the amendment to the amendment and along the lines I have mentioned, I shall be satisfied. I am going to try to conclude before the House rises, although I had intended to speak at greater length. However, I can place my views on other matters briefly before the House. I came into this House in 1911 and during all the time I have been a member, I have been an advocate of a clear-cut policy which is in entire contradiction to the views expressed in the address in regard to the tariff. Now, if I accepted the views put forward by the Government in the Address I should be contradicting the position I have taken in this House from 1911 up to the present time. It is not a question of consistency on the part of those who have advocated tariff reduction in the past. The question that concerns me, is: what attitude have I taken; have I been consistent; and do I intend to remain consistent? I am not looking forward to the future, but I intend to remain if I possibly can a consistent advocate of policies which I believe are in the best interests of the country. I know that the Prime Minister has attempted to put all those who believe in a low tariff, or people who believe in freedom of trade, into a certain category, the free trade class. I

refuse to be placed there. But I am an advocate of free trade wherever it is in the best interests of the majority of the people. I am in favour of low tariff where it is in the interests of the bulk of the people. I am not prepared to destroy industry and capital, and that is the bugaboo that has always been raised. But I am satisfied that in the budget that will be brought down by the Government the outstanding principles of the national policy will be maintained.

Because we find those men in the country who have long been advocates of high protection loyally supporting the Prime Minister. Well, I cannot join in the support of the Prime Minister along with individuals who agitate high protection; they would not be proper company for me with the views I hold.

Now, having promised the people who returned me in 1917 that I would not abandon the principles that I supported in the past, and having reached the stage where there is a definite declaration on the part of the Government that it is going to adhere entirely to the principle of protection as it has been in existence in this country for forty years, I have come to the parting of the ways. If it is impossible for the Government to concede the point that I have mentioned in connection with redistribution, I cannot possibly vote confidence in a government that expresses opinions of that sort, because I would be declaring confidence in a government in whose principles I did not believe. That would not be fair to the Government, it would not be fair to me, and it would not be fair to the people who have elected me in the past.

And so my position is this: Now that we have passed the war stage and are reaching what we hope are normal times I am still in the position that the Prime Minister was always in and adhering to the views that he advocated prior to the war. That is all. I am there and that is where I intend to remain until I am convinced that I am wrong. Up to the present I have not been so convinced. It was my intention to speak on other questions this afternoon but I shall have an opportunity of doing so later. I shall therefore close my remarks, feeling that I have placed before the House in condensed form my views on the amendments and on the main motion.

Upon Mr. F. F. Pardee (West Lambton) and Mr. F. L. Davis (Neepawa) rising to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for West Lambton has the floor.

Mr. PARDEE: I move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 3, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. LAPOINTE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, for the first time in my parliamentary life I rise to a question of privilege. The Ottawa Journal of this morning has, among others, the following headline over a report of the remarks I had the privilege to make in the House yesterday:

> Says Quebec Will Not Abide by Imperial Conference attended by Mr. Meighen.

Mr. Speaker, that is a vicious, misleading statement. I do not think I used the word "Quebec" once during my speech yesterday. I spoke as one of the Canadian representatives, not as one of the Quebec representatives, and if the Ottawa Journal bases its activities on sectionalism, I do not.

THE MEMBER FOR LEEDS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if in the opinion of the Government the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) has not forfeited his right to a seat in this House by virtue of his having accepted a position as one of the arbitrators on the board which is to value the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I do not know that the Government gives legal opinions, especially on the floor of Parliament. If the hon. gentleman will submit his question in the usual way on the Order Paper, he will receive an answer.

RELEASE OF PRISONERS FROM STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): In view of the release of three

prisoners from Stony Mountain Penitentiary, may I ask the Minister of Justice if he will lay on the table of the House at the earliest moment the papers in connection with that release?

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I am not aware what prisoners the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I refer to the three gentlemen who were sent to jail in connection with the Winnipeg strikes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware that these gentlemen were released; I shall make inquiry. I understand that they served their time. I may say that the immediate dealing with these matters is at present in the hands of the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). I may add also that it is a well established practice of this House that papers with regard to releases under the Ticket-of-Leave Act should not be brought down to the House, except, perhaps, in some exceptional cases. The practice has had the sanction of numerous Ministers of Justice, and in particular had the sanction and approval, on an occasion which I remember, of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I do not think it is neecssary now to go into the reasons for that practice—reasons which Parliament has accepted on numerous occasions. However, if there be any papers relating to these cases, I will examine them and see whether there are any which should be brought down.

THE MEMBER FOR ST. ANTOINE, MONTREAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Is the Prime Minister aware of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) having made any public declaration to the effect that he had tendered his resignation as a member of this Parliament? Has the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government received an intimation from that hon. gentleman of his desire or intention to tender his resignation?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I have seen no public declaration made by or on behalf of the hon. member for St. Antoine, nor have I received any communication that I can give to the House.

BY-ELECTIONS TO FILL VACANCIES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend if he can inform Parliament when the writs will be issued for by-elections to fill the vacancies that exist in the constituencies of Yamaska, Quebec; York-Sunbury, New Brunswick; Medicine Hat, Alberta; and West York, Ontario?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I am able fully to conform to precedent in that regard, and to tell my hon. friend that the writs will be issued in due course.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend if the writs will be issued simultaneously, or at different times?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will appear when the writs are issued.

CANADIAN LOAN TO ROUMANIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT: (Chambly and Vercheres): I would like to direct the attention of the Government to an item which appeared in the Montreal Star yesterday regarding the Canadian loan to Roumania. A despatch which purports to come from Ottawa states that the interest due on April 1st, amounting to $1,475,234 has not been paid by Roumania, and that the Government were trying to make a settlement with that country. I would like to know if it is true that the interest has not been paid, and on what basis the new settlement is to be made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I do not know that that is a question of sufficient urgency to justify our taking up the time of the House in discussing it at the moment. But one thing I can tell my hon. friend at once is that as yet the Roumania interest has not been paid.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker—Surely if the interest has not been paid and if a new basis is being determined for a settlement, the House is entitled to be informed as to the nature of that settlement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is, no doubt, entitled to know, but not at this stage unless the Government chooses to give the information.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The House is entitled to know before the settlement is decided upon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not upon the Orders of the Day:

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Campbell, resumed from Wednesday, March 2.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I shall, if it will not be too much for the right hon. leader of the Government to bear, open remarks by offering him my sincere congratulations upon his attainment of the high position which he now occupies. He has brought dignity to the office; he fills it with dignity, and the worst wish that any hon. member on this side has for him is that he will not be permitted to bear that dignity too long.

It was of great interest to me to listen the other night to the speech delivered in this House by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie). One reason why I listened to his speech with such interest is that we have sat in this House a long time together, and the other and principal reason if his absolutely chameleon-like change of policy. It appears to be customary that the moment a man, no matter what his former political views may have been, attains office, and perhaps, in order that he may retain office, the old faith and the old shibboleths go and he seems to cut his coat according to his cloth in the way of politics; a strange virus seems to get into his blood, something that was not there before, something that, I may say, does not seem to suit him very well.

My hon. friend launched into an argument on the tariff, and he stated that the Opposition had done everything in its power to avoid the issue. He said further: What we want to know is just where they stand. If I know anything of the members of the Opposition, they are not attempting to avoid any issue as regards the tariff. When the tariff is brought down and when the proper time comes to discuss the tariff, every hon. member on this side will be found amply prepared to state his position. There is before the people to-day only one issue and it is not the tariff. What my hon. friends opposite would like, and what they are endeavouring to do on every available occasion, is to draw the tariff herring across the track so as to keep the people from thinking of the real issue, which is whether my hon. friends opposite should resign or not. It has been proved in the by-elections that that is the issue to-day, and on that issue I purpose speaking.

As I have already stated, a most chameleon-like change has come over the Minister of Militia and Defence in regard to his fiscal ideas. It is not so long ago that members on this side of the House introduced certain resolutions in regard to the tariff, the first one that I remember being in 1914, and another one in 1917. The first resolution was introduced in 1914 by Mr. Knowles of Moose Jaw, who was then a member of this House. This is Mr. Knowles' resolution:

> That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when, in the interest of the farmers, and consequently in the interest of the whole of Canada, the duties on agricultural implements should be forthwith removed.

The present Minister of Militia and Defence had some words to say upon that subject and they were no uncertain utterances; they were as clear-cut as they possibly could be. This is what he said, in speaking in this House on the 11th March, 1914, as reported at page 1566 of Hansard:

> Mr. Hugh Guthrie (South Wellington): I desire, before the motion is put, to offer a few remarks upon what I consider to be one of the most important questions with which this House has had to deal during the present session. We on this side of the House, and, I fancy, some members on the other side of the House, are not quite satisfied with the wave of the hand by which the right hon. the Prime Minister sought to relegate this important matter to the ash heap, or, at all events, to some place outside the precincts of this Chamber. The question is too big and too far-reaching in its consequences to be dealt with by the Prime Minister in a ten-minute speech, and by the silence of the members of a party numbering 130 or 140 in this Chamber. I have no doubt that there are many hon. members, supporters of the Government, who are very keenly interested in this matter—many of them representing rural ridings; many of them representing, as I do, both rural and urban populations—and who desire to give free expression to their thought and opinion upon this grave question.

And so on. I read that simply as an introduction to the speech which he delivered. Later in his speech the hon. gentleman referred to the Prime Minister of that day and said of that right hon. gentleman:

> He had not heard the case very fully argued; he said the Government would consider the question, but he stated, as deliberately as a

man could state it in the House, that on account of the trusts and combines of the United States it would not be possible to give free agricultural implements to the people of Canada. There is only one thing left for him to do, and that is to reduce the tariff on agricultural implements to a minimum. In my view, that will not be as satisfactory as the complete abolition of the duties upon agricultural implements.

Further on he said:

If these trusts cannot take possession of the British market, which is a free market, how could they take possession of the Canadian market if it were made a free market? To my mind, there is nothing in the argument of the Prime Minister. It was not a reason for refusing to abolish the duty; it was the merest kind of an excuse.

Then he went on:

I rose on this occasion chiefly because I think that some member from the province of Ontario should interject some remarks into this debate to show that the demand for agricultural implements is by no means limited to the western provinces of Canada. The riding which I have the honour to represent in this House is about equally made up of urban and of rural inhabitants. I am satisfied that, irrespective of party, the people engaged in agriculture in the county of Wellington, north or south, would hold up both hands for the boon of free agricultural implements.

Then he continued:

So I believe it is in the great province of Quebec and in the Maritime Provinces; certainly it is in the great western provinces of Canada. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, the demand is as broad as is the country. I then ask the Government: Why not accede to a demand of that kind when your revenue is going to suffer so little and when no Canadian industry is going to be injured?

He said further:

I desire in a few words to show that the removal, the entire abolition of the Canadian duties on agricultural implements, would not do an injustice to a single manufacturing establishment in Canada.

Therefore, in 1914, the present Minister of Militia and Defence was absolutely certain that free agricultural implements would be a great boon to the people of the Dominion; that it would help in cheapening food, and that it would not do one iota of injury to Canadian industries. Those are three very good reasons, and I submit that they still hold good to-day. Just one more quotation from my hon. friend's address:

I, for one, believe that of all the industries in Canada the agricultural implement industry is the one now best able to stand without the support of any customs tariff at all.

That was on the motion of Mr. Knowles. In 1917, this motion was moved by the Hon. Frank Oliver, then member for Edmonton:

[Mr. Pardee.]

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the public interset if the Customs Tariff Act were so amended as to provide:

1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.

2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery, and repairs for same, rough and partly-dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.

What did the Minister of Militia say at that time with respect to clause 2 of the resolution? He said this:

I therefore favour that portion of the amendment which provides that agricultural machinery shall be upon the free list. I favour the whole of the free list as set out in paragraph 2 of the amendment.

He further says:

And when I look at the trade returns and find that in item after item which it is now proposed to put upon the free list the revenue collected is so small as to be negligible, it seems to me clear that the time has come when the relief asked for in this clause of the amendment should be granted.

The Minister of Militia the other night directed his attention principally to the Farmers' party. He produced a catalogue and declaimed loudly against it. Well, that is quite within his privilege, so far as I am concerned, but I want to ask this: If the Farmers' party go on advocating, as they do advocate, and as we on this side of the House have advocated, that certain articles should be put upon the free list, does it lie in the mouth of any hon. member of this House, even the Minister of Militia himself, to find such fault with the Farmers' party that one would think they were doing some great national harm in expressing their views? Even if the farmers do not buy their agricultural machinery at home, but in the United States, there is this much to be said: the duty goes into the treasury of the people of Canada, and not to the manufacturers. Why, Sir, the Minister of Militia talked as if it was a matter of absolute disloyalty to buy anything outside of one's own country. Sir, until the millennium comes I think the people are going to buy where they can buy cheapest. It struck me as I heard that portion of the Minister's remarks, that I could see the beginning of the old flag waving again. Disloyalty for the farmers to buy in the cheapest market? Who has the right to accuse of disloyalty any class that acted so well as the farmers have done during the past few years? I say that such language comes not well from the Minister, and that that sort of argument should not be made.

In passing, I noticed the other day the report of a speech by an hon. member of the Senate, expressing the opinion that in view of the Fordney Bill which has just passed both houses in the United States there should be reprisals by the Dominion of Canada. Now I do not believe that that is a proper policy, or ever will be a proper policy, to pursue, either for the nation or for the individual. You will never get far down the road by adopting reprisals as a nation along these particular lines. The thing for the people of this country to do, so far as that question is concerned, is to keep their heads level and to attend to their own business along fiscal lines as it should be attended to, and let the other nations look out for themselves.

I desire now to take up what to my mind is the real issue before the people of this country. The Minister of Militia the other evening quoted many precedents to show that so far as the Government was concerned it was carrying out the will of the people in retaining office. Well, if precedents are to count, all I can say is this, that my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), in the excellent speech he made yesterday, with the precedents that he quoted absolutely swept the ground from under the feet of the Minister of Militia. I do not believe there is any judge who, hearing the matter argued legally, would not say that the precedents quoted by the hon. member for Quebec East outweighed the precedents quoted by the Minister of Militia. But, Sir, I am not concerned with precedents in this case. They do not appeal to me here, and for this reason: precedents ought not to weigh in the case before us because there was an absolute promise by this Government that on the conclusion of the war they would go to the country. It was plainly and distinctly understood, if ever anything in this world was understood, that that Government was formed for war purposes, and war purposes only; that it would endure only during the life of the war; and that when the war was concluded the people would be consulted. Why should the Government not have consulted them before now? The people of Canada have realized in the last year more than they ever realized before—because up to last year they had not taken the matter into their serious consideration—that since 1911 they have not had one single iota of a chance to pass upon questions affecting the Dominion of Canada. There has been no discussion upon public platforms; there has been no dissemination of opinion; there has been no attempt so far as our own political questions are concerned to educate the people. Therefore, I say that in view of that promise, which the people of Canada absolutely believed would be carried out, there is one thing, and one thing only for this Government to do, and that is to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the by-elections. Let us take the last five by-elections. The Government won three out of five. Now three of those elections were absolutely hand-picked, and in two of them ministers of the Crown were running. Can that be considered an expression of public opinion? Does anybody mean to say that because a few thousands of the millions of voters in Canada have expressed their opinion, that is a mandate for the Government to continue in office? I distinctly say it is not, and I believe the people of this country take the same view.

The Minister of Militia seemed to feel rather badly—perhaps his were only crocodile tears—about the "remnant" of Liberalism in Ontario. Let us admit for argument's sake that there are not many in this House, but what they are makes up for any lack of numbers. I want to tell the Government this: There is the healthiest "remnant" of Liberalism in the province of Ontario that there has been for many years, and it just wants a chance to act. There is Liberalism in the province of Ontario, the same old Liberalism it has always been, standing for freedom of thought and freedom of speech, well-settled theories and policies; and the Liberals of Ontario are quite content that these theories and these policies and these doctrines shall be tested out at the earliest possible moment. If the minister is so confident that there is only a remnant of it left, and that that remnant cannot accomplish much, one would at least suppose that under such circumstances the Government would have sufficient courage to go to the country and stand by the result. But the great trouble is that they lack any courage. This Government is like the clinging vine; it shoots out its tendrils in the direction of little by-elections which they calculate upon winning. Sometimes the tendrils do not find any purchase, they break, and down comes the vine; although occasionally the tendril succeeds in hanging on. But in each case in which it has hung on, the success has been

of no credit to the Government, because the constituency has been hand-picked. But while, in my opinion, at any rate, no Government knowing, as this Government knows, the attitude and the frame of mind of the people of Canada, should continue in office. Nevertheless this Administration persists in hanging on, it still clings tenaciously to its position. It will not be responsible to the people of Canada, whose opinions and desires it absolutely disregards. Why, under these circumstances, the Government continues to carry on, is a state of mentality on its part which I cannot grasp. I would at least say, in their position: Come on and we will have a fight; it will not be bloody; there will be a good deal of gas but that will not matter so long as we fight it out and see who is the winner: let us find out whom the people want as their servants, and when they have made their choice we are ready to obey their commands. Surely that is only logical and right, and I ask the Government to take this course. But, to my mind, the milk in the cocoanut was spilled by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) before he sat down. It is quite evident why they do not want to go to the country. We got a little inkling of it from the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), but we got it all from the Minister of Militia; and that was that on the grounds of equality there would be many times greater representation in the cities than in the rural districts. The Government know that their policy appeals to the big interests, and the big interests live in the cities. So that with a redistribution such as they propose to give them, the cities shall send such representatives as will vote in their interests. The rural representation, they expect, will be cut down to as great a degree as possible, while the urban they will build up, and build up, as I have no doubt they will do if they last long enough to make a redistribution—and make it in such a way that only their own supporters shall come from the cities. That is the reason there is no election and no appeal to the people; that is the reason why public opinion is being flouted day by day and the public are being told by this Government, who forget that they are the servants of the people: You attend to your own business and let us alone and we will attend to ours, and when we are ready we will ask for your advice. That is the whole kernel of that portion of their propaganda. The Minister of Militia the other night, by sort of process of elimination, finally figured out that although the Government did not deserve the confidence of many portions of the Dominion of Canada, still they had the confidence of some, and then at length he got down to the supposed fact, which he stated with great vehemence: "At least we have the confidence of the House of Commons." Well, it would appear to me when I arrived here about two weeks ago that possibly they had and possibly they had not. But I thought that if there was one thing which they did not have it was the confidence of the Commons; and I have no doubt to-day that if hon. members sitting on the other side of the House voted as their hearts dictate and not as the glory of office impels, they would vote in such a way as to show quite plainly that this Government has not the confidence either of the people or of the House of Commons.

Sir, I say again that precedents matter not. There was a promise and that promise should be absolutely carried out. We have the strange spectacle of two ex-ministers of the Administration sitting on this side of the House, both having resigned for the same reason and both of them now antagonistic to the Government. Is not that palpably an evidence that the Government has not the confidence of the House and certainly not of the pepole? When any Government, as this has done, has seen its followers leave it day by day, month by month, and year by year, it surely can come to one conclusion only, and that is that it is not wanted and that another is wanted in its stead. The great bête noir to hon. gentlemen opposite is the Farmers' party. Well, I hold no brief for that party, but I do say, as a Liberal, that if the farmers want a party of their own and desire to express certain views, they should be at perfect liberty to carry out that idea. This is an absolutely free country. Why, therefore, should there be any bitter feelings against any section of the people who desire to give expression to their views? Surely it has not come to such a pass in Canada that none can get together and express views or advance theories. It it has, then it is a sorry plight for this Dominion. But I do not believe that such is the case.

Now, I have only this to ask the Government, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that they trust the people. The people are not often wrong. In this strong, virile young country the people know pretty well what they want, and if they do go wrong they will very quickly get right again. I say, therefore, that the Government ought to trust the people and give them an opportunity

to say what Government they want at the present time. In other words, I commend to the members of the Government, in all fairness to the people of Canada, this exhortation: "Play up, play up, and play the game!"

Mr. FRED LANGDON DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the subject matter of the Address, may I express regret that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden), who led the Government previously to the present Prime Minister, is in such a state of health that he is unable now to take any large share in the affairs of the country. I should like also to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address and to express my appreciation of the manner in which they discharged their duties in this respect.

In 1908, when the present Prime Minister first sought election, I was a constituent in his riding and ineffectually did my best to keep him from coming here. I can now congratulate him on his brilliant and rapid rise to the position of Prime Minister. He is to my certain knowledge a true Conservative, tenacious of principles, and able in the advocacy of them, and the times are going to demand a man of such characteristics as their champion. These opinions are all going into the crucible, and they will have to undergo considerable refining and much change. While Union Government lasted, under the former Prime Minister, I endeavoured to give it my full support, and did so support it in all matters for which it was primarily formed. But it was inevitable that, in view of the procedure followed in the formation of this Government and the new issues, I must seek new alignments. Hence I find myself in "No Man's Land."

There is no political terminology apt in description of Union Government: It was not one party, it was not a coalition, it was not a fusion. When we first met in joint caucus I was surprised. During the war I said nothing, but in the second session I advocated a change to a coalition basis. I discussed this with some of the ministers. In the third session there was a caucus of Liberal Unionists to consider the future course. The decision was, to go on for the present as we had been doing. With that decision began the disintegration of the Liberal Unionist group and the present difficulties of the Government.

Because of lack of clear political definitions no political action in the constituencies was possible. When the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Calder) recently told the West that the Government had been too busy for political activity he talked bunkum. If we had been a coalition each member could have organized; but as the case stood we could do nothing. For a Conservative Unionist to organize, looked like throwing the Liberal Unionists overboard; and for a Liberal Unionist to organize was to seek a separate career and throw the Conservative Unionists overboard. We could not appeal to both until the future course was in some measure determined. The consequence was that as time went on confusion grew in the ridings; and as elections must be faced the confusion must be ended. As no preparation had been made in the ridings it only remained for the Government party in the House to attempt a fusion. This fusion is no wider than the House. If the Peterborough election demonstrates anything it is that the fusion has not included the electorate. Many Conservatives deprecated but they will finally accept it. Many Liberal Unionists doubted it and will finally reject it.

There were two opportunities for a coalition—one when the Government was formed and one after the war. Both were lost. The result is that the Government finds itself to-day out of touch with the electorate and generally unprepared for an election; and it needs time, desperately needs time.

Though forseeing the present position for myself, I supported the Government last session because it proposed to balance its expenditure with taxation. As the whole is greater than any part, so it seemed to me that to get a balance of taxation over expenditure was more important than an exact justice in any of the items making up that taxation. I had differed with the Government in its 1919 Budget, and last year re-stated some of my objections to its tariff policy. The member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said he was smoked out. He and some of his associates think I stayed until I bear on my garments the odor of the smoke that expelled him. I assure him that the fire never touched me.

In 1919, in association with a distinct group of Liberals in coalition, I could have continued in support of the Government, for issues had arisen which seemed to me important enough to justify such a course

could I have had assurance such as a coalition of that sort could give. Without such assurance, in complete surrender to the fiscal opinions held by four-fifths of the Government supporters, I found myself, on other issues, in fundamental disagreement, and so departed.

In the main I agree with the Progressive platform—at least as interpreted by the leaders of that party. The recall I would never accept, as it is not consonant with our system of representative government and degrades a member no matter what may be his service. I agree also with the leaders of the party that it must extend its membership with all classes of the community and free itself of any class organization or control.

With regard to the Liberal party, the presence in their ranks of many strong protectionists hampered Sir Wilfrid Laurier throughout his career, and forced him to opportunism on this question. At this stage in our affairs, despite the fact that this fiscal question is not of the essence of Liberalism, it is desirable that a government should come in unanimous as to protection or decided tariff reductions. The Liberal leader has not spoken with the same voice in the East as in the West; this opportunism is inopportune now. If he could tell the West his sympathy with its desires for reductions, he should be able to say to Montreal something thereon beyond this—that it is overshadowed by the larger question of restoring representative government. If the Liberal party had in 1911 to suffer the loss of its Toronto protectionists, 1921 may be the time to lose its Montreal protectionists; the omens forecast it.

The foregoing sufficiently discloses the attitude I shall take on the tariff. Let this be added. In examining the tariff it should be borne in mind that we have had practically the same policy for over forty years. No country will accept protection but on the principle that eventually competition among the encouraged industries will bring prices to the general world level. Canada before the war was one of the dearest countries of the world to live in. Have we got the competition expected? If not, why? Have combines defeated it? Has our tariff become an Old Age Pension instead of a Mother's Allowance?

This nation is now the upholder of Statism in its operation of a combined system of transportation by railways and steamships. The freight rates decision and policy thereon of the Government, have not been fully satisfactory to the country and I trust there may be laid before us some plan of getting better results. The operation of the railways calls for large improvement and possibly this will be effected when the Grand Trunk is finally taken over. If the Government would appoint a committee of the House to report thereon, I believe the country would approve.

In the past I have urged the attention of the House and the Government to consideration of a committee on Estimates as a great improvement in means of retrenchment. In other respects as well, this would have important results. The Minister of Finance led me to expect that a committee to consider and report thereon would be favoured by the Government and I take the earliest opportunity to refer to it. Discussion of it will be possible when a resolution now on the Order Paper is reached.

On the question of Imperial Relations, I have been pleased to see that the last two Prime Ministers of Canada have been in agreement in policy. This is a subject that should not come into party politics, and I regretted yesterday to hear the utterance of the member for East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe) thereon. Not a regard for the public interest, but party acrimony spoke them. I trust an opportunity to discuss on the floor of the House, the policy Canada shall pursue may be afforded.

The excess profits tax has long been marked for extinction as an unjust system in peace and directly making for inflation. As the British Government has announced that there it will be discontinued, it is to be hoped that it may be reformed out of existence here.

The natural resources are more strongly than ever being demanded by the Western Provinces. The position of those provinces as inferior members of Confederation must be reformed so that the same principles shall prevail in all, that no grievance as to status may mark our full stature of nationhood.

Finally, with regard to the sub-amendment which I have seconded, its first consideration is the country's interest, and not the tactics of party strife. The Government's supporters who demand redistribution, as I did last year, must recognize that without a miracle the Government must disappoint them. As it cannot recognize, and may very probably be defeated, any Budget adopted this year cannot settle business conditions. If the Government can carry its Budget, and as obviously it

seeks to make the tariff the next issue, it cannot let that issue stale by postponing its appeal to 1922. Add the three components —inability to organize until the eve of an election, unsettled business, and an issue shaped to its liking, and the result is undoubtedly an election this fall. If the interests of the country are consulted, a redistribution will be made before this session closes and a House properly representative will be returned to deal with all the many great and disputed questions.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I wish to associate myself with all that has been already said in a complimentary way of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and also of the mover and seconder of the Address. I particularly desire to associate myself with what was said by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid). I think in the few words he contributed he gave excellent advice to the Prime Minister.

Now, coming to the particular questions before the House, it is not my intention to devote very much time to the resolution, for I think the ground has been almost entirely covered; there may be one or two phases of it which I may touch upon if time will permit. In the meantime I wish particularly to direct my remarks to some of the matters discussed by the right hon. the Prime Minister during his tour of Canada shortly after his elevation to the chief citizenship of the Dominion. Some of those statements reflect specifically on the people whom he describes as being particularly represented by this group. In justice to myself, to our organization and to the people referred to, I deem it my duty to deal with some of those statements.

The Prime Minister directed his attention to the farmers first, I believe, during the by-election in Colchester, when he described them as being in alliance with, I think he termed them, seditionists, wreckers, Bolshevists and other people whose doctrines were preached only in one country in the world at the present time. To this statement, Sir, I take the strongest exception.

4 p.m. I do not think that a grosser misrepresentation was ever made of any class or group of people. I shall therefore give a few illustrations to show to hon. members and to the people just the position that the farmers assumed during the crucial period in the history of our country. It is not pleasant for me to have to deal with this matter, and up to the present time I have refrained from referring to it in this House, but my duty now compels me to demonstrate the absolute baselessness of the statement of the Prime Minister. I will be as brief as I can and will commence at a point shortly after the war broke out.

In the month of February, 1915, we held a convention of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Association and a movement was started, known as the Patriotic Acre Movement. At that time a plan was undertaken whereby every member in our organization who possibly could would make a contribution towards a fund by donating a certain number of bushels of wheat produced on his land. The net result of that movement was that during the following summer an entire trainload of wheat, consisting of forty cars, was delivered at the port of Montreal free on board a transport to the order of the British Government. My hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) corrects me—it was a trainload of flour consisting of forty 80,000-pound cars. This meant quite a large contribution. But in addition to that trainload of flour an additional $20,000 remained in the fund, and that sum has been invested in Government bonds, the interest on which, amounting to $1,000 each year, is paid over to the Children's Pavilion in connection with the sanitarium on the Qu'Appelle lakes in the province of Saskatchewan. So it will be seen from this example alone that we have not got very many Bolshevik tendencies in our organization.

Mr. EDWARDS: Nobody said you had.

Mr. MAHARG: However, I will proceed to show that we at least attempted to do our part in that time of national crisis. The House may not remember, but the farmers of Western Canada remember very well the first action the Government took in dealing with the wheat of the West. They commandeered several million bushels in fact all of the standard grades of wheat then in store at the head of the Lakes. That wheat was paid for at a price $1.20 per bushel or which approximated two-thirds of the subsequent value of the wheat of that particular crop. The farmers made no particular outcry. They took the view that if it was absolutely necessary for the Government to pursue this course, well and good. But I will have a little more to say in connection with that if I get time to touch on the appointment of the proposed commission to inquire into the grain trade. Then further action was

taken subsequent to the appointment of the Board of Grain Supervisors. Reprentatives of the agriculturists of Western Canada were called into conference in the city of Winnipeg, and were asked to name a price that they thought would be fair for their wheat. That conference was held and a price was submitted. The minimum price was $1.50, the maximum price was $1.90, but a flat rate of $1.70 per bushel was considered preferable. As a matter of fact the actual price which the farmers of Western Canada were paid for their wheat under the Board of Grain Supervisors' recommendation was $2.20 per bushel. So you will see that even from a mercenary point of view they offered to take fifty cents less for their wheat than what the Board of Grain Supervisors thought was a fair price.

Now, we will go on a little further and relate another instance. In that peaceful province of British Columbia where the people are so peaceful that they raised no objection to accepting all the products of the Western farmer, on which their is no duty, or to letting us, in turn, have the products of their orchards in the form of apples and other fruits, in connection with which there is a nice little profit to them by way of duty. Nevertheless, peaceful as they are, trouble started in Vancouver. It gradually filtered through until it got into Alberta; it went from there to Manitoba, and a serious situation was arising. At the height of that trouble the one man in Canada more particularly charged with the maintenance of law and order in Western Canada than any other man came to the executive of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Organization, which was in session in the city of Regina, and, in confidence, laid the whole matter before them and asked their hearty co-operation should the worst come to the worst. In fact, he told us he was convinced that the agriculturists of the West—our organization—was the only organization that he believed could successfully cope with the situation if the worst came to the worst. Now, this man, who knows the West, I believe, better than any other man, has no thought in his mind of any Bolshevists, seditionists, or anything else of that kind being in that organization. I am citing the case of the Saskatchewan organization simply because I am quite familiar with what was done there. But I have alsolutely no reason to believe, and do not believe that any different spirit existed in the other provincial organizations.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILL

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, his Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned.

The Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following Bill:

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the Motion of Mr. James McIsaac for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Campbell, resumed.

Mr. MAHARG: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended, I was dwelling on the actions and attitude of the farmers of the West during the war period, and I want to go just a little further in that respect and say a word or two regarding their actions and contributions towards patriotic efforts during the war. The one great patriotic movement was, I believe, the Red Cross, and as regards provincial contributions towards the Red Cross, the province of Saskatchewan came second in the Dominion of Canada. A further contribution which I have in mind at the present time was that undertaken by Dr. Robertson on behalf of the relief of the devastated areas in France, and the contributions from Saskatchewan towards that fund took first place in the Dominion of Canada.

I come to the election of 1917, the crucial test of the entire Dominion as to just what action and attitude our people were going to take as regards the steps necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. What was the result in Saskatchewan? We have in that province sixteen constitu-

encies, and every one of them returned to this House a man instructed by the vote behind him to give his fullest support to everything necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. There were no vacancies whatever; the front was a solid one, and I think I can go further and say that in proportion to the vote taken, the majorities given in that province exceeded those given in any other province in Canada. I want to go just a little further to show what was the attitude of even this group, although it was referred to by the Prime Minister himself as not representing the farmers; indeed, his words as quoted, were that "the Crerar bunch did not represent the farmers." I am not going to argue the point as regards representing the farmers; evidently, the idea that he was trying to impress upon the people by his words was that we were more or less of a Bolshevik class. To disprove any such idea as that, I think I have in sight sufficient evidence, namely, the fact that 50 per cent of the total group of cross-benchers had sons in khaki during the war. That should prove that they are not too bad a kind of "Bolsheviks," even if some people should try to tag them with that name.

I come to the last feature, the final proof of their attitude and their sincerity. A couple of months or so ago at our convention in Saskatchewan, we unveiled an honour roll which, I think, for a provincial organization, cannot be exceeded in numbers by any other organization in Canada. We had a scroll in the neighourhood of four feet square, and it was covered with names as closely written by a pen as it was possible to write them. I have not the exact number, but I should say that it contained the names of close to one thousand men who had made the last and supreme sacrifice for their country. It seems, indeed, rather strange that, while the heart-wounds were still bleeding, the Prime Minister of this country should endeavour to hold up the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters and others closely connected to them, as a group of people seeking an alliance with those who had not the best interest of our country at heart. Such action comes with very bad grace from him; further, it very ill becomes the Prime Minister of this country, or even anyone supporting his Government, to talk of "alliances." Most of us have a very vivid remembrance of an alliance made, I think, in 1911, by the then Conservative party. We may be accused of a number of things, but I do not think anyone can accuse us of forming an alliance with those who were prepared to shoot holes in the Union Jack as did the Conservative party at that time.

The Prime Minister started on his Western tour, and he was met in Winnipeg by a committee representing citizens of the province of Saskatchewan. The primary cause of the appointment of this committee was the discontinuance of the Wheat Board. There was held in a town in Saskatchewan a public meeting to which representatives of the different boards of trade of the towns along the line, municipal officers and the public generally were invited, and were present at that meeting. A committee of three was appointed, one of them being the mayor of the town in which the meeting was held and the other two being representative farmers of the districts represented at that meeting. This committee proceeded to Winnipeg to endeavour to impress the Prime Minister with the importance of re-establishing the Wheat Board. They had an interview with him, and, amongst other things, he told them that the re-establishment of the Wheat Board had never been asked for, either inside the House of Commons or out of it. I think most hon. members who were here last year know very well whether the re-establishment of the Wheat Board for another year was asked for or not. I will take the liberty of quoting from Hansard one or two things that I said myself in respect of the Wheat Board. I will be as brief as I can. Speaking on this subject in the House of Commons I said (Hansard 1920, p. 2636):

> Just so long as the pooling arrangement exists on the other side where our wheat is marketed, we must have a similar arrangement here; if Governments are going to buy, the Governments will have to sell.

So that the Prime Minister will not be of the opinion that he was not in the House at the time I was speaking, I will quote from my remarks in connection with the Wheat Board at the time when the enabling legislation was before the House, and the Prime Minister was in his seat just across the floor from where I was speaking. The gentleman who had preceded me had been trying to convince the House that the farmers themselves were not satisfied with the Wheat Board, and in reply to that, and speaking on behalf of the farmers, I said (Hansard 1920, p. 4131):

We are perfectly satisfied, and we have been satisfied, with the method that had been adopted in handling the grain. I should have been pleased had the hon. gentleman furnished some proof in support of his statement. If it is not satisfactory to them (the farmers), why are they, as a body, from one end of the country to the other, asking that this enabling power be given . . . . At their convention they went further; they asked not only enabling legislation, but that the Government continue the Wheat Board for another year. The Canadian Council of Agriculture passed a similar resolution, and recently, through their executive they have again stated that as long as there is Governmental control of buying in European markets, we must have Governmental control in Canada in regard to disposing of our wheat.

There are several other quotations I could give. Here is one (Hansard 1920, p. 4133):

We have been told that this is paternalism. In what way is it paternalism? We have been told that we are asking for protection. I have stated in this House more than once that we never asked for protection; never asked for a fixed price to the producers. We never asked for that at all; all that we are asking for now is: Since you have forced it on us; since you have disorganized conditions, and since the price was fixed for one purpose or two purposes at the utmost, you must continue this so long as conditions remain as they are in European countries.

There are several other passages I could quote from different pages, but my time is limited. I think I have quoted enough to show that the Wheat Board had been asked for both in this House and outside.

The Prime Minister on his tour visited several western cities. I heard him speak in the city of Moosejaw on his way west, and on his return he spoke in the city of Saskatoon. When speaking of the Wheat Board there after being persistently questioned as to why the Wheat Board was discontinued, and he is reported in the Saskatoon Star of November 13, 1920, as follows:

Stand on Wheat Board Question.

He reviewed the circumstances which led to the organization last year of the Wheat Board. Immediately after the passing of the Act he was attacked in the West on its account, and up to the time control was dropped the government had no word of commendation. In the House they were criticized by those supposed to represent peculiarly the farmers' views.

Now, I have absolutely no recollection, and I do not think Hansard will show, that one word of criticism was offered from those supposed specially to represent the farmers. The report continues:

This year the board was discontinued because careful investigations showed, he said, that further control was not in the public interest. He gave as reasons the absence of wheat control in the United States and the absence of controled buying in Britain.

[Mr. Maharg.]

Now I state, and I defy contradiction, that at the time this enabling legislation was passed there was control in the buying of wheat in Great Britain—full government control. At the time the Minister made this statement in Saskatoon, exactly the same control existed, and it exists today. I think my right hon. friend, as First Minister of this country, should be a little more conversant with the facts before he undertakes to discredit the representatives of agriculture in Western Canada.

I want to say a word or two as to the results of the discontinuation of the Wheat Board. In the first place, at the time the market was thrown open, things were going along very nicely in Western Canada. We had in sight, as we supposed, good and substantial reasons for continued prosperity throughout the West. While we did not have a heavy yield, we had a fair average yield, and the price at that time was such as to allow a fair return to the producer over and above the cost of production. But immediately the market was thrown open, or shortly after, the prices started to slump, and the result was that business so far as the West was concerned became stagnant. For the sake of illustration, I might quote a conversation I had with a merchant in one of the towns. He told me how business had been going on, and to mark the contrast he instanced several articles, among them fruit. He said that previously to the slump in the price of grain his customers were taking out apples by the box, two or three boxes at a time, but, he said, within a week after the price of grain slumped, his customers instead of buying apples by the box, were buying twenty-five and fifty cents' worth at a time and taking them home in paper parcels. He said the same was true of sugar, tea, and in fact, all the staple commodities. His customers instead of taking supplies sufficient to last two or three months were taking just enough to keep them living from hand to mouth. It was only a matter of time for the stagnation to spread, and soon the wholesalers were hit, then the jobbers and manufacturers, and eventually the labourers when the manufacturers ceased to produce. I think you can trace the general stagnation in business very largely to the fact that the Wheat Board was discontinued.

We have heard a lot about the adverse balance of trade with the United States. In my opinion, the discontinuance of the Wheat Board will be responsible, before the entire crop is marketed, to the extent

of at least $100,000,000 of our adverse balance of trade with the United States. I do not think I am exaggerating one bit when I say that the amount of grain purchased from Western Canada by the United States at the reduced price consequent on the discontinuance of the Wheat Board will amount to at least $100,000,000 before the season is over. That is one hundred million less will be paid by the United States on account of the drop in price.

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend contend that the price of wheat is fixed by the Wheat Board, or was when the Wheat Board was in existence, or by the European market—the Liverpool market, as it is known.

Mr. MAHARG: I am quite prepared to admit that it was the European market, and I think the European market would have been very satisfactory this year if the Wheat Board had been continued, but it was not. I might ask the hon. gentleman a question. Why is it that wheat went away down to $1.25 a bushel and then rose close to $2.00 a bushel? Had there been any change in the European conditions? I am speaking of the price paid to the farmer at the initial point. Large quantities of our grain were sold for $1.25 at the initial point. Was there anything in the conditions of the European market or anywhere else to justify that. I might go a little further on that point. We all remember that the Winnipeg grain exchange representatives came here during last session and how the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) assisted them very materially and how caustic he was in his remarks about the Wheat Board. We have a vivid recollection of these things. They, the Winnipeg grain exchange representatives, told us that if the market were thrown open, we would get $4 or $5 a bushel for our wheat. Of course, we took that with a grain of salt, but we were prepared to continue the Wheat Board and let them secure the world's market for us. That price, however, never materialized.

Last fall, in order to be in some degree consistent with their previous statements, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange undertook to give reasons why the market had slumped, or why these prices had not been paid, and they had to take the prospective crops of the large producing countries, such as Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and India, in order to make anything like the showing there was the previous year, and even then they were some 60,000,000 bushels short. But what was the actual result? The market went away down while the harvests of these countries were merely in prospect, but when these crops were assured definitely and some of them harvested, that is, when the prospects had become a reality, the price started going up again until it reached 50 cents, 60 cents, and even 75 cents a bushel higher than it had been on the prospective results. Will my hon. friend say that the European market or world conditions had anything to do with that? I do not think so. We shall have to look elsewhere to find out why that happened. It happened simply because of the non-existence of the Wheat Board to steady the market in order that there might not be five, ten, or twenty thousand sellers to one or two buyers. No one was expecting big prices from the buyers, but we were expecting the stabilization of prices so that those who were unable to get their wheat out early would receive at least a fair proportion of return from the whole crop.

Now, another statement which the Prime Minister made in the West was that we never had the courage to move the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture as an amendment to the Budget. Well, he might have gone a little further, if he wanted to be fair, and told them that why we did not move it as an amendment for the reason, as this House knows very well, that a second amendment to the Budget is not permissible, owing to some old custom whose origin I do not know but which I think must have been conceived in medieval ages, for it is as far behind the times as anything can possibly be, and why it should continue I cannot say. Had it been in order, the platform would have been moved as an amendment. However, the next best thing was done and the Prime Minister must know that it was placed on Hansard by myself, I think in either the first or the second session I attended Parliament. It is on Hansard as public property and every one is free to scrutinize it to his heart's content, and the more that is done the better we shall like it, for we have nothing to fear.

I want to touch upon one or two remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), who, I am sorry, is not in his seat at the present moment. One of the strangest attitudes which any person could adopt was the critical view which the minister took of the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He criticised that hon. member rather severely because he ventured to take up some of the

time of the House in dealing with the fiscal policy of Great Britain. He thought he might have been better engaged discussing the fiscal policy of Canada. Well, I am not going to say that I disagree with him there, but there were certain conditions that led up to the hon. member for Red Deer discussing the fiscal policy of Britain. During the last session of Parliament no less a personage than the present Prime Minister himself spent considerable time discussing Britain's trade policy, and drawing attention to the results of that policy as he saw them; and, among other things, Great Britain was represented as a land of paupers and incompetents, all on account of its fiscal policy. Now, I wonder if there are any Canadians small enough to deny a gentleman, especially one who hails from the Old Land, the privilege of stating to this House the exact position of Great Britain in relation to pauperism and incompetency. I think this House will agree with me that the hon. member for Red Deer very ably answered the arguments of the Prime Minister and demonstrated to him that far from pauperism and incompetency being the condition of Great Britain, matters had gone in the other direction continuously for years and years and that a change had come very shortly after she had adopted the free trade policy. I think it very unfair for any one to try to deny any member of this House the privilege of defending not only the land of his birth but the particular part of a country in which he might have resided at a particular time.

The Minister of Militia went a little further in his defence of the Government and said that the Government must be judged on its record since last July. That is all very well, but it should work both ways. While the Prime Minister was out West speaking to the electorate there, I think he took credit for almost everything that the Conservative party had accomplished since away back in 1878. Now, if he is going to take credit for the good things which the Government preceding his own Administration achieved, then, logically, he must assume responsibility for some of the other things that do not look so well. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) instanced the five by-elections that have taken place since July last, asserting that the Government had won three seats out of the five. I do not need to dwell on this point, as it has been touched on by some of the speakers who have addressed the House since the minister made his speech.

[Mr. Maharg.]

But there are one or two of the elections which we might refer to briefly, such, for instance, as the contests in East Elgin and West Peterborough. These seats were not selected by the Government; the other three, or at least two of them, were, and, Sir, I think we are safe in concluding that the Yale seat was very carefully considered before it was thrown open. Had there been any fear so far as that constituency is concerned, I think the present representative would have been expounding the gospel of protection through the columns of his paper rather than from a place on the floor of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, they deemed it a perfectly safe seat, and I will say that we are very glad indeed to have the present representative (Mr. McKelvie) with us. Now, what about West Peterborough? I do not know whether it is true or not, but word has trickled through to Western Canada that there was some promise or other in connection with a dam that was to be built there. I have not heard the rumour contradicted, and I take it for granted that there must have been something to substantiate it. Well, dams are, of course, supposed to be built to stop flows. It is quite evident that that dam did not stop the flow of voters in West Peterborough. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think that instead of damming the flow of votes it had the result of damning the Government to a certain extent, and I think it would have been wise on the part of the Government to have been more circumspect in their promises. Of course, whether the dam will be built remains to be seen.

Now, I come to another part of the speech of the Minister of Militia, a part which I think was uncalled for. I think that I can prove to this House before I conclude that instead of the United Grain Growers' Company being the chief sinner there are others equally as bad, although their professions would lead you to think that they were almost sprouting wings so far as this matter is concerned. The hon. gentleman maintained that the United Grain Growers' Company were dealing solely, or practically so, in American implements. Reasons were given a year ago by myself on the floor of the House why farmers' companies were dealing in American implements, the prime reason being that the Canadian manufacturers absolutely refused to sell any kind of implement to the Farmers' Co-operative Companies. Now, Sir, I know whereof I speak, for about fifteen or sixteen years ago we formed a Co-operative Farmers'

Company locally in our own district. Among other things we decided that we would handle the large implements and carload requirements of the district, and we undertook to see if we could secure implements. Sir, we could not obtain even a wheelbarrow or a hand cultivator, let alone the big implements for the farm. We had to go to the United States to get every single one of them.

An hon. MEMBER: They would not even sell to the returned soldiers.

Mr. MAHARG: Sir, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) a few nights ago illustrated what the Drury Government were doing in the purchase of their graders. He said they were using American road graders. I venture to make the assertion that it is quite possible the same principle extended even to the matter of supplying a Farmers government with the necessary implements for taking care of the roads. It is just possible something of the same spirit may have been manifested there; and it would be well if the member for Brantford would look into the question. It might also be well for him to inquire into the matter as regards previous governments. Are we to understand that the Whitney government never had occasion to use a road grading machine during their term of office? Or is it a fact that the Canadian machine was of such a character that it would not do the work, and when a progressive government came in they had to obtain a grader of a suitable type? There are several features in connection with this matter that are well worth looking into.

Now, while the hon. member for Brantford is in my mind I want to thank him for the kind compliment he paid to our little Group here. I am sorry, Sir, that in some respects I cannot return the favour; I wish very much I could. He spoke of the rotund figures, the ruddy countenances, and the youthful appearance of gentlemen on this side. I think I can return the compliment only to this extent that the hon. gentleman is very sprightly in appearance. I want to consider further for a time the matter of the purchase of American implements. I was about to express my sorrow that the member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) was not in the House, but I now observe him sitting opposite me, and I am very glad of the fact. About the time that the war was on—I just mention this fact so that the House may make allowance for some of the utterances of the hon. member for Regina —the hon. member undertook to write a war pamphlet and gave it a very striking title. When I mention the title the House will be good enough to understand that the choice of the words is not mine, they were the selection of the hon. member. The title of the pamphlet is:
"After Hell—What?"

An hon. MEMBER: That is awful. What does it mean.

Mr. MAHARG: I am merely giving the title of the pamphlet, I am not going to undertake to answer the question. I now hold in my hand an extract from that pamphlet and the peculiar thing is that it only came into my possession to-day. It really would appear as though it were an act of Providence. The extract came in by mail this morning. I knew nothing about its coming here, I made no inquiry about it; the fact is that when I opened my mail I found this extract and I am going to read it to the House. My hon. friend says in the extract:

> And if our manufacturers would do business according to the foundation spirit of the protective tariff which they enjoy, instead of the least possible production with the largest possible profit, we would to-day have cities with millions and employment for hundreds of thousands more than we have.

The hon. gentleman further says:

> No need then to write about getting profitable work for returned soldiers. How well the writer recalls the spirit in which Sir John Macdonald laid the National Policy: "Tall chimneys for every hamlet and work for every man." But he conceived a body of manufacturers who would be content with enlarged markets—not enlarged profits in the same old restricted market. He conceived manufacturers who would supply the need, thus employing multitudes of men. There are two ways a tariff can affect a manufacturer. He can be content with a small profit and thus hold the whole market, or he can raise his price to the level of the tariff, sell a little here and there at enormous profits and enjoy the results while the country damns him.

Now this is the significant part—and that is why I introduce it in connection with the purchase of American machinery by the United Grain Growers—this is the significant part of the whole thing. He goes on to say:

> Go over to the North side of Regina and in half an hour you will see what a wrong conception the Canadian manufacturer has of the Canadian tariff. Acre after acre with foreign made goods; here and there a Canadian made machine—that exception amply testifying to the small soul and narrow vision of the manufacturer who made it.

Mr. CRERAR: Who wrote that?

Mr. MAHARG: This is a quotation from the pamphlet to which I have referred writ-

ten by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan). I think that in itself goes to prove there must surely be others than the United Farmers who are buying American implements. Let me quote a little further:

Can we give employment to our returned men when that condition prevails? Can we be considered industrially alive when that is the established order? We Canadians have time after time declared our faith in a protective tariff, and I am a protectionist yet, but I would be darned well ashamed of myself were I a manufacturer enjoying 35 per cent tariff and still see foreigners running off with most of my preserve. There is something wrong with the Canadian manufacturer; he wants a jolt; a head-on collision, as a matter of fact something that will knock him clean out of his state room into the day coach where he can get some idea of what surrounds him. Grit or Tory or Unionist has no objection to being decent to him as long as he is alive; but we are tired carrying a corpse. These dead men who imagine they are going to feed returned men on tariff are a menace to our country to-day. If they will but shut up and get busy and make goods, selling them at a reasonable profit, so that they will sell them, and thereby make more goods, thus employing returned and other men, we could forgive them. But if they start any more of this doling out tariff from their measly little shops where tariff and profit are the chief things they manufacture (except nerve), then they had better quit, for our country is in no mood to tolerate their unprogressiveness and lack of enterprise. Western Canada at least will tolerate a tariff more willingly than they will manufacturing sloth. If the tariff is designed to increase manufacture, and thus give employment, then it must do what it is designed to do, or cease to exist. A market big enough to keep every returned soldier employed exists and it is not proposed that the tariff beneficiaries shall by means of that interpretation of the tariff which yields big profits on a small output rather than small profits on a big output, prevent our returned men from engaging in the supply of that market. The contracted conception of his duty as a manufacturer enjoying exceptional privileges, which our manufacturers have, is the biggest stumbling block to-day in the way of getting employment for our returned men. If our manufacturers are to get the profits of a protective tariff then they must at least make an attempt to supply the goods that the tariff protects. Otherwise the tariff has no virtue. Who in Canada will say that our manufacturers have been equal to our Canadian market? Go into our stores and buy Canadian goods if you can, and there get your answer. Our warehouses the same. Wake up manufacturers, and make your factories Canadian size. If you don't the Government will be justified in wiping out every vestige of protection you have."

Mr. DUFF: Where is the title to come in?

Mr. MAHARG: I will leave that to the imagination of the hon. member. As I said before, I will not attempt to answer the question. But I wish to compliment the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) on his ability in writing a pamphlet that I consider deals directly and specifically with what we are troubled with to-day in so far as unemployment is concerned.

[Mr. Maharg.]

Mr. BELAND: Will my hon. friend say when this pamphlet was published?

Mr. MAHARG: It would be perhaps two years ago.

Mr. BELAND: By whom?

Mr. MAHARG: By the hon. member for Regina.

Mr. COWAN: And the hon. member for Regina stands by every word he wrote.

Mr. MAHARG: Certainly.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Cross the floor and take a seat over here.

Mr. MAHARG: I just wish to compliment the hon. gentleman on having written the one thing that we need to consider at the present time if we are to get rid of unemployment.

Mr. COWAN: That is what I want done.

Mr. MAHARG: Now, Sir, I shall go a little further with these great patriots who cry "Buy in Canada," and who were talking to us the other night. When we come here for the session we usually send down to the Distribution office to get a few supplies. After the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) I thought I would examine these supplies to see where they were purchased. Among the dozen or so articles there is a pair of scissors, which I found were made in Newark, New Jersey.

An hon MEMBER: Where is that?

Mr. MAHARG: I think the House knows very well where New Jersey is. It is just across the river from the city of New York. I found the lead pencils that carried a mark were of British make; I found the rubber eraser was made in the United States by the Goodyear company; the pyramid of desk pins were made in the state of Connecticut; the little thumb clips were also of British make; of the three pen points, two were made in the United States and one in Great Britain; the pen holder was also made in Great Britain; and, Sir, the one redeeming feature of the whole outfit that the maker had thought fit to mark was a bottle of mucilage, which was inscribed thus—"Boston, Montreal, New York, Chicago."

Mr. BELAND: Will my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. MAHARG: Certainly.

Mr. BELAND: A statement was made to me that a large part of the implements used at the Brandon Experimental farm are

of American make. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to give the House some information in that regard?

Mr. MAHARG: Mr. Speaker, I would not care to make a statement as to that. I do know that at the Experimental farms I have visited there are American implements. Of course there may be a reason for it, and we are prepared to be lenient. But we do object to hon. members of the Government and their supporters continually accusing us over here of buying American-made goods when we are absolutely helpless in securing them from Canadian manufacturers because of their refusal to sell to us. This great Government institution can compel Canadian firms to sell to them, and yet in the little equipment I have in my desk upstairs there is not a single article that can be guaranteed as being of Canadian manufacture.

Mr. ETHIER: Not even the matches distributed to the rooms.

Mr. MAHARG: I am not a smoker, consequently I have not had an opportunity of examining the matches, but I am prepared to take the hon. gentleman's word for it. I am going to extend my inquiries and see how far this system of buying non-Canadian goods extends in the Government's purchases; it may go much further.

Now, Sir, a matter which is apparently uppermost in the minds of some of the hon. members across the floor is the appointment of a commission to inquire into the grain trade. So far as I am concerned if anything can be accomplished by appointing a commission of inquiry I will be only too glad to support them in every way, and so far as our particular company is concerned, we will give them every assistance, as we have absolutely nothing to conceal.

But, Sir, I wonder why there is
5 p.m. all this solicitude on the Government benches at this time for an inquiry into the grain trade. Of course the reason is the discontinuance of the Wheat Board. But I make this assertion, that had there been one-half the enthusiasm on the other side of the House in favour of the re-establishment of the Wheat Board that there is now for an inquiry into the grain trade, the Wheat Board would have been continued without a doubt.

And, Sir, from the way this matter is being advanced it does not look very reassuring. If the statements that we hear as to the personnel of the commission have any foundation whatever, then I doubt very much whether the farmers of Western Canada will be at all satisfied. But if the Government are going to appoint a commission, I want that commission clothed with the fullest authority to make an inquiry into every transaction in the grain trade, particularly the transactions in connection with the commandeering of our wheat, the sales of wheat by the Trade Commission overseas, and such like matters. We would like to know what happened. For instance, when that wheat was commandeered in Western Canada the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said it was absolutely necessary to get the wheat right away, that they could not wait to buy it on the market. I should like the proposed commission to inquire into and find out just why such a length of time was given to the people who were supposed to have this wheat in their elevators at Fort William to make delivery of it. I am informed, I think on the best authority, that months elapsed before this wheat was delivered. We have a very good idea why there was that interval, but we would like this commission to say why. We would also like to know why at a certain time this year, when the terminal elevators contained 17,000,000 bushels, one company handling about one-tenth of the grain had one-quarter of the grain in the terminals in its possession held for orders from the farmers. On this basis there should have been forty million bushels in the terminal elevators. Where was it? This is something for the proposed commission to inquire into. We would like to know if the Government officials permitted this wheat to be moved without the surrender of the documents calling for that wheat. Where did it go? Those are some of the things we would like to know. If there is any laxity there among the Government officials, and if any inquiry is needed, it is only because the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, which is the servant of this Government, is not living up to its duties. It has got every last power in its hands to inquire into everything mentioned by hon. members opposite, except the matter of the street price; everything else is entirely in the hands of that Commission, and at any time it can make the fullest inquiry it may see fit, and nothing in the world can prevent it taking action if it desires to do so.

Why do we need another commission? Are the Government going to appoint a commission to inquire into its own servant, the Canadian Grain Commission? Unless the proposed commission is appoint-

ed with full authority to inquire into everything connected with the grain trade, then, Sir, the Government might just as well not appoint it at all. I welcome the appointment of a commission that will go the length I have outlined. It might even make a little inquiry into the workings of the Canada Wheat Board. Not that I think the actions of the Board in any particular needs inquiring into, but I should like to know, for my own satisfaction, if any individuals attempted to get in between that Board and some of the starving European countries that needed our wheat.

The member for Kindersley (Mr. Myers) tried to leave the impression upon the House the other night that I was opposed to the Canada Wheat Board, and to Government control of our wheat crop. Well, Sir, everyone who has attended the sessions of this House or has read Hansard, must know that ever since the Government took control of the marketing of our wheat I have been a consistent supporter of continued Government control in some form or other. The hon. member for Kindersley and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), who introduced this question, know very well that in the session of 1919 I, with them, had many interviews with the then Minister of Finance and the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, the member for Halifax, with a view to persuading them not to throw the market open again. They know very well that I was many times their chief spokesman in this respect. But, Sir, I want to go just a little further. At the meeting of the Canadian Council of Agriculture shortly before the market was thrown open, a committee was appointed. The member for Kindersley said he did not think that the directors of the two companies gave to the continuance of the Canada Wheat Board the support that they should. But who were the members of that committee? The general manager of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, the assistant manager of United Grain Growers, Limited, and myself. I was not in attendance at the committee meetings, but this committee drafted the proposal that was placed in the hands of the committee appointed by the Government at the conference held here; its report was furnished in detail and was acted on and carried out under the management of the Canada Wheat Board. It ill becomes any hon. member to try to show to the House that the directors of this Company or myself or anyone else connected with it was not in favour of the continuance of the Wheat Board or of the control of the marketing of our wheat. However, the circumstances surrounding the whole thing go to show that the two companies themselves formulated a scheme and placed it in the hands of the committee on the very day that the conference was held here in Ottawa—a conference attended by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Who knows very well that the facts are as I have stated them.

There are several other things that this proposed commission, if it is appointed, might inquire into, but time will not permit my going into them. But there is another matter to which I wish to refer while the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) is seated opposite me. During the course of his remarks the other day, the hon. member said something to the effect that the apple growers of British Columbia were feeding their best apples to their cows. Well, Sir, it is most peculiar how things happen. A document, of the existence of which I was unaware, was placed in my hands to-day—evidently the people are watching us. This document comes from British Columbia, it is directed to the editor of the Regina Leader.

Mr. COWAN: And telegraphed to you yesterday.

Mr. MAHARG: It does not matter where it comes from or how it came here; it is the meat of the article that is of interest to this House. It is a genuine document; it is in my hands, and that is what counts. It states:

Dear Sir:

You quote Dr. Cowan in your issue of February 22 as having read on the floor of the House on the 21st instant a quotation from a letter received by him from a British Columbia correspondent, stating that the British Columbia growers were feeding their best apples to their cows. I would suggest that Dr. Cowan's correspondent was trying to put one over on the Doctor. Best grades of apples are quoted in the stores here in Penticton to-day at $3.25 per box. If there is such a thing as a slack market for apples, the abominable express rates, not the tariff, are responsible for it. Two days ago a friend of mine who was on a visit here secured four boxes of apples from a grower, got a dray and took them to the express office to ship to Chaplin, Sask., but when he asked the express he found it would cost him $10.50 to send the four boxes to Chaplin, so he decided rather than pay such extortionate rates to try and re-sell the apples here, which he did. You also quote the Doctor as saying that he had yet to find one Liberal in Regina who was satisfied with Mr. King's definition of the tariff, all of which reminds me of a certain sportsman travelling in a train who, in conversation with

a fellow traveller, said he had lived for many years in India. His companion asked him if he had ever seen any Christians in India. He said, "No," he had never seen one. His companion then asked him if he had ever seen a tiger there. "Oh, yes," he said, "I have shot many of them." A missionary who was sitting near spoke up and said, "I have lived forty years in India and I have never seen a tiger, but I have seen thousands of Christians. Each saw what they looked for.

Well, Sir, I am afraid that the hon. member for Regina—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Did not see any tigers.

Mr. MAHARG: —did not see many tigers in the city of Regina, especially in the form of Liberals; they do not go round in that guise. But I think if he will make careful inquiry he will find one or two in the city of Regina; I have more than once heard them express themselves in that city.

In conclusion I wish to say just a word about the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I have no hesitation in saying that the amendment does not suit me by any means—that is, the wording of the amendment, and it does not suit the people of Western Canada. Nevertheless its effect, if carried, would suit me and the people of Western Canada very nicely; consequently, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing left for me to do but to vote for the amendment.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I desire in the first place to tender my most sincere and kind congratulations to the right hon. Prime Minister of this country. I do so as a member of this House and as a Manitoban. He and I came to this House as a result of the elections held in 1908. Ten of us came to the House together on that occasion. To-day I am on this side, and my right hon. friend is on the wrong side; one sleeps in an honoured grave in France; others are enjoying positions as a result of the power of this Government to appoint them to such positions; and the remainder are in that place where the dead still speak, the Canadian Senate. I have great regard for my friend the Prime Minister of Canada. My friends out West at different times have asked me what manner of man he was, and I said then what I say now—that I believed he was the best Tory in Canada. He thinks as a Tory; he acts like a Tory, and, if I may say so without being personal, he looks like a Tory—he is a Tory. I give him credit for ability, for industry, and for courage. I am sorry that as a Manitoban I am unable to follow him; further than that I cannot go. He is a partisan, and so am I, but in our partisanship we differ. He has done all he could in the past, particularly in 1917, when he opened his campaign in the town of Morris, backed up by the premier of that province, to do what he could toward bringing about my defeat. He did not quite succeed. Perhaps he will be more successful next time, but in the meantime he may be kept very busy trying to save himself from defeat. For the reasons that I have given, I congratulate his party on having selected him. That he will live up to the traditions of the Conservative party, there is no doubt, as he is a reactionary; but whether he will be able, so to speak, to sway the multitude, we on this side are anxious to find out, more especially because the people of Canada are very anxious that this test should be made.

This debate has resolved itself into this. There has been some talk of the tariff; but in the meantime the tariff can very well stand; so can the freight rates, and from a western point of view and also from an eastern point of view, so can the question of the natural resources of this country. What we are dealing with especially, in following the amendment to the motion for an Address, is the question whether the people of Canada and the members of this House desire or do not desire a general election. A sub-amendment has also been moved, but, for my part, I cannot understand it; at least I could not understand it until I read the language of the hon. member who moved it. What did he say? Amongst other things he made this statement:

> It may possibly not have escaped your attention, Sir, that since last session I have crossed the green carpet and now occupy a position on the side opposite the Government. I do not know that that fact is of any particular significance.

I agree with my hon. friend that it is of no particular significance, because his language used further on endorses the statement that I make. He said further:

> This does not mean that I differ from the Government now any more than I did in the past.

And further on:

> I have no desire to see a change in government just at the present moment that would produce unnecessarily chaotic conditions.

The situation in regard to the sub-amendment, if I understand it aright, is this. It was moved by one who might be charged as acting in the capacity of sub

rosa agent of the Government. That hon. member crosses the floor of the House, but he says that he agrees with the Government. He does not want an election. He knew that the amendment of my hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) was on record many days before he submitted his sub-amendment. As regards his statement that his crossing of the green carpet or the floor of this House might have no particular significance, I agree with him—there is none. He could have stayed where he had been for the three sessions which have passed since the general election of 1917, and still have moved his sub-amendment. I want to say this in passing: If I had so far forgotten myself as to have supported Union Government, and I was offered my constituency by acclamation guaranteed; if I had accepted and had gone to that side of the House, being elected as a member of the House at that time, and if I had remained there until the present moment, I ask you, Sir, to accept my word as a member of this House, I would have stayed with the ship; I would not desert it in its hour of dire distress. My hon. friends opposite need men such as my hon. friend who comes as a Liberal from the province from which I come. There are Liberals and Liberals. The true Liberals are on this side of the House; they are not on the other side.

The only argument that can be advanced in favour of the sub-amendment—and there is some weight in it—is the question whether it would be in the interest of the Canadian people to have a general election following the redistribution of seats which must necessarily take place after the census which, we hope, will be completed some time this coming summer. I was a member of this House before the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell). I was a member of this House in 1911 when the very gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury Benches sat, as I sit now, in the cold shades of Opposition, and they demanded an election on the reciprocity pact as put forward by the Government of that day. I challenge them, all or any of them, to produce from the records of Hansard anything to show that they asked that that election be not held in 1911 on the ground that the West, from which many of them came, would be unfairly dealt with. Did they ask that the election that took place in 1911, and that resulted in the defeat of the Laurier administration, the best this country ever had, be postponed until the following year, until the then Government could take the census, redistribute the seats and give the people justice? No, they did not do that, and not doing it, if they are sincere now, they were most insincere in 1911. For this reason: The census as taken in that year gave to my province five additional members, to Saskatchewan, six additional members, to Alberta, five additional members, and if I remember rightly, to British Columbia, including the Yukon, five or six, I think six, additional members. Does any man think for a moment that by a redistribution now the West stands to gain that number of seats? Not at all. The other night this argument was advanced in this House—and I admit there is something to back it up. But will Manitoba or the other western provinces really gain? If we do, the number will be very small. There is in this country one province in which race suicide is not fashionable; that is Quebec, and I hope there are others. If the unit of representation in Quebec, which is represented in this House by sixty-five members, goes up from 30,000 odd to 40,000, how many seats will we gain in Manitoba? Perhaps one or two; and if the Government follows the line as indicated by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) the other evening, where will those seats go?—if you will allow me to put it in that way. They will go to the city of Winnipeg, which represents practically one-half of the population of that province. The redistribution will take away from the rural districts, not only in Western Canada, but in Ontario and Quebec, the rural members that they now have. The Government expects, by so doing, by using such political strategy, that they can appeal to the people in the large towns, cities and centres of industry in this country, and that the Government will be the gainer thereby. They do not want to be too sure of that. I am not a prophet, but I think I can say that in the next House there will be from ten to twelve Labour members, who will come from the large industrial centres, not from the agricultural districts.

So far as the election is concerned, whether we should have it now or later, I do not propose, as the representative of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, to assume the responsibility of stating that there should not be an election. My reason is very simple. I have endeavoured, no matter how feebly, no matter how I may have failed—if I

have failed—in some instances, to represent the people that I know best and that best know me. I have lived in the county of Provencher since 1879. I passed through it before there was a railway in Western Canada, and I believe that I know the political situation in the province of Manitoba as well as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I do know this: I know the wishes and the opinions of those who live within the boundaries of the county which I represent. Not only do they ask for a general election now, but a year ago, before the last session commenced, they pressed for it just as strongly as we are doing now. There is only one thing for me to do as their representative, and that is to comply with their wishes or to be honourable enough to resign my seat in this House. I have not been asked to resign my seat; I believe these people still have faith in me. Believing that, and knowing their wishes, apart altogether from what my personal wishes or desires might be in the matter, I am going to support the amendment. I certainly, under no conditions whatsoever, will support the sub-amendment.

There are others besides the people of my county who have expressed themselves as desiring an election. There are the returned soldiers of this country. There are the farmers of this country, from Charlottetown to Victoria, who are represented in this House by an intelligent, and by no means a small body of men. They constitute a recognized party in this House, and have their leader, who will take his chances with us and hon. gentlemen opposite whenever election day may come—and may it come soon. The farmers of this country are asking for an election. The business men of this country are asking for an election.

There is somebody else who is asking for an election, although perhaps not much attention will be paid to this statement by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have some idea of how to conduct an election. My methods may be crude, perhaps not as polished as others, but they are effective. Mr. Speaker, I get my information, I have got it in the past, and I get it now and in the future from the children in the schoolyards. When I am in doubt as to what a certain section is going to do, I make it my business to find out—I do it myself, or some one does it for me—what the children in that particular district may happen to say. If they are against me, I know I am up against it; if they are for me, I know I am all right. I got many reports from the schoolyard in 1917 that were, I am sorry to say, unfavourable. I would not like to repeat on the floor of this House what even a clergyman said on a public platform in the county from which I come, where we run elections red-hot from the time they start until long after they are over. I know what the children said then in certain districts, and the poll pretty nearly went that way.

Now I pass from the school-children, the business men, the farmers, and the soldiers, and take another large class that has not been mentioned, that is, the enfranchised women of this country who did not vote in 1917. In the district in which I live, the majority of the women in the county of Provencher—and I make this statement believing it to be true—who voted for my opponent in 1917 are going to vote against this Government at the first opportunity. They have fully made up their minds to vote against this Government. Now miracles are not going to happen between now and election day, although somebody on the other side will doubtless try and work them. I say that the women of my county are against this Government, and they have good reasons for being so.

When I ask for an election now, some one may say, you are playing a selfish game, you are afraid of a redistribution of seats. I am not afraid of a redistribution of seats, nor am I playing a selfish game. It happens that my county is in the southeastern portion of the province, and from a military point of view, so to speak, I am protected on the east by the province of Ontario, on the south by the state of Minnesota, and on the west by the Red river. I have, therefore, only one line of trenches to watch, and so far as I am concerned they can either take away from or add to my constituency—I care not which. Although I do not care, at the same time I may be defeated, for elections are uncertain, but take my word for this—that if I am, the fellow who gets in won't need a Turkish bath for the next six months anyway.

I say there should be an election for this reason if for no other, that in the year 1917 the Canadian people were in what might be termed an abnormal state of mind. Men said things and did things, and women said things and did things, that they would not do to-day. They have come down to terra firma, so to speak. There is unrest, but happily the unrest is

not gaining ground, at least, we hope not. It is unthinkable to me that men who have had long service as members of this House, for instance, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) or others associated with him much younger than him, can argue for a moment that the people of Canada are the same to-day as they were in 1917, or that they think in any one respect as they did in 1917, when men's passions and prejudices were inflamed, and the people generally were in an abnormal state of mind. I maintain that it is not fair to the people, no matter how the 1917 election was carried—and it was anything but fair to me, and we condemn that—now there is an opportunity for the Government to appeal to the people and get an expression of opinion on the questions of the day, that that opportunity should be denied. The right time to appeal is now, but the Government are hanging on to office, for what? They are hoping against hope, and what they are doing to-day other governments in this country have done before them. The Tupper Government of 1896 held on to the last minute of the day. It was bad business from a party point of view. This Government expect they will be stronger two years from now than they are to-day.

They will be just that much weaker. How can they be stronger? They cannot possibly hold a majority in this House, and they will be mighty fortunate if they do it this session. They are in great doubt themselves; they are in a blue funk at the present moment. We are not crowding the Government, if I may say so. The Opposition have been absolutely fair. They say to the Government: Hurry on the necessary business before Parliament and before the country; take your Supply; be manly about it; get up and get out just as quickly as you can, and go to the country for the approval or disapproval of the people. They will have to go sooner or later, and the longer they delay the worse it will be for them. The other night I listened carefully, as I always do, to the eloquent Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie). I may say that there is a personal political interest for me in the hon. gentleman. The first political meeting I ever attended in my life was held in December, 1886, in the county of Wellington. The main actor was the father of the present Minister of Militia, Mr. Donald Guthrie, and when it came to attacking the Tory party and making a speech that was incisive and telling, and one that would be long remembered, well, he was one of the best I have ever heard. That was quite a while ago. I went to the meeting a Grit and when I came away I was a confirmed Grit; and I wish to say this—and I shall speak of the "acid test" a little later on—that to-day I prefer to be a Donald Guthrie Grit rather than a Hugh Guthrie Tory. Our hon. friend promised us the acid test. Well, I fancy pretty nearly every man on this side of the House has had the acid test applied to him at sometime or other. I got all the acid test I wanted in 1917. I stood up and survived it, and I am prepared to try it again. What is the acid test? Of course, we all know there are many acids, and I guess the acid test which they will apply, if they ever do apply any, will be something in the nature of boracic acid, which is a mild antiseptic that may be applied to wounds. My hon. friends opposite admit that wounds exist; there are wounds on this side of the House, they admit, they say, and they admit that there are wounds in certain sections of the country. And now they want to alleviate those wounds and are repentant. However, their apologies and their repentance will not be accepted by the majority of hon. members of this House, and certainly not by the majority of the people whom those members on this side represent. In the first place, hon. gentlemen opposite think they are very smart. They are going to put on the acid test, they say. In my estimation that is nothing but a bluff. They say: We will put forward the Liberal platform. Well, that will not faze me. They then threaten to bring forward the Farmers' platform. Well, you will not faze me there either, except in so far as one thing is concerned, and that is the Recall. I would not vote for the Recall if it were in the Liberal platform, and I am mighty sure I will not vote for it when it is in the Agrarian platform. I will come here elected to stick, or stay at home defeated; but no little committee back in the old county of Provencher is going to tell me some day, if they have some personal or other grievance, that the best thing I can do is to pack my trunk and go home. If they do I will tell them to mind their own business, for I am here to stay. Why, the thing is foolish; it is not Canadian; and there is not a man in the Agrarian party to-day who can stand up and defend the principle of Recall, eloquent as some of them are. No, Sir; I will not countenance any Recall, —Well, yes, there is one recall that I might

favour. When I cross the river I might find myself dissatisfied with my habitation, and if I were recalled it is likely I should come back. But I will have no Recall while I am a living man.

The acid test, Mr. Speaker, is being applied every minute, every hour, and every day as time goes on; while we are sitting in this House it is being applied. Who is applying the acid test, though? The manufacturers of Canada are applying it at least hourly to this Government. They say: Boys, come across before election, or we forget you. If you don't hurry you will find yourself in the wilderness of No Man's Land, as described by the high protectionist the other day, the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). The Government know that they must satisfy the manufacturers or else land in No Man's Land. But whether they satisfy the manufacturers or not is of no consequence, for No Man's Land is exactly where they are going to find themselves, anyway. Some one else can apply the acid test just as well as those on the side of the Government. Their numbers may be greater; numerically they may be stronger; but that is not the whole thing. We may be a remnant, as we have been described. Well, we allow them to say so. But there was a remnant at the Battle of Waterloo, in the Old Guard; there was a remnant in the shape of the Light Brigade at Balaklava; and there were remnants among our own sons and brothers in the fields of Flanders during the war. But they all came back. A remnant is not so bad after all as something upon which to build a political party that will rule the country in which they belong. There have been many remnants, but we are a much stronger remnant in this country than they imagine. Hon. members opposite may say we are a remnant, but that will not hurt us. We know, as everybody else knows, that they are the remnant. They are a remnant that is afraid to hold an election. They are afraid to reorganize the Government. The Prime Minister is anxious to reorganize, and he shows his good sense in the desire to do so; but he is afraid to open seats for Cabinet Ministers, because he knows that there is not a constituency where a Cabinet Minister has a chance of being elected. There is not one from Charlottetown to Victoria.

We have been taunted by the statement that in certain provinces the representation on this side of the House is very small. On the face of it that statement is true. I do not know how it was in Eastern Canada at the time of the general election; but I do know what went on in Western Canada, at least in some parts; and I want to say that the tyranny and the terrorism that prevailed in that section, backed up by every newspaper in the three western provinces so far as my knowledge goes, except two, were such, that it is no wonder that there are two men on this side from Western Canada. How so many came from the eastern provinces I do not understand. But we shall find out what went on, and we will prove that tyranny and terrorism did exist in this country in 1917. I believe it had the backing of the Government, although I would not say it had the backing of all its followers in this Chamber or out of it. I believe it was winked at by the Government, the idea being "Put this man out of business by any means, pretty much, that you desire." That day is over. They will not on the eve of the next election be able to promise the farmers of the country "You vote for us and your sons shall be exempt from Military Service." I say such a proceeding as that was a contemptible piece of business on the part of any man or any government. Although I represent a farming constituency I opposed that procedure. I maintained that the son of a farmer had as much right to go to war as anybody else when conscription was the law. Then what did the Government do? After making that promise to the farmers of Canada they immediately turned around and, as in the case of the signing of the Treaty of Limerick, they broke that pledge, before the ink was dry, to suit their own convenience.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am about to conclude. I want to go on record, as a western man, as in favour of an election before re-distribution although by re-distribution I should gain. I am in favour of an election because the people whom I represent and the people are generally calling for it.

Not that all the electors are going to vote for the candidates of the Liberal party; their votes will be divided, there is no question about that. The representatives of three or four parties will be before the people and each will get some support. But I believe that the ballots of the great majority of electors will be cast in favour of those who have urged an immediate appeal to the people. For our part we welcome that appeal and we have no fear as to the outcome. We shall stand where we have always stood,

maintaining true Liberal principles. As a representative of the Liberal party I shall be found standing where I have stood in the past. Every man in my constituency knows my attitude and what my views are upon all questions that have been debated in this House. If my constituency sees fit to reject me, I shall have no complaint to make and neither should hon. gentleman across the way who to-day are in the position of usurpers. The best proof of that is the fact that they are afraid to go back to the very people who sent them here but a few short years ago. I maintain that the people desire a general election and wish it to take place at the earliest possible moment. Such being the case the amendment of the leader of the Opposition will have my hearty support.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROBERT H. HALBERT (North Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne and the amendments thereto at this late hour in the debate—and I know the Government is anxious to bring the debate to a close—I am sure, Sir, you will permit me to dispense with the time-honoured custom of throwing bouquets.

First, I want to thank the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) for his warning to us in his speech. He seemed to be worried that we of this little group were being courted by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). I also want to thank him for informing us that our wooer is insincere and is trying to deceive us. The information did not cause any serious heart throbbings among the members of our group. But for the peace of mind and comfort of the right hon. Prime Minister, I would hasten to remind him that all courtships do not end in marriage—as he no doubt is well aware after his somewhat fruitless wooing in the province of Quebec, although there are symptoms that he has secured one convert, as it is generally understood that the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) is making go-goo eyes across the floor and longing for the flesh pots of a Cabinet position. But there are always jealousies between wooers, especially if they are both wooing for a purpose. The old saying tells us that "faint heart ne'er won fair lady," but I am sure, Sir, no one would ever accuse the right hon. the Prime Minister of being faint-hearted. However, the wooing which he and his supporters are indulging in will never win for them the support of the intelligent, democratic-thinking people of Canada. Even the wooing of his tariff policy is losing its chloroforming effect.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, and, through you, the attention of hon. members to the words of the right hon. Prime Minister as recorded on page 37 of Unrevised Hansard. He was speaking of the Colchester by-election and he said:

> There was a candidate of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) who is represented to-day by the distinguished member for Red Deer. There was a candidate of that party in the county of Colchester and they had some rather questionable support—support from men who advocated very strange doctrines, very strange doctrines indeed, doctrines put into practice in only one country in the world that I know of. But that party had a candidate and its candidate was buried under a majority of some 1,500 votes.

I wonder what very strange doctrine the right hon. Prime Minister was referring to. Perhaps, Sir, if we would read some of the big headlines in the Colchester papers that were supporting the Government candidate we might get a little information on the point. You wil find in the Truro Citizen of Saturday, September 18, 1920—and it was in all the local Conservative papers—this heading in large letters—so large that you can probably read it, Sir, when I hold it up in my hand:

> Will the Farmers and Working Men of Colchester Stand for Deviltries of Bolshevism?

I will not take up the time of the House in reading the whole advertisement, but I will quote one or two items, which I think will be sufficient for my purpose. This is all about the Bolshevik doctrine in Russia; I do not know what that had to do with the Colchester by-election, but it was given great prominence in this paper. I will quote some paragraphs:

> Women are reduced to the level of chattels. Free love is the Bolshevik doctrine. No longer is woman regarded as a human creature to be loved and protected. The Bolshevick treat her as a beast, to be bought, sold, and raped as their cruel passions dictate.
>
> Will the farmers and working men of Colchester stand for such deviltries; and approve of being linked up in this campaign with canvassers who openly espouse the cause of Bolshevism?

Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with that I am going to read a report of the

proceedings at the Conservative nomination convention in East Elgin. The heading of this news item is:

Foster Puts U. F. O. With Bolsheviki

Aylmer, Sept. 11.—At the Conservative Nomination Convention in East Elgin yesterday, Sir George Foster made a slashing attack on the U. F. O., ranking that organization with the Bolsheviki and the British miners who would oust responsible Government.

This is what the right hon. gentleman said:

Be careful before you arise and from the top of the soap box or anywhere else propound that it shall be swept aside,—

He was speaking about the past history of Conservatism.

—smashed to pieces, that you shall put some class interest in its place—Soviet, Bolsheviki, miners' or farmers' party, I care not what it is—one is almost as bad as the other—

Thank goodness for that little word "almost." Now I want to read from the Mail and Empire. Speaking of the right hon. the Prime Minister it says:

At the Granby meeting Premier Meighen had something to say about Winnipeg Labour extremists uniting themselves to what appeared to them as the most formidable opposition to the Government. This was the Crerar party, or the Western Grain Growers' Organization.

Premier Meighen's reference to this was well warranted and appropriate and does not, in the least, carry the inference that he deemed the Canadian farmer in general to be Bolshevist.

The Crerar group and the Canadian "farmers" are by no means the same.

I happen to be one of the Crerar group, and I am proud to have as my leader a man of the standing, integrity, ability and honesty of the hon. member for Marquette.

Now then, who was the farmers' candidate in Colchester? His name was Captain Dickson, a young farmer who owned a farm near Truro, and who when the war broke out turned his farm over to strangers to work, enlisted and went overseas, did his bit in France, was wounded, and came back when the war was over as a captain and I am told decorated with a Victoria or a Military Cross—a very creditable candidate I am sure you will admit, Mr. Speaker, a candidate you would not think of accusing of being a Bolshevik or linked up with humbugs, fakirs, or nation-wreckers. Did those who are making those insinuations do as much for their country as Captain Dickson did in its hour of peril?

I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to another article in the same paper headed in big type:

A Carnival of Corruption Charged. How the U. F. O. Did It in Ontario. Some Light on Farmers' election in Dufferin County, Ontario.

The truth of the matter is that there were no corrupt practices, and none were proven, and the judges who sat on the election protest ordered the party who filed the charges —and who was of course backed up by the Conservative Government of the province— to pay all costs in connection with the case, as they stated that everything in connection with the election was honest and above board. But, Sir, those insinuations and charges had done their work in Colchester in assisting to defeat Captain Dickson and in electing the hon. member for Colchester, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy). We in this group, and Captain Dickson as well, would sooner be defeated than elected and hold office by such high-handed misrepresentation and stooping to such low degrading deceptions and questionable methods. When men or governments will stoop to such practices to be elected, what can you expect of them, Sir, when they get in office? Is there not a grave danger of their continuing those same methods? There is only one safe course to pursue for all who want to maintain self-respect and public confidence, and that is to play fair in everything. The structure of society and government is built upon the basis of respect and confidence, and when that fails society or government becomes but a rope of sand; and any government holding office that has not that confidence weakens the respect that people have in government and in public men.

I will have to vote for the amendment, Mr. Speaker, because I believe this Government has not that confidence, and that the people are anxious for an election at as early a date as possible. In support of that, I will only refer you to the by-elections in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) claimed to speak for that province, but, Mr. Speaker, Ontario has spoken with no uncertain voice. We have had five by-elections in Ontario— Tory Ontario; did the Government win any of them? You, Sir, well know that a Government which has the confidence of the people seldom loses a by-election, but this Government has lost them all. In Glengarry, in Temiskaming, in East Elgin, in North Ontario, the candidates who ran on the Farmers' platform were elected and now sit in this group; in West Peterborough a Liberal candidate was elected. I would not then, be doing my duty to my riding, to my province or to this Dominion were I to vote to support a government which, as the by-elections go to prove beyond the shadow

of a doubt, has not the confidence of the people.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said during the course of his speech on the Address that it would be better to hold on to the seat he had, than to take chances in an election. This sentiment was endorsed also by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that they were speaking not only their own opinion but the opinion of a good many of the men who sit around them.

We have heard a good deal about redistribution; it is one of the main arguments that is being put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite as an excuse for their hanging on to office. It is contended that it is not fair to disfranchise the West, which should have increased representation. But, Sir, not only the West but a large part of the Dominion is not represented now—or perhaps I should say, is misrepresented— and the Government seems determined to disfranchise these people until they get good and ready and get the constituencies changed so that they will be able at least to re-elect a corporal's guard from those on the opposite side of the House.

We in this little group feel that great issues are at stake to-day, and that the next few years will determine the future of Canada. All who have the interests of Canada at heart feel that we have ahead of us many years of steady, patient, earnest and perhaps sometimes heartrending toil, but along this way lies the only road to satisfaction and success. It will test our metal, the sincerity of our purpose and the purity and strength of our ideals. It will find the weak spot in our moral make-up—but at the end lies the goal, the making of Canada and the well-being of her people. Have we, Mr. Speaker, the courage to face the future with the inspiration of a great purpose and find a joy and an honour in the doing of it, or are we going to let past and present conditions continue to break our hearts, mar our morals, and destroy the birthright which is the inheritance of all those who were born in and love this great Canada?

We hear great criticism of the farmer's organization and the farmers' group. The hon. member for Brantford took some measure of comfort, I have no doubt, from his criticism of the Ontario Government. But the farmers have never shown that they were at all dangerous, except in the minds, perhaps, of members on the opposite side. Why are the supporters of the farmers' platform branded as Bolshevik? Because they refused to be influenced by the backwoods ranting of politicians who trade on partyism and bigotry and we say that henceforth the standard of Canadian citizenship is to be measured by a man's worth and not according to the length of his ancestry of party heelers. The farmers are bound to Canada with an intensity of attachment. They are rooted in its soil; as native sons they love Canada with the passionate love of children for their mothers. Their fathers and forefathers cleared the land and railed the highways. France is finding her hope today not in her cities and large industrial centres, but in the industry and thrift of her rural people. It was this same industry and thrift that paid France's indemnity to Germany after 1870. It is the peasants of Belgium who are re-creating that country and making it again the garden of Europe. It was the farmers of Denmark who in 1880 created the organization out of which has grown, perhaps, the biggest national business success of modern times. Only by the same grit, determination and steady, plucky labour can Canada ever hope to become great or can her place among the nations be assured. If Canada in the years to come is to make any lasting contribution to civilization, it will be because her people have breathed the spirit of true democracy and feel the responsibility of the great task which they have inherited. With a task so great before us, Canada can well afford to take stock of her resources and of the spirit of her people. It is a significant fact that the people of Canada to-day are learning their own power, are doing their own thinking, and are prepared to accept and discharge the responsibilities that all this implies. Were it otherwise, Canada would be unworthy of her inheritance, of the sacrifice of her bravest sons, and of the great future which awaits her.

We have, Mr. Speaker, another very important task; we must cement our common citizenship. Our flag is made up of different colours of silk or wool, but taken together they make up the Union Jack of which we are all so proud. This magnificent building in which we meet is built of stone, brick and marble, but what unites these elements in a building which will endure forever? Cement, is it not? We have in Canada people of different races and creeds. What is needed to unite them? The gospel of Canadian citizenship. Between these different races and creeds there must be agreement as to the national ideals,

and this agreement will be brought about not by force but by education and goodwill and friendly co-operation. We should aim to make Canada and Canadianism so dear to the hearts of all who live within our borders that they will seek this citizenship of their own accord, and cherish it as a privilege and a source of pride. Build up Canada and true Canadian citizenship, and the rest will take care of itself. This is the work of a united people, and must find its inspiration in a great national need. If we fail in this task, we shall suffer loss; if we succeed, our children will rise up and call us blessed and civilization will learn to pay tribute to the greatness of the spirit of the Canadian people.

There has been considerable discussion, Mr. Speaker, about who should be on the Government benches; several hon. members intimate that the leader of the Opposition turns a longing eye in that direction, and that he is angling for the Prime Ministership. But, Sir, that is not the issue to-day; that is not what is being discussed outside this House. The issue is not the right hon. Prime Minister and the National Liberal and Conservative Party; not the leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party; not the hon. member for Marquette and the National Progressive Party; the issue to-day is whether Canada is going to have its destinies controlled by a greedy plutocracy or whether we are going to be allowed to establish a real economic democracy without which political democracy is farcical. There must be a change, Mr. Speaker, or our civilization will be hopelessly brutalized. The horn and hoof of the protected interests have been long enough upon the doorstep of Canadian homes and Canada's House of Parliament. The fight for freedom from this vulgar and oppressive domination has only begun, but, Sir, it will never let up until the common people, the wealth-producing people of Canada, are liberated from the thraldom of the financial barons who own this country financially and control it politically, and until we have a condition of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. No matter how fertile the soil of a country may be; no matter how frugal and industrious its people, it will remain poor and backward and its people will be lacking in the highest comforts of life if its trade laws and its fiscal policies are unsound.

Protection in any country creates a class, bound together by self-interest alone, armed at all points and ready for action against any one or any party that would dare to curtail its privileges. Such a class is without private or public honour and actuated solely by greed for financial gain. Protection has been called slavery of the same kind as American slavery, but not in the same degree; but the day is not far distant when we shall see embodied in active legislation the ideals and aspirations of the plain folk of Canada. Though the ship may swing with the tide, while the anchor holds firm to democracy, we are safe.

Sixty thousand of the brightest, best and bravest of Canada's sons lie buried on the fields of France and Flanders, for what? Because they were willing to die for the economic and political emancipation of the world.

Mr. SMITH: Because you would not help them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HALBERT: That is too small to reply to. We all know that since Confederation, Canada and the Canadian people have been owned and controlled, economically and politically, by a few manufacturers, a few railwaymen and a few big lumbermen. But, Sir, the war has changed things and the army of emancipation is on the march to-day. When the representatives of that army arrive at Ottawa, they will say to all and sundry, no matter by what name they are called: "We have come here to upset the tables of the money changers; we have come here to unseat autocracy and to establish democracy; we have come here to enter into the heritage that our sons and brothers have died to purchase; we have come here to rescue our beloved Canada from economic and political bondage; we have come here to place Canada where she belongs, in the forefront of the battle of a free and democratic people."

Since I have come into this House, I have listened attentively to every hon. member who has spoken, and that is more than members on the other side can say.

Mr. SAMUEL WILLIAM JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on the question now before the Chamber, I feel very much like the young Swede who, on a moonlight evening in a public park, was induced to propose to a lady to whom he had been paying attention for some considerable time. After he had been accepted, a sudden silence fell upon the young man. This silence after a while became almost unbearable to the young lady, and she said:

"Why don't you say something? Why don't you talk?" And he replied: "I think there has been too much blank talking done already." I have listened in this House for nearly three weeks to addresses of various kinds, and I feel that it is almost impossible to add anything to what has already been said. Some speeches, in my humble opinion, were wise; others were otherwise.

It has been the custom with every hon. gentleman who has risen from his seat to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address. I gladly do so, although I am free to confess that I have almost forgotten what they said; but in that respect, I do not think I differ from any other hon. gentleman who congratulated them, and the only difference is that, perhaps, I am a little franker than they are. One thing, however, I am assured of, and that is that the remarks of those two gentlemen will not bring them within the purview of the Seditious Offenders' Act which was put on the statute books by this Parliament a year or two ago. Their speeches were safe, sane, if somewhat innocuous, and I extend to them my full meed of praise. My only regret is that the Government did not see fit to observe the time-honoured custom of seeing that one of the two addresses was delivered in the French language, a custom which, with, perhaps, one or two exceptions, we have observed in this Parliament for fifty years. I suppose the Government felt that by having the Atlantic speak to the Pacific, they were observing the dual rule. We have one gentleman from Prince Edward Island answered by a gentleman from the Pacific ocean. Deep called unto deep. We have one gentleman from British Columbia, representing the British race, and from Prince Edward Island we have what I suppose should be called Cape Race.

When my hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) closed his admirable address in this House, he referred to the Government as those who occupy high seats in the synagogue and who make broad their phylacteries, and he warned us that for that reason we ought to have nothing to do with them. For my part, being an observing Jew, if I thought they did occupy high places in the synagogue and make broad their phylacteries, I would at once cross to their side; but I feel that my hon. leader was entirely too kind to them; he probably wished to refer to them as the ordinary, common, garden variety of hypocrites. Perhaps it was the beautiful picture he painted of the loaves and fishes and the full platters and so on which, has induced my co-religionist, John the Baptist, to cross the floor. You have heard, Sir, the old saying: "Every country has the Jew it deserves," and perhaps I can extend that by saying that "Every party has the Jew it deserves."

I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on the high and important office to which he has been called. He was not elected in open convention, as we consider ought to be the custom in a democratic country; he was elected by caucus. But I venture to say that, had a convention been called, the party to which he belongs could not have secured a more able and astute leader than he has turned out to be. You will remember, Sir, in Paradise Lost, when the fallen angels were looking around for a leader, they chose Satan. Why did they choose Satan? They did so because they said that Satan was the ablest one in their party, and he was raised to that "bad eminence" of leadership by those fallen angels. I remember, after reading in the newspapers one morning that my right hon. friend had been selected from among all others at the party caucus, I sat down and wrote him a letter of congratulation. I told him that while I and many others had doubts whether he would make a good Prime Minister, we were all assured of one thing, and that was that he would make an admirable leader of the Opposition a position to which I hope he will soon be called.

When the Peterborough election was on, we had reason to believe that the Prime Minister was going to follow precedent and that if the election in Peterborough went against him, he would dissolve Parliament. In an extract from La Patrie about that time, reproduced in the Montreal Gazette, the Prime Minsiter is reported to have made this statement:

> Mr. Meighen has already said that if the people wanted a general election, they had only to manifest their desire at a by-election. He considered no clear indication was to be obtained from previous by-elections. It will be interesting, therefore, to hear what significance he proposes to attach to the verdict of Peterborough.

I do not know whether the Prime Minister actually made that statement; but taking into consideration this extract from La Patrie, which is not by any means unfriendly to the Government, this extract being reproduced in the Montreal Gazette, I take it that that statement is correct.

What has happened which has caused the Prime Minister and his Government to change their view? Why is it that a change has come over the spirit of their dream? On the morning following the election in West Peterborough, the Montreal Gazette, the Ottawa Journal, and other newspapers favourable to the Government, declared that now was the time for an election. Everybody was prepared for the funeral, except the corpse. Surely, Mr. Speaker, no better evidence could be found in the whole world than the election in Peterborough. The issue, and the only issue, in that election was: Have the Government a mandate from the people? Are they ursurping power? Ten thousand voters in Peterborough, out of about thirteen thousand, declared that the Government had no mandate, but notwithstanding the voice of the people, the Prime Minister is still hanging on to office. It is apparent to every person that the Government is disintegrating. Mortification has set in. In the elections of 1917 they had, I believe, one of the largest majorities ever given to a party in the Dominion of Canada. To-day what have they? They are counting heads. They are robbing hospitals. They are dragging from sick beds poor hon. members who are not permitted to rest in peace—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Shame.

Mr. JACOBS: —and for what? To maintain this Government in power. It is a shame, and I am glad the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) admits it. He represents a division which adjoins mine, and that is probably why we agree sometimes on some things.

I do not need to traverse all the questions that have been debated in this House. The main question as to whether this Government was formed for a specific purpose or not has been so well debated on this side of the House that the argument, I submit, is irrefutable, and I challenge any member on the other side of the House to answer the charge made which has been backed up by the most telling precedents ever put before this House, by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) in his admirable address yesterday. A strange silence has fallen on the Government for the past two days. At the beginning of this debate we were tilting against men whom we thought worthy of our steel. Later, they were not so worthy, and finally, we found that we were obliged to tilt against mere windmills, until now, Mr. Speaker, we are tilting against nothing. There is no answer; we are whipping a dead horse, and I submit that all that it is necessary for us to do is to take our seats and see that the vote is forthwith cast. The gentlemen on the other side of the House in their mentality are very much like Sir George Etienne Cartier.

It is said that when opposition developed in the House to any of his measures his cry was "Call in the members." He would dispose of the question at once by a vote—no discussion, no argument,—just call in the members. I see that Tory tradition still prevails in this House. The right hon. the Prime Minister has a party which is called the National Liberal Conservative party.

Mr. LALOR: You left out the word "and".

Mr. JACOBS: The National Liberal and Conservative party. Let us take the national part of the name first. The National party is a party that deserves well at the hands of the Government. Had it not been for the National party in 1911 the Government would not be in their places to-day. It was Mr. Bourassa who acted as Cyrano de Bergerac to the then leader of the Opposition, and got him into power. He reached My Lady's Chamber with the assistance of Mr. Bourassa, and no person else, and we know how Mr. Bourassa was treated a few weeks afterwards. Still, it appears the Government have some kindly feelings for their old friend, and when they came to give the child a name, he was given for a first name "National," in remembrance of the kindly act of Mr. Bourassa and his National followers. Then we have the name "Liberal." What does that mean? Is it worth calling a party by a name simply to salve the conscience of three hon. gentlemen who have left this side of the House and crossed to the other? I do not think it is. It is the custom in our synagogue, Mr. Speaker, to call our children after the names of our dead relatives. These three Liberals certainly are dead ones, and my friends on the other side have evidently adopted some of our Jewish customs. I am glad they are doing so, and I hope before I am here very much longer they will follow others. Then comes the word "Conservative." I suppose they are entitled to call themselves the Conservative party, because after all these Nationalists and these Liberals are really Conservatives. They have been swallowed by the Conservative party. They have "returned from their ride with the lady inside and the smile

on the face of the tiger." A motto which I would suggest to the Government would be the one Mr. Vanderbilt used on one occasion when he was asked "What will the public say?" He replied "The public be hanged." That is a motto which I suggest should be adopted by this new Government. A famous French general in the Crimean War, I think it was Marshal MacMahon, in a communique to headquarters stated that he had taken the Malakoff redoubt. He explained the situation in a very few words, "J'y suis, j'y reste"—"I am here, and I intend to remain here." That is good tactics in war, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose, this being a war government, they feel they can righteously adopt tactics of that kind and say "J'y suis, j'y reste."

Evil communications corrupt good manners. The Conservative party is not the Conservative party it was before it became contaminated by these elements. I would ask my hon. friends on the other side if they have Mr. R. B. Bennett's opinion of them. He is a gentleman who practically used to sleep with the former Prime Minister, who could not go anywhere without Mr. Bennett. Whether he was afraid to leave him in Canada when he went abroad I do not know, but Mr. Bennett used to travel with the Prime Minister when he went abroad, and he was the recipient of many favours from the Conservative party. It would be interesting to know what Mr. Bennett's views on this party are, and also those of the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario, the former Minister of Militia, (Sir Sam Hughes). It would also be interesting to know what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) thinks of this once great party. A story is told of a student of zoology who was asked by the professor of his college to define what a lobster was. He said: "A lobster is a fish, is red in colour, and walks backwards." The professor said: "That definition is perfect except for the fact that the lobster is not a fish, is not red in colour, and does not walk backwards"; and it might be said adopting the student's definition with a slight variation that this Government is the greatest lobster we have ever had in this country.

I do not know why it is that the Government was not satisfied to revert to the old name of "Conservative" when the so-called "Union" label was discarded from the title of the present party. The Conservative party stood for a great deal in this country. It was the party of Sir John A Macdonald, and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was instrumental in forming that party into an important fighting force in Canada. Why is it that they have cast aside that name and now seek something which they think is just as good? The new name indicates the hybrid origin of this Government; but like everything hybrid, I am afraid it is not destined to come to much. A definition was given recently of this National Liberal Conservative party, in which it was likened to the mule, in that it had no pride of ancestry and no hope of posterity. Our chief objection to this Government is that it was formed during war time and consequently is saturated with the war spirit; and you never can do anything in the matter of re-establishment on a civil basis unless you get rid of the war spirit and everything it implies. And I propose to show in the few minutes at my disposal that this war spirit still permeates and impregnates in its entirety every Department of the Government. I have only to refer to the Department of Marine, which is presided over by my good friend the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Ballantyne). In passing, I may say that I am glad to think that a member from the city of Montreal should be appointed to this high and important office. This department started building ships during the war. It may have been necessary that we should have ships during the war. No one could tell how long the war would last; it was practically an impossibility to predict its duration; and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Naval Service cast about him to see that we should have as many ships as possible for the purposes of the war. But the hon. gentleman has evidently forgotten that the war is over, because he is still going on with the building of ships, or at any rate is completing ships which were started after the war. Is not that an indication of the war spirit which permeates the Department of Marine? We want these ships no more than a man wants a third leg; they are useless to us. Shipping in every part of the world is at a standstill. I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to a couple of telegraphic despatches which appeared in the newspapers only a few weeks ago touching the situation with regard to ships throughout the world. I shall quote from the Montreal Star, a newspaper by no means hostile to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Rotterdam, January 7.—Forty-nine ocean steamers, mostly Dutch, are laid up at the present time at Rotterdam because of lack of

cargoes and the low freight rates according to Burgomaster Zimmerman. He also announces that while more ships entered Rotterdam last year than previously the actual tonnage was only 58 per cent of that of 1913.

Side by side, in a parallel column, I find the following:

Vancouver, January 7.—The keels of two new Government steamers, the Canadian "Transporter" and the Canadian "Trader" were laid at the Coughlan shipyards here yesterday. Seven hundred men are engaged in the yards.

Then on January 7th, the same day—I am still quoting from the Montreal Star—there appears this item:

Prince Rupert, January 7.—A meeting of the creditors of the Prince Rupert Dry Docks and Shipbuilding Company was held here yesterday. W. E. Hodges, who presided, read a statement showing approximate total liabilities exceeding $800,000.

A few weeks earlier in the newspapers, the following appeared:

The Canadian Engineer reports that the Mexican Government has placed orders with the Prince Rupert Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company for thirty-seven vessels. A form of the proposed contract is now before the Marine Department, Ottawa, for approval.

How is it possible, if this contract for 37 vessels was placed with the Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company in November, that in January this company should have gone into liquidation? That is something which I cannot understand, unless it be that when the creditors of the Prince Rupert Company found that Mexico was seeking to buy 37 vessels from Canada they felt it was high time to close up the works. This only goes to show—and I could cite numerous instances—the moribund condition of shipping and shipbuilding throughout the whole world. And yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has committed us to nearly $100,000,000 in the matter of the building of ships. We are, and have been for some time, groaning under the railway incumbus, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries evidently is not aware of the fact, because, notwithstanding that burden, he is still putting on our shoulders a policy that will mean to this country, before the eyes of the Government are opened to the situation, a loss not of $100,000,000 but perhaps of $200,000,000. How long are the Canadian people going to stand this? Are we not quite right in demanding an immediate election in order to test the feeling of the people as to whether they want shipbuilding started, when the country is almost on the verge of bankruptcy? Now, that is an indication of the war spirit which, as I have said, still permeates the members of the Government.

May I take another Department, about which I know something, the Immigration Department? We have on the statute books and in Orders in Council certain laws respecting immigration, which are the most extraordinary and grotesque that it is possible to imagine sane people would enact. I make this statement advisedly, and shall show you what some of these laws are. For instance, we have an Order in Council respecting immigration which declares that any immigrant who wishes to come to this country must come direct from the country of his birth, be it the Balkans, be it Ukrainia, be it Poland, or be it any of the countries of Central Europe. If he comes direct from the country of his birth he will be permitted, under certain conditions, to land in this country; but should that man and his family have left the country of his birth and gone to England and have lived in England say for fifteen or twenty years, brought up his family there under English customs, and taught them English ideals and the language of the country—if that man attempted to land in Canada with his wife and family he would be debarred from entering the Dominion. Now, I am not saying this as a jest, Mr. Speaker. It is not something from a libretto of Gilbert and Sullivan, or something from Alice in Wonderland—it is an Order in Council of the Department of Immigration. Now here is another thing:

No person will be permitted to land in this country unless he is possessed of $250 in cash on his person at the time he presents himself for examination before the Immigration officer at the port of entry.

He must have in his possession $250 so that he can keep himself alive until he obtains works. But if the man is coming to relatives who are worth say half a million of dollars and who are prepared to give bonds to the Government that he will not become a public charge it is not sufficient. This man may use his $250 for living expenses and he may then become a public charge but that is of no consequence to the Government. If he lands with $250 that is sufficient; but no matter what bonds another person is prepared to give, or what bonds his relatives are prepared to give he is not permitted to land without $250.

Now there is another rule. In times when there is little work people are permitted to

land in Canada but under what conditions do you think, by an Order in Council? The party landing must give security that he won't work, and if he is caught working he is taken by the scruff of the neck and sent out of the country. This in a country of seven millions of people and capable of maintaining within its borders at least one hundred millions. We are now paying interest on a debt of two and a quarter billions of dollars—seven millions of people are paying that interest? If there were fourteen millions of people in this country they would be paying the same amount, and the burden upon those who are now in Canada would only be one half of what it is at the present time. So that we are not doing these people such a great favour when we permit them to come into this country, we are simply giving them an opportunity of paying part of our debts, and I say that this policy of the Government in keeping out the strangers from entering the country is the policy, the war policy, which was inculcated into us during the time of war. We are afraid of strangers. We are told: Keep this country for the Anglo-Saxon people. Well if the country is to be kept for Anglo-Saxons why don't they come? I venture to say that when we are paying our debts we do not ask ourselves the question where the money has been collected—whether collected from Anglo-Saxons, or from Poles, or from French, we pay our debts with their money; and I submit that this policy of keeping out desirable people on such trifling, trivial, pettifogging grounds is not worthy of the Government. It is the policy of "He is a stranger; heave half a brick at him." We have an idea that because a man does not come from England, or Scotland, or Ireland he is thereby not fit for a good Anglo-Saxon to associate with. I want to tell this Government that in adopting such a policy they are making a very serious mistake; they should not select people because of their origin; they should select people for what they are. If a man and his

9 p.m. family, present themselves for entry into Canada, if a man selects this country from among all others in which to bring up his family and to live and die here, it is the duty of the Immigration officer to see whether such people are likely to make true and proper citizens, and if they are they should be allowed to come in and the Government should not apply the yard stick rule to which I referred a few moments ago.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

As to the railway policy of the Government. I am not going to discuss it, I merely wish to say that the railways were practically managed by public control in every part of the world during war times. That is, in the countries which had entered the war—in the United States, in England, and elsewhere—all these railways were taken over by the Government. Railways were taken over by the Government in Canada, but the Minister of Railways seems to have forgotten that the war is over. We are still on a war basis, although it is now nearly three years since the war terminated. Is not that a sample of the war spirit of the Government, and do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is the bounden duty of the people of Canada to get rid of this Government as soon as possible and place this country on a peace basis where it ought to have been placed long ago?

Now, let me say a word or two with regard to the Department of Trade and Commerce—and I notice that my right hon. friend the minister at the head of that department (Sir George Foster) is looking me squarely in the eye. I have kindly sentiments for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I feel that he has not received proper treatment at the hands of the Government. The right hon. gentleman ought to be able to sing his Nunc Dimittis. He has given forty years of his valuable life to the various departments of the Government. There was nothing he touched that he did not adorn. He is the old man eloquent of this House. It is a pleasure for me to listen to him whenever he rises in his seat. I feel that he ought now to ask for his demit. We all know, it is an open secret that he has been seeking, or his friends have been seeking for him, the High Commissionrship in London, which has been kept vacant for a considerable time. He has all the qualifications intellectual and social which fit him for that position. Why not send him to his reward? The trouble with the Department of Trade and Commerce was that during the war it was not expected to function very much. It was more or less somnolent, because we were then doing no trade or commerce. But now that peace has come the department ought to drop that somnolent attitude and become active. This is a department where there ought to be activity, but unfortunately, for reasons which I do not know, that department is still asleep. It ought to wake up; the sooner it does the

better for the country at large. I have spoken as I have in no spirit of antagonism to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. On the contrary I feel that it is my duty to say a good word for him in this House when his own party and his own Government are not doing it.

May I say something, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the tendency which has been apparent for some time to take from this Chamber the important popular departments and place them in another Chamber? It seems to me that if there are any departments which should be presided over by ministers sitting in this House these are the Post Office Department, the Labour Department and the Department of the Interior. Now where are these departments? They are in the other Chamber. Is that right and is it proper? The hon. gentlemen opposite should realize the importance of having the Post Office Department represented in the popular Chamber. The Post Office Department is one which touches every single man, woman and child in the Dominion. Questions are arising every day with regard to the post office, with regard to the many functions which have to be performed by that department in its tens of thousands of offices throughout the country. A question with respect to that department may be asked of the Government and the Government answers by proxy in one, two, or three weeks, if it remembers the question which has been put. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we owe a duty to the people of this country and that is, to see to it that the administration of this important department is brought back to this Chamber with as little delay as possible. Of course, I understand that the gentleman who presides over that department had to be provided for in some way; but for Heaven's sake get him some other department and not leave him in charge of the Post Office Department, which is of such vital importance to every person in this country. The Labour Department is one which deals with the people, with the working men, in this country, else why a Department of Labour? Well, for some reason known only to the Government the head of that great popular department is in the other House. It was claimed, I remember, that the former Minister of Labour who sat in this House was not as active as he should have been. The result was that the administration of that department was moved out of the House of Commons and placed in the other Chamber. It is another case where "My father whipped you with whips, but I will whip you with scorpions." "You say that this gentleman is not giving his attention to the department, as he should, in the House of Commons? Well, we will send the department to the Senate." And there it is.

Now the Department of the Interior. That is a department, it seems to me, which vitally affects new arrivals, intending settlers, farmers who are coming into this country to develop our—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Natural resources.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes. Why is that department not represented by a minister in this House? I am aware that the Government is in such a position that they dare not open any constituencies, and that is one of the reasons, we say, why we ought to have a general election and put affairs on a proper basis. We cannot accommodate this Government very much longer. We are willing to do what we can, but in the name of public decency we owe it to ourselves to see that the Government is dug out of its hole and driven to the country.

The Department of Militia is another department that indicates the permeation of the war spirit. We have a new Minister of Militia who is not a military man, he is not a Son of Mars. The only "fighting" he ever does is to make a "fighting" speech in the House, and he follows that rule of fighting in which discretion is the better part of valour, because he finds it is well to fight and run away so he may live to fight another day. This gentleman, in order to show that he was in sympathy with the war spirit, promptly jumped our expenditure in the Militia Department from something like $8,000,000, which I think it was before the war, to about $20,000,000, if we include the Northwest Mounted Police.

Here we have the League of Nations, and we have my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the former President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) going across the Atlantic ocean to settle all the ills to which flesh is heir—to bring peace into the world and not a sword. But on the other hand, we have the Minister of Militia and Defence, who is left at home, jumping the estimates from $8,000,000 to $20,000,000. I understand that our share of the cost of the League of Nations is about $200,000 a year. Does my right hon. friend not think that it would be better for us to spend $20,000,000 towards the upkeep

of the League of Nations and $100,000 or $200,000 for our militia? Perhaps it would do more good.

I could go on and show how in every branch of the Government service we have the war spirit. The Naturalization Act, the Franchise Act, and other Acts which we passed last session had the war spirit breathed into them.

But I find that I have already taken up more time than I intended, and I shall resume my seat in a moment or two. Before doing so, however, I should like to say a word or two about the threatened Royal Commission to investigate the grain trade. I know nothing about the grain trade, I cannot talk in terms of wheat, and it goes against the grain for me to talk about it. But I was rather astonished to find that this important question should have been relegated to the gentlemen who occupy seats in the rear of this chamber. It came on rather suddenly. One day the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) threatened the Agrarian group with a Royal Commission of inquiry into the grain trade; next day another hon. gentleman took it up; next day still another hon. gentleman took it up; and finally all along the line we found a wonderful similarity in the addresses of these hon. gentlemen, until one could not but conclude that some person higher in authority than these gentlemen was giving them their cue; they spoke in such parrot tones that one might very well come to the conclusion that they were under the tuition of the professor of parrotology in the Government; but of course that is one of the mysteries into which we are not permitted to delve. I am inclined to think that if a Royal Commission is to be appointed the gentlemen from the Agrarian group will be able to give a pretty good account of themselves. They look to me as rather decent, honourable and respectable citizens.

Mr. LALOR: Coax them along.

Mr. JACOBS: If they are not, so much the worse for them. It is a matter with which we on this side of the House are not concerned. But, as I said before, I believe they are well able to take care of themselves.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the talk of conciliation towards the province of Quebec? I come from that province. I represent a division which is largely French Canadian, and I think I understand the mentality of those people. They were sufficiently tolerant and wide in their views to elect me to be their representative in this House—an example which I have yet to see from other parts of the Dominion. From time to time we read in the government press articles of a conciliatory character with regard to Quebec. We are told that the people of that province are safe, that they are sane, that they are progressive, that they are conservative and that they have all the virtues which it is possible for a race to possess. A great change has come over this people since 1917, evidently. But, Sir, do you think that the province of Quebec is going to be won by mere lip service such as is indulged in by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? When you find positions to which French-speaking Canadians are rightly entitled taken from them and given to English-speaking Canadians, when you find them ignored in the filling of public appointments, do you think those people have for the rest of the country, and particularly for the Government, those "Christian" feelings which you would like to inculcate in their breasts? Let me take, for instance, the appointment recently to the International Joint Commission. One of the three positions occupied by representatives of this country had been held by a French Canadian ever since the Commission was established, the first gentleman appointed being Mr. Aime Geoffrion, of Montreal, the second hon. Thomas Chase-Casgrain, and the third hon. P. B. Mignault, who is now a judge of the Supreme Court. The vacancy caused by his accepting a judgeship was filled by this Government appointing Sir William Hearst. A poor Tory politician out of a job—a discredited Tory politician with nothing to do, is appointed as French representative on the International Joint Commission. That is a sample of the attempt at the conciliation of Quebec. Is it at all surprising, Mr. Speaker, when hon. gentlemen on the other side invite Quebec to give them support, that, as my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) said, the poor fish from St. Hyacinthe is the only one that they landed.

Then, let me take the case of the appointment to the Senate last year of a gentleman to take the place of the late Senator Landry. Senator Landry typified a certain element who are very strong in their views with regard to certain questions—the Catholic school question particularly. He was a gentleman of very high intellect and of considerable ability. He died in due course of time and was

gathered unto his fathers, and the French Canadian who took his place was a gentleman named Lorne C. Webster. Then, there was the case of the ill-fated Board of Commerce, which was born with the seeds of death in it. No French Canadian was appointed to that Board; perhaps that is why it died so early, because French Canadians are long-lived people. That ought to be a lesson to my hon. friends on the other side; it should cause them to see to it that they appoint to positions of that sort men who are noted for vitality. The failure of the Government to appoint a French Canadian on the Board of Commerce was keenly resented throughout the whole province of Quebec. I could go on naming other instances in which traditions have been broken down by this Government—traditions which had been consecrated by fifty years of custom. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite ask us of the province of Quebec to come in, and lend them a hand when they are in dire straits. It is expecting too much of flesh and blood to ask Quebec to do anything for this Government under the circumstances, and so long as such treatment is meted out to them, just so long shall we have on this side a solid block from that province opposing the Government tooth and nail, until we have them on the run—which I think, Mr. Speaker, we have succeeded in doing at last. The Government, Mr. Speaker, is tottering to its fall. No power on earth can now save it; it is moribund. It is said that of the dead we should say nothing but good. All I can say of the Government is, in the words of Shakespeare:

Vex not his ghost; O, let him pass; he hates him,
That would upon the rack of this tough world
Stretch him out longer.

Mr. H. O. WRIGHT (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, in rising at so late a period to make a few observations in this debate, I am sure it will not be possible for me to offer much that is new. However, I feel it my duty to occupy a few moments of the time of the House before the vote is finally recorded.

Before proceeding, let me offer my congratulations to the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who has since last session been elevated to the high position of Prime Minister of this country. I do not hesitate for one moment in saying that as a new member I have admired the great efforts he put forth during the period of the war in his desire to serve our country and the Empire. Since assuming the high office he now holds, his courage and resourcefulness have been greatly admired, even by those who do not agree with his policies or with the pretensions of the multi-named party which he leads.

Lest I should be accused of violating a time-honoured custom in this debate, allow me, Mr. Speaker, to extend to the mover (Mr. McIssac) and the seconder (Mr. MacKelvie) of this motion, my felicitations. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not extend my congratulations also in another direction. Since this Parliament last met an incident has occured which is of far reaching national importance: I refer to the fact that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has been selected by a very large portion of the people of this country as leader of the new National Progressive Party. In my opinion their selection of a leader has been a wise one, for in the member for Marquette we have a man of very wide business experience in Canada, a man who has risen from the ranks of the people, who is thoroughly conversant with their problems through knowledge gained from personal experience, and, most important of all, a man whose integrity and honesty of purpose is beyond reproach.

Lest I should forget it later, I wish to express my appreciation of the kind references made in regard to this group by the hon. gentleman who preceded me. (Mr. Jacobs): I trust that we shall not disappoint him. I merely wish to thank him for his kind words.

I shall not attempt to follow along the by-roads into which this debate has led us; I will endeavour to confine myself for the most part to one or two items of national importance. The country has been very considerably agitated by the introduction into the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of a measure which, in its effect, aims at the vitals of one of our chief industries. I refer to the Fordney Bill. Too much importance cannot be placed upon the effect that that legislation may have upon the agricultural industry of this country should it become law. I am informed that three quarters of the wheat exported from this country last fall found its way into the United States. Had a measure been in force such as is contemplated in the Fordney Bill it is my opinion that the result would have created a financial panic in a great portion of this country. The effect upon the grain-growing industry would have been disastrous; it would have shut out prac-

tically the only market we had for our grain. The surprising feature of this situation, Sir, is that during the time this most important legislation was before Congress, Canada, which, we are told, has assumed the status of nationhood—and I sincerely hope it is true—was without official representation in that country. Not only that, but even the good offices of the British Ambassador were not available owing to his absence overseas. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has informed the House that it has been decided to appoint an ambassador at Washington, but the delay is in the selection of a man suitable for the position. It did not seem very difficult to secure suitable men to represent us at the Peace Congress and at the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva; surely it cannot be so difficult to find a suitable representative to go to Washington to protect our interests there.

I am quite sure it is not generally known in the country to the south of us that Canada is her second best customer. But that condition is easily understood when we realize that our Canadian interests have not been properly represented in the United States and that therefore the importance of the Canadian market is not appreciated.

I would urge upon the Government the necessity of the immediate appointment of a capable ambassador at Washington. Further delay may mean the placing of agriculture and of the myriad industries that depend upon it in a very precarious condition, which otherwise could in all probability be avoided. We should also have trade representatives in all the large cities of the United States.

The Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), in his speech the other day, told us that there were two ways in correcting the adverse trade balance: one was to buy less from the United States and the other was to sell more. The latter process appeals to me very strongly. Surely such trade representatives would be of inestimable value in procuring outlets for manufactured goods of Canadian origin. It must be a source of great inspiration to Canadian manufacturers to look to the south and see the great market that exists there for their goods. There is nothing wrong with the goods they manufacture; those goods will compete favourably with any they may meet on the world's markets. What our manufacturers need is a broader vision and, as has been so well expressed by the hon. leader of this party (Mr. Crerar), courage to go out and fight the commercial battle with those who, in most cases, are not any better armed than they. These trade representatives would be of great assistance in guiding their efforts and would act as a searchlight to guide them in securing new outlets for their goods.

There is another matter to which I should like to direct attention. During the period last fall when grain was being shipped to the market from the farmers in western Canada, very great difficulty was experienced in obtaining cars, more particularly along the lines now operated by the Canadian National system. At practically every shipping point along the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is now under the control of the Canadian National system, and which runs through the constituency which I have the honour to represent, grain buyers were instructed to purchase only one car of grain and no more until that car had been finally disposed of. The grain was taken into the elevator for storage, but no purchases could be made beyond the limitation I have mentioned. The result was that in a very short time the elevators were filled, and the farmer who needed money to meet his financial obligations found himself in a position where he had the value in grain to meet those obligations, but he could not find any market for it. In the meantime, the market value of wheat was going down at an alarming rate, and the loss sustained by those men was very serious. The cause of this condition seems to have been the great shortage on the Canadian National system of cars suitable for shipping grain. In many districts that I visited last fall, the farmers were hauling their grain many miles beyond Grand Trunk Pacific points in order to get to the Canadian Pacific where cars were available.

I am pointing this out more to acquaint the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) with the facts, than for the sake of offering criticism, in the hope that this condition may be remedied before another crop is placed on the market.

Besides the serious loss that has been suffered by the farmers on account of the shortage of grain cars on the Canadian National system, there is another important feature. A very substantial increase in freight rates was granted to the railway companies last year, but owing to the shortage of cars in the early part of the wheat shipping season, our National system was not in a position to take full

advantage of this increase. As a result, we have been called upon to pay a greatly increased freight rate, largely to the Canadian Pacific railway, and on top of that, we shall have to get down into our pockets and pay the deficit on the Canadian National system, thus paying twice, whereas, had there been sufficient cars to earn the additional revenue mentioned, we would have had to pay only once, to some degree at least.

I now come to a subject which, up to a day or two ago, seemed to be a rather dangerous one for a member sitting in this group to approach. I refer to the Canada Wheat Board. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been patting themselves on the back for the success of the Wheat Board, and they have tried to make it appear that every member in this group was diametrically opposed to it. That is not the fact, as I am sure they are convinced now after the proofs that have been placed on Hansard by previous speakers. Every member of this group was in favour of the continuance of the Wheat Board for another year, and if my hon. friends opposite pat themselves on the back because of the success of the board, what have they to say about its discontinuance? Nothing. As soon as it was seen in the West that the board was a success and a great boon to the farmers, we asked for its continuance for another year; but the Government, supported by those hon. gentlemen said: "No; we will not allow it to continue," this, notwithstanding the fact that the same or practically the same system of buying by Government commission, axisted in 1920 as existed in 1919. Even in the statement read by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Blair), there is no proof that Mr. H. W. Woods, President of the United Farmers of Alberta, was opposed to the Wheat Board if it were kept clear of politics. Mr. Woods, at the Moosejaw convention of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, stated that, in his opinion, if the Canada Wheat Board had been continued for another year, that is the year 1920, it would have saved the farmers of western Canada at least $50,000,000. That is the statement also made by the hon. member for Battle River. I do not know whether he obtained his statistics from Mr. Woods or not. I see he shakes his head, but he will agree with Mr. Woods on that one point at least. I well remember in the debate which took place upon the Wheat Board last year, that the hon. leader of this party hesitated to commit himself to the endorsation of the Canada Wheat Board as a permanent institution, but he made a strong plea for its continuance during 1920 until selling conditions became more normal. Compare his attitude with that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and what do we find? The leader of this party asked for the continuation of the Board for another year; but the Minister of Trade and Commerce absolutely refused, no doubt on the strength of representations made to him by parties interested in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and in other lines of commercial endeavour, who draw their incomes from the grain produced on the farm on its way to the ultimate consumer.

The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) appears to have made a great discovery. In his speech the other day, amid the tremendous applause of those who sit around him, more particularly those from Western Canada, be announced that there were abuses in the grain trade in Western Canada. Well, that was not at all surprising to those sitting in this group, and I would remind the hon. gentleman that in the very first remarks I made in this House on the Budget of 1918, I drew the attention of the Government to that very fact. It is now suggested, with a blare of trumpets, that a commission is to be appointed to investigate the grain trade in Western Canada, I have this to say to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), who seems to be heading this agitation on the Government side and also to the Government: that if this Commission is appointed, and if it is composed of practical men capable of investigating the grain trade, men of integrity, men free from political influence, it will have my entire support; but I would remind the hon. member for Macdonald and the Government, that the people of this country are becoming somewhat tired of the continual procession of commissions that have been appointed since 1917 and before, and which have professed a very great deal, but, in the estimation of the people have accomplished very little. The only real accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, that I can call to mind has been from a commission which is not precisely a Government commission; I refer to the Board of Railway Commissioners. They have succeeded in raising the freight rates. I do not think under the circumstances that hon. gentlemen sitting in this group can be accused of being overly suspicious if they suggest that the appointment of this commission to investigate the grain trade in Western Canada is being

urged more for political purposes than for any real good that may come to the farmers as a result of its investigations.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), in what seemed to me to be a very able address this afternoon, pointed out a very patent fact, and I think the same fact was pointed out by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), namely, that the commission under whose jurisdiction the grain trade of Western Canada is at the present time, is a Government commission entirely under the control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). Therefore, if this new commission finds anything wrong with the grain trade, I fear that the censure will fall on the heads of hon. gentlemen opposite.

A few days ago we had a speech from the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier). I am sure we all thoroughly enjoyed that speech as an oratorical effort. With regard to the main portion of his speech I have nothing to say, because it had to do with what is more or less a family quarrel in the official Opposition party; but I find on page 86 of Hansard a reference which he made to so-called foreign-born living in Western Canada, and I think it is my duty as a representative of some of those foreign-born, and as a citizen of Western Canada, to draw attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks. He said:

> Sir, I have no objection to the people of the West; none at all. I respect them. They came her to draw from the soil the wealth which Providence has stored there for those who are sturdy enough to work and obtain it. I have no objection to their helping us to develop the country. But, Mr. Speaker, figures are figures, and I have before me figures that show that west of the Great Lakes 63 per cent of the population are not British born. This is not my fault, but it is a fact. Am I going to preach an alliance with those who have not the same ideals as we have and who do not love our institutions? No, Sir, I cannot do that; for one, I will not consent to it. Everyone, of course, is at liberty to choose his own ally. I am choosing mine, and I shall try to make my people see as I do in this matter.

Taking into consideration the fact that from year to year the various governments have spent a considerable amount of the people's money in an effort to bring immigration to this country, and have been very successful in obtaining a great number of foreign-born settlers in Western Canada, I think such references are unfortunate, to say the least. We in Western Canada fully realize that before we can have a thoroughly united people, these people of foreign birth must be assimilated into our population, and must be taught our Canadian ideals. I have travelled among these people to whom my hon. friend makes reference, and from my own personal experience I wish to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have none of his apprehension. I would remind him of the fact that a great many of these so-called foreign-born have come into this country to escape oppression in their native land, and thoroughly appreciate the freedom and the privileges which they enjoy in Canada, and they are true and loyal to our institutions.

I wondered when I heard the hon. gentleman's remarks if he referred to the American-born in Western Canada. We have thousands and thousands of American-born citizens in Western Canada, and we have no finer settlers there. These people have practically the same ideals that we have. They are industrious and they are making splendid citizens of this country. I call to mind an instance which will go to prove the statement that these people are rapidly becoming true Canadian citizens. A few years ago a family came to Western Canada from the State of Indiana. There was a young girl in that family. She completed her education in the province of Saskatchewan, and later was employed as a school teacher in the district in which I reside. I have had occasion to go many times to that school house. I have taken a particular interest in it, as I do in most of the schools in my constituency, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no school teacher in this country who is more zealous in teaching the love of Canada and true Canadian ideals to her pupils than that little girl from Indiana.

There comes to my mind another instance. Another family came from the United States to Saskatchewan. The head of this family had been at one time President of the Senate in one of the States of the American Union. He brought with him two sons. The father took up a considerable tract of land, and is one of the largest farmers in the district where he resides. He is a respected citizen, a man who takes a keen interest in all our local institutions. He is keenly interested in all the political affairs of this country, and has given every evidence of loyalty to our institutions. His sons publish a weekly paper in a town in Saskatchewan. I am a subscriber to that little country paper, and I want to say that in its editorial columns I have read just as strong a defence of Canadian and

British institutions as I ever read in any periodical published anywhere in Canada by men who are British or Canadian-born.

I happened to come across one of these editorials to-day, and I shall endeavour to read without mentioning the names which appear in it. I merely quote this article to show the class of editorials that appear in this paper, published by sons of a man president of the Senate in a certain state in the American Union and who has come to Canada and settled here. The occasion that brought forth this editorial was the dedication of a community hall in the town where these people reside. A certain gentleman was asked to make an address at the meeting and he made the statement that he found himself in a district in which the majority were of foreign origin. A letter was published later in this paper commenting on the address of this gentleman and the editorial comment was as follows:

> But there is one reference in Mr. Griffin's letter that the Despatch takes exception to, and that is where he states that Mr ——— found himself in the midst of a foreign majority. Mr. ——— was not in any such place at the hall He was visiting a Canadian town and was surrounded by Canadians. And we venture the opinion that Mr. ——— knows that he could travel the length of Great Britain and her possessions and nowhere would he find a community living more in harmony, more loyal to Canadian institutions, or more proud of British freedom. The fact that we are not natives is, strictly speaking, something that we all have in common. But our people are naturalized in law and in heart and would resent by an overwhelming majority at the poll any candidate who sought to curry favour by introducing sectionalism.

That is the sentiment expressed by some of the so-called foreign born. It has often occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulty we encounter in Western Canada in assimilating the foreign-born, lies not with those people themselves but with our own Canadian-born and British-born subjects. It appears to me that what we need is a broader and stronger Canadian national spirit. When you find men who are always vaunting their birth-place and proclaiming from the house-tops the fact that they are descended from fathers born in England, Scotland, or Ireland, as the case may be—when you find Canadian-born men walking around and calling themselves Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen, what can you expect those who come from Germany to do? Why, the German-born settler in western Canada will say "I am German;" and why should he not? What we want in this country, Mr. Speaker, is more people who will boldly declare, when asked concerning their nationality, that they are Canadians.

In connection with this subject I should like to cite a personal incident that occurred when the last census was being taken in Canada. It may be of interest to those who have charge of the present work in connection with the forthcoming census. I was in the town of Unity, Saskatchewan, when the Census Commissioner came and requested the necessary information in order to compile his statistics. We came to the point of nationality and the commissioner asked me, of course, what my nationality was. I told him I was Canadian. "Yes," he said, "I understand that; we are all Canadians. But you must be descended from people of extraneous origin. "Well," I replied, "I am not descended from any other nationality at all; I am just a Canadian." "What was your father's nationality?"—he then demanded. I said: "My father is a Canadian." The next question was: "Was he born in Canada?" I said "yes." "Well then," he said becoming rather annoyed, "Where was your grandfather born?" I replied: "He was born in Canada and you may go back one of two generations more and I will give you the same answer." Then he said: "Well, we have no column in this return for Canadian nationality." And my answer was: "If I am not a Canadian, I am nothing, and you may call me a Negro or a Chinaman or anything else you choose. My answer is simply, I am a Canadian."

Mr. HAY: Was that in 1911?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much having occupied so much time, but I desire for a moment to refer to a paragraph in the speech delivered the other day by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson). I had not the privilege of hearing the hon. gentleman's speech, but on looking over the report of his address in Hansard, I find that it was more or less an attack of a rather violent nature against this party and particularly against our leader (Mr. Crerar). I should like to read one paragraph of the hon. gentleman's speech. On page 306 of Hansard, the hon. member for East Algoma is reported as follows:

> What has been the attiude of the hon. member for Marquette, their leader, towards the farmers of this country? The hon. gentleman was Minister of Agriculture for at least a year and a half at a period when every Government in Canada, provincial and federal, backed by the whole body of public opinion, was bending

its energies to increase production, when the Dominion Treasury one might say, was wide open for the hon. gentleman to use its funds in any way that would stimulate our agricultural production. Can he point to one single Act that passed through this House at his suggestion to improve the condition of our farmers? Not one single Act or suggestion.

We see expressed in that paragraph the opinion of the hon. member for East Algoma of the hon. leader of this party. Without further comment, let me read the opinion of another hon. gentleman of this House, the right hon. member for Kings, Nova Scotia, (Sir Robert Borden), the late Prime Minister, of whom the leader of this party was at one time a colleague. On June 4th 1919, on the occasion of the resignation of the hon. member for Marquette, the right hon. member for Kings wrote as follows:

My dear Mr. Crerar, I have received with deep and unfeigned regret your resignation as a member of the Government but I entirely appreciate and respect the sincerity of the convictions which have impelled you to take that course. It will be my immediate duty to acquaint His Excellency the Governor General with your decision and to request his authority for the acceptance of your resignation. During the period of nearly two years in which you have been one of my colleagues your high sense of public duty, your fine ability and indefatigable energy have made your service to the country especially valuable. Within that period problems of an exceptionally difficult character have continually presented themselves, and I am most grateful to you, and to all my colleagues for the loyal assistance and earnest effort which on all such occasions have been of invaluable assistance to me in the consideration of such questions.

My association with you as one of my colleagues will always be to me a happy memory and I know that I may express this to you on behalf of all the members of the Government.

I am very grateful for your kind words in respect to my own part in public affairs since it has been my privilege to have you as one of my colleagues.

With every good wish

Believe me,

Dear Mr. Crerar,

Yours faithfully,

R. L. BORDEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here the opinion of two members of the House with respect to the leader of the Progressive party. The first is the opinion of the member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson). It is quite possible that he may hold his opinion in higher esteem than he does that of the hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) but I reserve the right to use my own judgment in the matter, and for my part I prefer the judgment of the former leader of the Government.

I would like to refer for a moment to the speech delivered a short time ago by

the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie). It will be remembered that the Minister of Militia followed the hon. member for Red Deer in this debate. The remarks of the Minister of Militia in reference to the splendid speech delivered by the hon. member for Red Deer were very scant indeed. He had no answer to make to the criticisms offered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark) and I think there was a very good reason for it—he could not find any arguments against them. He brushed aside the splendid effort, the magnificent speech of the hon. member for Red Deer, with the statement that this country was not very much interested in British politics, that it was much more concerned with Canadian politics. Well, we all agree with that statement, but did the minister not realize that in speaking as he did he was passing censure upon the Prime Minister. Practically the whole of the recent speech of the hon. member for Red Deer was a reply to a speech delivered by the Prime Minister at the last session of Parliament, when the latter made a comparison between British and Canadian politics and drew his own inference therefrom, and in the opinion of a good many, the premier's conclusions were not very well founded.

I would like to pass on to a paragraph in the speech of the Minister of Militia in which he referred to the commercial activities of the organized farmers of Western Canada. On page 43 of Hansard we find that the minister made the following statement:

But there is another point of view in regard to this matter. It is said that we in Canada are to-day suffering, to some extent at least, from unemployment. Is it a patriotic thing, or a sound thing economically, to take the money of the people of Canada at this critical period, to send it across to the United States to give employment in the factories there, to pay wages and keep employed citizens of the United States, while so many good Canadians during the past few months have been looking for jobs in this country? Would it not, in the first place, be a more patriotic thing, and in the second place, a sounder thing economically, if the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and his friends of the United Grain Growers would look about them in this country to the scores, yes, even hundreds, of Canadian manufacturers who can supply the goods they require, and try to make terms with them, spend their money in this country and thus give employment to unemployed Canadians.

That sentiment meets with the approval of all. I do not need to go into any details as to why the United Grain Growers' Company did not handle Cana-

10 p.m. dian goods. That question was very thoroughly dealt with by

the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) this afternoon. He stated that on the organization of the commercial activities of the United Farmers' they went to the Canadian manufacturers and tried to obtain Canadian goods. They could not do so because the Canadian manufacturers would not sell to them. Now, in all fairness I would say this: There may be a good reason why the Canadian manufacturers could not supply them, but they have never considered it worth while to make that explanation. When the Minister of Militia was reading us this lecture across the floor of the House perhaps it would have been more to the point for him to have turned about and addressed his remarks to the manufacturer members who sit behind him. If anybody is to blame for the condition that exists, for the quantity of American goods that is being handled by the Grain Growers' Organization in Western Canada, it is those very manufacturers who refuse to supply Canadian goods. I wonder if the Government are so keen and so anxious as they profess to keep their money in Canada and in all cases to purchase Canadian goods. We had a short time ago the case of the Government wishing to re-organize the Civil Service. Did they employ a Canadian firm to do that work? I think not. It appears to me that I heard a faint whisper somewhere that they went to Chicago and obtained the services of the Griffenhagen Company to carry out this work of reorganization, or disorganization, or whatever it may be. In this connection I would like to refer to another case. I am told that there is a garage maintained in the city of Ottawa in which are housed a number of automobiles for the use of Cabinet Ministers, Government cars paid for by Government money. I am not criticising that. It may be all right to buy these cars for the ministers; they may be perfectly entitled to use them. That is not the point I want to bring out. It is well known to you, Sir, and to hon. members that quite a number of splendid automobiles are manufactured in Canada by Canadian labour. Did the Government purchase cars of Canadian manufacture for the ministers' use? I think not. It strikes me that one of the makes that they run is called the "Cadillac," and I never heard of a "Cadillac" car being manufactured in Canada.

Another example comes to my mind. I remember very well a year or two ago when the Department of the Interior—which was then presided over by the present Prime Minister—decided to plough certain wild prairie land held by the Department of Indian Affairs and it was necessary to purchase machinery for the purpose. Did the hon. Minister of the Interior of that day, who is now the Prime Minister, insist on the purchase of Canadian made machinery for that purpose? Oh, no. He purchased Rumely traction engines, six of them, manufactured in Laporte, Indiana, notwithstanding the fact, which is very well known, that good traction engines are manufactured in the province of Ontario by Canadian labour, using, I presume, Canadian materials.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already taken up more time than I intended. I just wish to make a few remarks in regard to my stand on the vote which will shortly be taken. I was elected in the general election of 1917 to support—not the present Government but the preceding government for the period of the war. I wish to emphasize that point, it was for the period of the war that I was elected to support the Government then under the leadership of the right hon. member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden). We met in Battleford constituency—the executives of the two old political parties—and we came to an understanding to form a union of forces for a specific purpose—for the purpose of electing a member to come to Ottawa and support a Union Government for the period of the war, the specific purpose being the winning of the war; no other issue whatsoever entered into the arrangement. I remember on one or two platforms the tariff issue was mentioned, and the answer was given that we were not concerned about the tariff at all; the point in our minds was whether the money derived from the tariff would be spent in the Dominion of Canada or in Germany. That was the sentiment all through the campaign. I believe that I am properly expressing the sentiments of the vast majority not only in the constituency I have the honour to represent, but in all of Western Canada, and, I think, in a good deal of Eastern Canada as well, when I say that, regardless of any constitutional aspect of the case, the people of this country believe that the Government has outlived its mandate and that there should be a general election.

I differ from the Government on their tariff policy, and I take it that that is the chief issue in the speech of His Excellency. Therefore it will be my duty to vote want of confidence in the Government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I desire to take to myself and to offer to the House and to the country a comforting thought. I think that in the strife of party politics men sometimes magnify the evil which is to be wrought upon their beloved country if their own particular notion of public affairs should not happen to prevail. It is as well perhaps that we should guard against an error of that sort, and while each of us may press as earnestly as be likes his particular line of thought, it will be better, I think, if we keep in mind the fact that even if our view shall not prevail the sun will still rise and the King's Government will be carried on.

Naturally, from my point of view, I think the best kind of Government that this country can have is a Liberal Government. I think the traditions and history of the past show that. And if we may have a Liberal Government at no distant day, I trust that it may be as successful in the future as it has been in the days that have gone by. But perhaps that admirable condition of affairs is not attainable; it may be that we cannot have the blessing of a Liberal Government at an early day, and we may have to be content with a Farmer Government. It is quite conceivable, it is quite possible. Now, the prospect, if you so regard it, of a Farmer Government sitting in the seats of the mighty here, does not alarm me in any way as it does hon. gentlemen opposite. I cannot subscribe to the Farmers' view on all things, but I decline to regard the farmers of this country as Bolshevists, or Anarchists, or Communists, or any other kind of 'ists except good Canadianists. I have an abiding faith that if in the movement of events our Farmer friends should be entrusted with power the sense of responsibility which will then come to them will lead them to pursue a moderate course, and that though we may not agree with it on one side or the other, I cannot conceive that from that course there will flow any particular disaster to this Dominion. So a Liberal Government is the first choice; and a Farmer Government would not be too bad; and I will go so far as to say that if the worst comes to the worst—and that means if we have a Tory Government—the country could survive event that. The truth is, it is a case in which the patient, that is, the Dominion, is so strong that it can stand the doctoring schemes of any one of these parties and still survive.

I join most heartily in what has been said in congratulation of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) upon his attaining at a comparatively early age the high position which he now occupies. It has been my misfortune often to differ with the right hon. gentleman, and I am very much afraid that our conceptions of public affairs are such that our difference will continue; but that should not prevent me recognizing, as I do in all sincerity, that he will bring to the duties of his high office great qualities—first, the quality, the superb and highest of all qualities, high personal character; he will bring to it marked ability, of which we all have had evidence; and he will bring to it untiring industry. These are great qualities. May I not say too—and that is where the comforting thought comes in—that we have similar qualities in the two hon. gentlemen who lead the other parties? In my hon. friend who sits at my side, the leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Mackenzie King), and in my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), the leader of the Farmers' party, we have men who have also youth on their side, who have character, who have talent, who have industry. And from that I draw this thought, that no matter what may occur, this country cannot go so very far wrong when it comes under the leadership of any one of these three gentlemen. These qualities that I have mentioned—personal character, great ability and great industry—are indeed splendid qualities in mankind; they are qualities which each of these gentlemen brings as an asset to the Party which he leads: they are qualities which they all bring as assets in the common service of our country.

Among the subjects that have been discussed in this debate on the Address, not the least interesting has been the question of the League of Nations. It is true, as my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) said yesterday, that our representatives at the League of Nations have valiantly defended in this House that which nobody is attacking. This House is unanimous in its belief in the League of Nations. I myself am most cordially in favour of the League. I am not only in favour of it in principle, but I am in the main in favour of the machinery whereby the League of Nations is created. It may be within the recollection of the House that when the question of the Treaty of Versailles was before Parliament I gave expression to some views concerning Canada's participation in the League of Nations, in which I was careful to say that I spoke for myself only. I differed from the hon.

gentlemen opposite and I differed from many of the hon. gentlemen surrounding me. I want to be permitted again to state briefly my position in that respect.

I have said that I warmly favoured the League of Nations. It has not accomplished all that was hoped for; it has disappointed some people, and many look upon it to-day with very great gloom. I do not take that view. I regard the League of Nations as a noble scheme for a noble end, and even though it may not accomplish all that was intended, I regard it as a case, indeed, in which it is better to have tried and failed than not to have tried at all. Although the League of Nations has disappointed me in some respects, and although it is particularly disappointing in the failure of the United States to join—I can hardly conceive of its being a success if that nation stays out—nevertheless, with all the criticism that is offered, I still desire to be counted as a warm admirer and supporter of the League of Nations.

My difference was with regard to the manner in which Canada was participating in that League. Again let me remind the House that I am speaking entirely for myself on that particular point. My view of the matter was this: in all that makes for our Imperial relations; in all that concerns the relations between Canada and the Mother Country and other portions of the British Empire, in what I may call the inner circle of our Imperial family, I want Canada to occupy, as she has occupied for many years, a position of ever-increasing weight and influence. When we come to deal with foreign affairs, I am not desirous that Canada shall play a part of her own, separate and apart from the British Empire. I want the British Empire, when we come to deal with foreign affairs, to enter every conference as a unit, not as representing several places. Even in matters concerning Canada alone; even in Imperial matters in which Canada is particularly interested, my desire would naturally be that Canada should be, as she has been, represented by Canadians, but I would have them go into the conference not merely as Canadians, but as representatives of the British Empire. I expressed the fear—and I am not going to withdraw that expression to-day—that with the best of intentions—and I do not for a moment question the good intentions of the gentlemen concerned—this declaration on the part of the Dominions that they must have a separate existence in all these conferences, and a separate existence in the League of Nations, was not making for that Imperial unity that we should desire, but was paving the way towards separation. I have seen no reason to change my view in that respect.

There is a small party in Canada which desires the separation of this country from the British Empire; which desires the independence of Canada; which desires Canada to withdraw from the Empire and set up as an independent sovereign nation. I have spoken of it as a small party; it may be larger than we know. I speak of it as a small party because only a few gentlemen have identified themselves publicly with that movement. They are gentlemen of high standing, gentlemen of ability, gentlemen whose sincerity we can respect, even though we may not agree with their conclusions. But I want to call the attention of the House to this significant fact: I find that so far as I have come in contact with or learned the views of these gentlemen, every advocate of the independence of Canada looks with approval upon Canada's position in the League of Nations because he regards it as the beginning of a movement for the separation of Canada from the Empire.

That view is not held by me alone. There are several things occurring in relation to the proceedings of the League of Nations, to some of which I will draw attention. The speeches of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), of the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), our three representatives at the League of Nations, were very interesting. They gave us some information and presented their case as gentlemen of ability always do. But there were some things going on in the League of Nations about which they did not tell us; and it is a pity that we have to look to outside sources for some of the information that we ought to get here. I think that as the consequences of our action unfold themselves, there will be a revision of some of the judgments hastily formed a year or two ago—I think I see evidence already that on both sides of the House light is breaking.

There is a financial side to the question which some members will regard as important. The League of Nations is a rather expensive luxury. I hold in my hand an article which describes what is called by responsible men the "great extravagance" of that body. I will trouble the House only with the headlines:

Fat Sinecures on Paid Personnel of Commissions. Allied captains receive much more

than Marshal Foch, state French. Flagrant Injustice. Most Scandalous of Anomalies Inaugurated by Versailles Treaty. Princely Chauffeurs.

Now, of all that extravagance Canada pays her share. I am not presenting that as a serious side of the matter; by-and-by some members of the House who feel more keenly interested in that class of question than I do may draw attention to it. I only mention it in passing; I do not regard it as the gravest situation. The gravest position arising out of our action with respect to the League of Nations is that we are having the unfortunate spectacle—the word is not too strong—of the representatives of Canada and the representatives of the Empire quarrelling in the eyes of the public at the Peace Conference and at the League of Nations. There is evidence of that, and as the hon. gentleman did not give us a full report of all these things, we have to resort to the press. I find the following report from Geneva, dated December, 1920:

During yesterday's voting the British Empire was divided on nearly every question, Canada and South Africa voting against Great Britain regarding Armenia, and Australia abstaining from voting when the question of Bulgaria was before the Assembly.

Canada and the Empire voting against one another, quarrelling before the wide world, and showing that there is not that unity of the Empire which all should desire to bring about. Well, there is further information along the same line. I have before me a quotation from a New York journal. Careful observers in the public press are noticing what is happening in these proceedings; they are noticing the quarrels between the representatives of the Mother Country and those of the Dominions, and every enemy of Great Britain and the Empire is getting aid and comfort from these quarrels—which, I say, are not creditable to Canada, not creditable to the dominions generally. Here is an article from the New York World:

The Dominions disagree not only with the Mother Country, but with one another. England wants the Council to be supreme; Canada, South Africa and India claim equal rights for the Assembly. Canada is supporting the compulsory adjudication of international disputes, as urged by Elihu Root, which England opposes. On the questions of admitting Germany to the League and disarmament, as to which England has expressed no final opinion, the dominions are sharply in conflict.

Again we have evidence that the differences and quarrels between the representatives of the Mother Country and the representatives of Canada and the other dominions are attracting the notice of the outside world; and who shall say that conditions of that kind are making for Imperial unity? Let me quote another passage. We are all acquainted with that venerable labour leader, whose eloquent voice we heard down in the Museum two or three years ago, Mr. Samuel Gompers. There is much in his record that I admire; but in this particular instance, I regret what he had to say. He said:

"It was my experience," continued Mr. Gompers, "and I look upon it as something of a dependable guide, that the votes of the representatives of these Dominions and Commonwealths were more often with the United States than with Britain."

That is the fruit of Canada's participation in the matter—insisting on having an opportunity to play her own game. I know every hon. member in this House feels as I do in regard to the need for Imperial unity. I do not ascribe anything but the best motives to any hon. gentleman who differs from me, but I ask my hon. friends to think seriously over the situation as presented where, instead of having an Empire with a united front to promote peace, we have the representatives of the different sections of the Empire quarrelling in the eyes of the foreign world. It may be remembered that in discussing the League of Nations in this House, some of us took exception to one particular clause. In the particular point that I have been speaking of for the last few minutes, I have been speaking for myself, and I do not wish anybody now to endorse what I say. There came a moment in that discussion, when in the name of the Liberal party in this House, I made a motion in the House concerning the League of Nations. There was in that League one section known as Article X, which, if I may be permitted, I will read. It reads:

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

We did not undertake, although we did not like that clause, to move an amendment to it. We recognized the fact that a treaty, a bargain signed by a number of nations, could not be amended by the will of one. We did not even adopt the Washington practice, the method adopted there, of making reservations. All that we proposed to do was to say that there was a vagueness about that clause, and

that it would be the part of wisdom if, while adopting the Treaty, while confirming it without any qualifications, we should place on record our understanding of what that clause should mean. Therefore, with the consent of my friends around me, I moved the following motion:

That in giving such approval—

That was the approval to the Treaty—

—this House in no way assents to any impairment of the existing autonomous authority of the Dominion, but declares that the question of what part, if any, the forces of Canada shall take in any war, actual or threatened, is to be determined at all times as occasion may require by the people of Canada through their representatives in Parliament.

That seemed a reasonable proposal. How were we met? The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) denounced the motion. He declared that Article X and the Covenant generally were all right; that the instrument was a perfect one; that he would not have any interference; that it was a Holy of Holies; that it must not be touched, and so we were voted down and the League of Nations, including Article X, was approved. What do we find now? The right hon. gentleman, who would not listen to our representations in this House, went across the seas and deliberately proposed to strike out Article X altogether. The House may remember that when the question first came before the House, when the Prime Minister of that day, the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden), delivered a speech in explanation of the Treaty which he was submitting to the House, I ventured to ask him the question what would happen if the House should neglect or refuse to endorse the Treaty. My right hon. friend said that in that case there would have to be a change of Government, and he would have to go out. So this was such a sacred document that interference with it in any degree would have brought on us that dissolution which some people seem to be so much alarmed about to-day. No words seemed to be too strong for my right hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) to utter in denouncing our proposition, which was not an amendment, not a reservation, but merely a declaration which we thought would make clear what should be the attitude of this Parliament in relation to any question of war. At that time, the Minister of Justice gave us his views as to how the matter should be dealt with. He said that it was highly improper that we should attempt to make any reservation or amendment or declaration of any form. He said that the treaty must go as it was; that it was all right. There was no word of doubt on his part. Then he went on to say that if it turned out by experience that there was something wrong about the treaty, if it needed change or amendment, there was a way in which that could be done. I quote from his speech:

I think that with what I have pointed out with regard to a better opportunity that will come for dealing with this Covenant, if it requires improvement as soon as the League of Nations has been brought into existence—with that present in our minds, and with this further fact present to our minds, that if any of us consider modification essential or of great importance, or if this House upon further consideration—

Observe that—

—should come to the conclusion that modification in connection with Article X or any other provision is necessary, it will be perfectly open and competent to this House, when it sends its representative to the League of Nations, to send him there with instruction as to the amendment, whether it be this or any other that, in the opinion of this House, is essential or necessary or desirable in the interests of Canada.

So the Minister of Justice pointed out that the proper, and the only proper, course for an amendment was that instruction should be given by the Parliament of Canada. What instruction did this Parliament ever give to the minister to go overseas and demand that Article X be stricken out? Article X and the whole treaty constituted a solemn compact to which this House became a party, and I deny the right of the Minister of Justice or anybody else, without the authority of this House, to go to Geneva and undertake, in the name of Canada, to move to amend that contract. The Minister of Justice did not even have instructions from his Government. I asked the question: What instructions were given? I asked the Government to bring down the Order in Council. They brought it down, and it simply set forth that a meeting of the League of Nations was to be held, and that the right hon. Minister of Justice, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), should be chosen as representatives of Canada. Not a line of instruction. By the very method that the Minister of Justice himself laid down, he should have come to this House for instructions, and he should not have tampered with that Covenant in a single line. His action in that regard was a specimen of the autocracy which this Government

is manifesting all the time. It was an exhibition of the contempt that the Government has for Parliament, and it is one of the reasons why every man who respects the rights of Parliament will be justified to-day in voting no confidence in this Administration.

I have heard no effective answer, Mr. Speaker, to the contention advanced by the hon. leader of the Opposition at the beginning of this debate, that this Government no longer had a mandate to conduct public affairs, and that they were carrying on public affairs without any good reason to believe that they had the confidence of the country. I said I have heard no effective answer. Of course there has been one answer. It has come from many quarters, and has always been the same. They tell us that our right to sit here is within the law. They point to the British North America Act which says that Parliament "may" sit for five years, and they in effect translate that "may" into "shall," and make it appear it is our duty to sit here for the full term of five years. Sir, that is not the spirit of the British constitution. It is not enough in these days to say that a thing is within the law. That which is within the law is not always expedient. That which is within the law is not always honourable. I think it was the right hon. the Minister of Justice who pointed us to what was occurring at Washington. There, he said, was a government which was defeated four months ago, and is still in power. Well, the American system has its merits, or they would not have it, for they are a pretty intelligent people, and it is a fair assumption that for everything that exists in their system there is some good reason. But their system in that respect is not ours. There is a rigidity in the American system which no doubt has its purpose. They provide that their election shall take place on a given day, and you cannot change that at all. I do not say it is wrong; it is their method, and as I have said, it must have some merit or they would not have it. But our system is just the reverse. There is an elasticity in the British system which has its purpose and the purpose is not that we shall sit out for the full term of five years, but that as there become evidences of change of public opinion in the country Parliament may be dissolved in order that the Government of the day may ascertain whether or not Parliament possesses the confidence of the country. The argument advanced by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was fortified by many others, and particularly in the very able speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) yesterday. What thoughtful man could have listened to that speech without seeing that the whole spirit of the British constitution was against hon. gentlemen who hold office at the present time?

The Prime Minister and one or two other gentlemen speaking on that side made allusion to my own experience in Nova Scotia as having some bearing on this question. Why, they said, when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was Premier of Nova Scotia and resigned, there was no election necessary. That is true, but the conditions were not the same. I was for twelve years the premier of that province. I had made a record. The people thought it remarkable. I remember one kind friend, who was willing to pay me a compliment, although we differed on political questions, said the Government was all right so long as I stayed, but when I left, it would go to pieces. Well, I left it, and turned over the affairs to Mr. Murray, and he has been there for 25 years. Here in the changing scenes of this Ottawa climate, men may come and men may go, but down in Nova Scotia a good Liberal Government apparently may go on forever.

None of us on this side have contended that a change of leadership necessarily calls for an election. There is no such argument. When Sir John Macdonald died in 1891, nobody claimed that dissolution of Parliament was necessary. There had been an election only a few weeks before. When, at a later stage, Sir John Abbott passed off the stage, and Sir John Thompson succeeded him, nobody thought that an election was necessary. There was no change of policy, merely a change of the individual. And in later years, in every case of the kind where change in leadership takes place not involving any change in policy, there was no reason for having an election. Nobody contends that the mere fact of a change of leader creates the necessity for an election.

But what is the situation here? We have a new leader of the Government; there is no dispute about that. We have a new name; we have a new policy. Now it appears to me that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is on the horns of a dilemma: either we have a new policy, or we have not. If we have a new policy, if it is a new Government, with a new leader, and a new policy, then no argument is

needed to show that you must go to the country and obtain a mandate to support that leader and his policy. Oh, but, some say, it is not new, it is the same old business, there is no change, so you do not need an election. Well, there is a change of name. Mr. Speaker, a change of name to an individual or to a corporation is a grave and serious matter. The man who undertakes without lawful authority to change his name, the man who travels under an assumed name without lawful authority, the man who travels under a false name, furnishes presumptive evidence that he has fraudulent intent. If this is the same old policy, what justification have they for calling the party by a new name? Is it not presumptive evidence of camouflage, or something described by a stronger word? If the right hon. the Prime Minister says it is the same policy, the same Government, the same group of men, the same old thing, he cannot say that and at the same time justify the change of name. There is no escape from that. Either this is the old policy under a false name, or a new policy on which they are afraid to appeal to the country.

Several hon. gentlemen have expressed their personal opinions as to the understanding at the time of their election. A, B and C say: There was no bargaining with me. I was elected for the term of five years; no conditions were imposed, and therefore I assume it is right for the Government to go on. Many of us can probably say that, but what was the experience of any individual, where the matter was not discussed at all, is not important. What is important is, what was the general understanding in the country everywhere, and surely it does not admit of debate that the general understanding in the country was that the Government was chosen for the purpose of the war. Necessarily there had to be a laying aside of controverted questions in order that the Unionist Government might be formed. For what period were those controverted questions laid aside? I can imagine the interview of the Prime Minister of that day with one of my Liberal friends. "We must come together, gentlemen," he says, "for the winning of the war." "Certainly," says my Liberal friend. "Well then," says the Prime Minister "we will hang together till the war is over." "Yes, that is all right. We will lay aside controverted questions for that period." "Hold on," says the Prime Minister, "I want you to agree to put aside these matters for four years after the war." I do not believe that even my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) would have accepted the condition if laid down in that way.

It is perfectly evident that the Unionist Government was formed for a period during which reasonable request could be made for laying aside controverted questions, but the war being over, the moment events so shaped themselves that these controverted questions were thrusting themselves up for consideration, that moment the mandate of the Government to conduct public affairs ceased. I do not see how that can be a matter of dispute at all. Oh, some may say, it is a very foolish thing, this proposal that the Government's mandate has ended. Well, if we are foolish people in contending that, we are foolish in pretty good company. The Hon. Mr. Carvell, the former member for Carleton, New Brunswick, was a very active member of the Union Government, but Mr. Carvell felt that the mandate of the Government had ceased, and he retired. He is not a foolish man. He has received one of the highest offices in the gift of the Government. That, at all events, is a testimony to his sagacity and his capacity. There are others. My hon. friend the member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), who so ably and so satisfactorily, I may say, discharged the duties of Minister of Militia and Defence, must have felt that the mandate of the Government had ended, for he resigned.

The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) also felt that the mandate of the Government had expired, that now questions having arisen, it was incumbent upon him to resign. Similarly, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), the moment they attempted to deal with the troublesome question of the tariff, found that he could not agree with them and therefore resigned; and he is not a fool. And the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), a very active and prominent member of the Union Government, evidently took the same view. He is not here to-night, but I should be doing him no injustice to say that the action he has taken proves that he regarded the Government as having exhausted its mandate, for which reason he has resigned. Now, in the face of the general understanding which cannot be disputed, in the face of the action of all these members of the Liberal party who were in the Government, it is evident that we on this side of

the House are justified in saying that the Government has exhausted its mandate and should appeal to the country.

These things are so patent that when the new Leader of the Government was called to his high position, it would have been, it seems to me, the part of wisdom for the right hon. gentleman to have said at once to his colleagues: "Gentlemen, I must appeal to the country, for I do not feel that I ought to carry on in this way." However, some of them apparently persuaded him to keep on, at a time when conditions were not at all propitious for such a course, He would have been well advised, I think, and it would have been far better for all concerned, had he, at the time the change was made, declared that the conditions were such as to compel him to appeal to the country.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite try to comfort themselves with the belief that all is going well. A dozen members have spoken and have said that all is well. They ask: "What is the need of a change? The Government is all right; everything is going well; why make a change at all?" Well, they might comfort themselves with that belief, but they will not comfort any unbiased friends outside. Let me read an example of the opinions that are expressed by those outside of this House. This is what a good Conservative newspaper says:

> Cabinet reorganization, so essential and so long deferred, must be faced by the new administration without much further delay.

Mark you, "essential and long deferred"; and that was in November last. At that time it had long been necessary, and now it is immediate and pressing.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the paper?

Mr. FIELDING: I am reading from the Montreal Gazette, through its Ottawa correspondent. After some complimentary remarks to the Prime Minister, indicating that his visit to the West has strengthened him, and so forth, this correspondent goes on to say:

> He can now devote himself to organization of his Cabinet and the initiation of constructive measures. It cannot be denied that reorganization is essential for the further success of the new administration. Some members of the Government, through age or ill-health, desire to retire; others should be retired; and others again must give way to men in whom the party and the country have greater confidence. There should be at least five changes in the Government. There is a long stern fight ahead of the administration, and in that fight success can only be attained by men of strong physique and mentality who have confidence in themselves, and in whom the people have confidence.

That was four months ago. At that time reorganization was overdue; it had long been needed. And now it is absolutely necessary. This newspaper tells us that five changes were necessary. How many ministers do I see present? Let me see, —one, two, three—I believe there are just five ministers sitting on the benches tonight! Now, I should not like to have the task of selecting the five whom this correspondent thinks should go. I am perfectly willing to vote them all out en masse, bag and baggage; I should not like to have to choose from among these genial and estimable gentlemen and to determine whose heads should go upon the block. But when they console themselves with this soothing delusion that all is going well; when they see such unmistakable evidence before them day by day, in the by-elections, of the trend of public opinion and public desire; when they see public opinion reflected in the utterances of their candid friends everywhere, telling them that they have outlived their usefulness, I cannot for the life of me understand why the Prime Minister of the day can complacently hang on to the last moment. Someone remarked today that the Tupper Government had held on to the last moment. Yes, and the result was a catastrophe; and if this Government should hang on to the bitter end, depend upon it the catastrophe will be greater. I think, therefore, every argument that has been advanced in support of the contention that the Government should obtain a mandate from the people is absolutely well-founded and well-supported.

But we are told that we ought to support the Government for all the good things it has done. Well, we have a little difficulty in determining the time at which we should begin the accounting. One minister has said that the Government is only responsible for what has happened since July last, while other hon. members have contended that this Government is the successor of all governments that have been in power since 1911; and that is the sounder view. My good friend, the Prime Minister, may to-day properly be held responsible for the policy of the Conservative party from the year 1911 down to the present time. He was associated with the late Prime Minister and was always ready to defend that hon. gentleman's government. I think, therefore, we shall be doing him no injustice if we hold him responsible for that government's conduct. But, hon. members

say: Look at the noble and patriotic action of this Government in regard to the war! Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a great thing, if you want praise, to shout about the war. But I want to remind my hon. friends that the war did not begin with the general election of 1917. The war had already been in progress before that and we have to go back earlier.

I pass over the manner in which the Government obtained power in 1911; I pass over the unholy alliance which they made with the Nationalists of Quebec which was the foundation of all the trouble that has occurred in that province since; I pass over the slogan of "No truck nor trade with the Yankees" which so aptly expressed their policy at that date; I pass over the breach of faith they committed when, after being elected to prevent free wheat, they put free wheat on the list; I pass over the breach of faith which they committed also in regard to potatoes—I pass over all these things and come to the war. The war began in 1914 and lasted for four years and a quarter, and for three-fourths of that time the Government led by the right hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia, the late Prime Minister, carried on a partizan Administration with all the evils attendant upon partizan patronage. For three years out of the four they made no attempt to form a Union Government, and they made overtures in that direction only when they were in extremities and were likely to be beaten.

That is the whole story—four years of war and only one year of Union Government. For three years they took the money which the people of Canada voted through this Parliament so liberally and patriotically for the purposes of the war and expended it with the help of every patronage committee of Canada. And that is patriotism! That is the record of this Government in wartime, Mr. Speaker, and when the people of Canada some day look into it they will see what a sorry record my hon. friends opposite have made. If we are going to have in this debate the history of the Government's action in the war, let us have the truth, and let us not be told that the Government is a patriotic body, when for three years out of four it carried on partizanship in all its extremes.

Now, I have no desire to detract from anything that has been accomplished by my right hon. friend from King's, Nova Scotia, in his capacity as Prime Minister. He occupied that high position for a long period in the midst of exciting scenes, and it is but reasonable to believe, as I believe and willingly admit, that he has much good legislation to his credit. On the great question upon which the parties broke, on the great question which was the basis of the formation of the Union Government, I agreed with him and I supported him, and I have no regrets to express for that course. But when we are told that he and the hon. gentlemen associated with him pursued a patriotic course throughout the war, I join issue on that assertion and reply that for three-fourths of the time the Government played the game of partizans and not of patriots.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I am occupying more time than I intended, but there are two or three other questions that I should like to refer to.

With regard to the Washington representation I am not going to offer any criticism, but in all sincerity and respect I desire to offer a word of advice. The Minister of Justice, I think rather smarting under some chaff that came from this side of the House, said that the Government would appoint an Ambassador to Washington whenever they found the right man. Well, I suppose he was obliged to say something like that, but my hope and belief is that the Government have revised their judgment in that matter and that they have concluded not to send an Ambassador to Washington. I am not criticising their action, I am merely venturing, in all sincerity, to offer a word of respectful advice. I know something of how work is done at Washington. Have commercial agents, as many as you like, where there is business to be done,—I offer no objection, —but I affirm that if Canada sends an Ambassador to Washington he will degenerate into nothing better than a clerk under the British Ambassador—that is all he can become.

I submit that the arrangement which exists to-day is a far better one. If there is a real question between Canada and the United States the Ministers-in-Council deal with the question, they thresh it out; and a minister leaving Ottawa this afternoon will be in Washington tomorrow afternoon and able to present the Governments views to the American government, or to whomsoever he may be dealing with. A minister of the Crown coming in that way fresh from Council, fresh from consultation with his colleagues, is more useful and more likely to be an efficient representative than any clerk dawdling around Washington, and half the time doing nothing at

all. I am not finding fault with anything the Government have done. I am in all earnestness and all sincerity, in the light of my experience, advising them to drop the Washington business.

Then there is the Imperial Conference. Now I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was not quite fair to the Government. He asked the Government to bring down to this House a statement of the policy which they intend to pursue at the Imperial Conference. Mr. Speaker, you cannot take the Breeks off a Hielan man.

11 p.m.

You cannot get from anybody that which he does not possess. I do not say it offensively, I do not say it by way of censure, but I believe this Government does not know about any policy with which to go to the Imperial Conference. There is nothing to confer about. There is a great deal of rubbish talked about these Imperial Conferences—a great deal of rubbish. I agree that conferences between Imperial ministers and overseas statesmen, the meeting together of these men and the exchange by them of opinions, each one learning how the science of government is worked out in other countries, all make for a good purpose, and I do not for a moment wish to be regarded as opposing a conference. On the contrary, I say that, from time to time, such conferences are exceedingly proper.

I do not hesitate to say, however, that from the point of view of Canada there is no question to-day which requires to be submitted to an Imperial Conference. Mr. Lloyd George may have some schemes over there which are referred to in recent press cablegrams. Mr. Lloyd George makes picturesque speeches, but they are not always followed up by anything practical. A good able man he undoubtedly is; but if Mr. Lloyd George has something to-day to propose over there, we want somebody to watch him. If Mr. Hughes, of Australia, if that gallant soldier-statesman from South Africa, General Smuts, has anything to propose, of course it is our duty to listen; but I take the responsibility of saying now that there is no question to-day before the Parliament of Canada which needs to be referred to any Imperial Conference.

Why, it sometimes happens when these conferences are held, when the members come together, that they wonder what in the world they are there for; and if you look over some of their proceedings you will be surprised how many resolutions have been passed which never amounted to anything. They were academic resolutions; they never came to anything. The truth is that there is a body of people over in England, not a very numerous one, that I might describe as the "Grand Order of Fussers." They are talking about a new constitution to come before the Imperial Conference. They are always talking about what Canada wants, and about what Australia wants. Sir, Canada does not want anything. I say again there is no question pending to-day that this Parliament knows of—and we have a right to know if there is any question—there is no question which needs an Imperial Conference at all—absolutely there is none.

We have one little question of importance in its way in regard to the cattle embargo. We think that the British Government are wrong in their attitude. We believe they are wrong, but we may as well let it go because, if we are maintaining the right to regulate our own trade and commerce, we are not going to claim the right to dictate to the British Government how to regulate their trade and commerce in their own way even if it does not happen to please us. But, apart from that question, no man in this House could tell us to-day what there is that requires an Imperial Conference so far as Canada is concerned.

Of course, if the conference is to be held, and if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister should still be in office in June, I think it is quite right that he should go; but he is not going to have a very happy time. If I am not mistaken, my right hon. friend will find himself in a curious position. Every other government representative at that conference will represent people who have expressed their views in recent years and since the war—I think that is correct. If that be the case, what will be the position of my right hon. friend? He is in the position that he does not represent the people of Canada. It is a weak position. He will be a lonely sparrow on the housetop, a solitary pelican in the wilderness. I should think it would be a humiliating position for my right hon. friend to occupy, and—one of my colleagues says—humiliating to the country. I do not mean for a moment to be understood as opposing a conference. I say again, conferences are needed from time to time. Conferences of men on trade and commerce are good things, and as a result of them men understand each other better. I would have Canada from time to time represented at a conference. But I do not hesitate to say

that for my right hon. friend to go over to England in June, with things as they now stand, and to undertake to represent Canada with the full knowledge that he possesses—because he is too intelligent a man to doubt the fact that he does not represent the people of Canada—is to place himself in a position that he ought not to occupy, a position that he will always regret.

We were told that we should support this Government because of the things they have done. I have spoken briefly of their general war record. I heard one hon. gentleman—I forget now who it was—speaking of the wonderful record of this Government—say, "Look, they have given votes to women." They did not. Looking back in my mind's eye to the elections of 1917, there are two households that I recall. One was a family of ladies who had votes. They had a son and a brother who had gone to the war, and it was right that they should have votes. But, close by, there was another home where there were three ladies who had no brother to send to the war, but who were giving their days and their nights, and their money and their energy, to all the good works that the women of Canada were doing. They had no votes because the Government did not put them on the voters' list. Was that patriotism? Was that statesmanship? Ah! but it is said, they have given the votes now to women generally. No, they have only pretended to give them votes. They have put a provision in the statutes giving them the votes, but they will have to wait until 1922 before they get a chance to vote. No, the things which my hon. friends opposite describe as tributes to the Government's wonderful policy will not stand examination. The Government has outlived its usefulness, as has been contended by many hon. members.

There is only one point more I think I will speak upon, because I believe there are other hon. gentlemen who desire to express their views to-night. One of the things we are told this Government has done for which we should give them great honour is the abolition of patronage. Well, I am not going to deny the Government some share of credit for that matter. If any hon. gentlemen in this House are anxious to have the control of patronage again, I am not one of them. I am not complaining if I have not any patronage. I do not want it. It is better to be without it for many reasons. If the Government has abolished patronage, I want to give them credit for it, but I must say this: No sooner do they agree to do these things than they begin to try and evade their own laws. I think it was the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who described them of being guilty of infanticide—they were always killing their own babies.

Well, with all the cry they have made about abolishing patronage, what is the situation? The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is to-day claiming the right to exercise patronage to the extent of 15,000 officials in this Dominion. I had a letter from a man down in my county who had heard somewhere that the census officials were going to be appointed on the nomination of the members. I wrote him that I thought he was mistaken, but that I would inquire. So I inquired of the proper department. I thought: If this is going to be done by the Civil Service Commission I am not going to complain; but if it is not going to be done by the Civil Service Commission, perhaps it will be well for me to ask if the members irrespective of politics are to make the recommendations. The assurance I got from the official authority is that they have gone back to the old patronage game; they are going to appoint the census officials on the nomination and recommendation of members supporting the Government. That is patronage. Why, Sir, in almost every claim the Government set up we discover that while they are making great professions of virtuous policy they do not live up to them.

For all these reasons I say the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in this amendment is the correct one. This Government have no longer a mandate to conduct the affairs of the country; they have no longer any right to believe that they have the confidence of the people of Canada.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow the very good example set by a number of the preceding speakers and extend my sincere congratulations to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on his accession to the very high office that he now occupies. I can remember in 1909, I think it was, when I first heard him speak as a young man, at that time a private member, I predicted that he would go far; that prediction has been realized. I further predict that if he desires to remain in public life he will always fill a very prominent position.

We have now a brand new Government with a brand new name and—I say it with all respect—a brand new Prime Minister. But, Sir, we find that they have a very old policy. I would have thought that a new government in such a new country as this, where conditions are changing, might to some extent modernize their policy. However, I will quote a passage from the speech of His Excellency, delivered as the mouthpiece of this Government. He said:

It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision—

Speaking of the tariff.

—regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There is so much conversation on the floor of this Chamber as well as in other parts thereof that it is absolutely impossible for the Speaker even to follow the hon. member who is now addressing the House. I must ask hon. members and others to refrain from talking.

Mr. MACNUTT: I was quoting a part of the speech of His Excellency regarding the tariff. It reads:

It is the opinion of my advisers that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained:

That is a very old policy—as old as the country. I am afraid that I cannot support it. At the same time I commend the Government for their frankness in stating exactly where they stand on the tariff. It is another story with regard to what we call the official Opposition. It is very difficult to say where they do stand with regard to the tariff. Liberalism, as I have always understood it, meant "no special favours," which are conveyed, of course, under protection. But from the expressions of prominent Liberals in public and private and their attitude generally, we have come to the conclusion that a majority of them do not stand upon their own fiscal platform. And it is a very good platform in some respects.

It has been claimed that this little group here, which I believe sincerely stands for free trade in many respects, for instance, in regard to tools and implements that are used in developing natural resources, free food, and so on, and a low tariff in other respects—it has been claimed, I say, that this little group should affiliate politically with the present Liberal party; but as long as there is that distrust amongst our group —I can speak for myself and, I think, for the rest of my colleagues—there is not very much chance that there will be any such fusion. Recent by-elections have shown that we are not very likely to fuse. And, besides, a great deal of evidence has been brought forward to show that there is more than a doubt as to where the Liberal party as a whole stands on the tariff. In support of this assertion I wish to quote some newspaper reports of statements claimed to have been made by prominent Liberals. This is the first report:

The recent speech by the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux at Ste. Martine, Chateauguay county, has attracted considerable attention in the East. In this address Mr. Lemieux said: "It is possible that in the West Liberals think that we should have a policy of free trade. It may be that in the West and in other provinces it is said that all duties should be abolished. It is necessary to have commonsense. Protection is necessary, moderate protection,—

I have never been able to find out what is meant by "moderate" protection. It occurs to me that this word is in the same class as the word "adequate" which was formerly used in the old Halifax platform of the Conservative party. It is altogether a matter of opinion that constitutes moderate protection.

—and equitably distributed with justice for the producer and consumer."

La Patrie, of Montreal, makes this comment on Mr. Lemieux's deliverance:

Following the example of other members of his party, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, at a public meeting at Chateauguay set himself out to destroy the impression that the Liberal party supports free trade. Briefly, but clearly, he formulated his policy as being one for moderate protection. One of the principal questions which the electors will be called upon to decide by their vote in the next general election will be that of tariff reform. It is true that on that question the Agrarian element, especially in the West, holds extreme views in favour of a radical reduction of the tariff, as a preliminary to its complete abolition. But in the speeches of the party leaders, ministerial and Liberal alike, nobody can discern exactly where their policy differs on this question. The Liberals who are responsible for the direction of their party evidently will not compromise themselves. They are obliged to acknowledge the imperiousness of the motives which compel the Federal administration to maintain a protective tariff.

At a dinner in Quebec addressed by the Hon. J. A. Caron, Minister of Agriculture in the Quebec Government the principal guests were the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) The following is a summary of some of the remarks made by Mr. Caron who is a pronounced Liberal and leader in the province:

Mr. Caron had at his right throughout the luncheon Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, leader of the Liberal Opposition, and on his left, separated from him only by C. A. Magrath, the chairman, Premier Meighen. The address was refreshingly frank, the speaker declaring in preface of his political observations that the best thing for him to do was "to tell the truth." He opened his address by referring to the importance of agriculture in the Dominion and by outlining the means taken by his province to further that basic industry. He intimated, however, that manufacturing was rapidly increasing in his province, declared flatly that there were no free traders in Quebec."

An extract from a report of the meeting of the Tariff Commission at Three Rivers, Quebec, is as follows:—

The local Board of Trade, represented by Mr. Burrill, its president, registered in favor of a protective tariff as the best means to protect Canadian industries. Eugene Tremblay, in the name of the employees of the Wabasco Cotton Company, of Three Rivers, said that any reduction of the tariff would be prejudicial to their company and consequently prejudicial to the employees of this company. He favours the maintenance of the present tariff law. The directors of the Shawinigan Cotton Company said that the textile industry had no actual protection on account of the depreciation of the pound sterling, and they ask for a more severe tariff.

Well, Sir, I was wondering what the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) a very prominent Liberal sitting on this side of the House, thinks of the views of a number of his prominent constituents.

There is no use, Sir, in going over the ground that has been travelled so much. I simply wish to give a few reasons for voting as I shall to-night, I wish also to say a few words with regard to a matter in which we are all interested, the welfare of the returned soldiers. This is a matter which we cannot allow to become stale. I am going to say a few words in connection with the settlement of soldiers on the land in the West—in fact, all over Canada. I believed in that plan; I believe in it yet, although I have sometimes criticised its local administration. Conditions have changed very much lately and I think there should be a review of the situation to some extent. The report of the Board is a very favourable one; it goes to show that to a large extent the plan has been successful. I wish to read the following summary of it:

The loans granted to date total $80,302,649; the amount of land taken up, 3,371,000 acres; estimated saving to the soldiers on the purchase of land, $2,700,000; and the area of new land broken in the West, 202,730 acres.

A summary of the operations of the Soldier Settlement Board up to November 30, 1920, is given as follows:

Number of veterans in communication with Board, 100,000; number applied for privileges of Act, 58,811; number accepted as qualified to farm, 41,906; number qualified but not yet located, 21,975; number in training under supervision of Board, 916; number completed training, 1,144. Total number of loans, 19,931; total amount, $80,302,649.

These loans were distributed over the different provinces as follows: Prince Edward Island, 302; Nova Scotia, 397; New Brunswick, 511; Quebec, 455; Ontario, 1,405; Manitoba, 3,297; Saskatchewan, 4,893; Alberta, 5,727; British Columbia, 2,944. The amount of loans disbursed was $70,281,872; initial payments on land purchased, $3,672,638; number liable for repayments November first, 12,507; number who made repayments, 7,470, or 59 per cent; amount due, $2,334,174; amount repaid, $1,369,256, or 58 per cent. Now that was a very fair showing. I do not know to what particular provinces this percentage relates, but I want you to notice that 41 per cent did not make even the small payment required under the Act. Further, it is not stated whether the repayments were made in full or not. In fact, I know that a number of them were not made in full. The following are some further figures with regard to this land settlement plan.

Number who have repaid loans in full, 291; number of failures and changes of ownership adjusted, 166; amount invested in these farms, $620,869; amount realized in re-sale of farm and equipment (showing average loss of $38 per farm), $614,548. Stock and equipment purchased for soldier settlers, $22,619,759; saving to settlers through special arrangements with dealers, $742,568.

A great number of these settlers have so far appeared to have done well. All will congratulate the Board upon handling the matter as well as possible, and the men themselves are also to be congratulated. But, I keep pretty much in touch with these matters and I know that a great many of the returned men have not done very well, through no fault of their own. I will mention some of the reasons. All that they purchased was bought at a time when prices were at the peak. In my locality, on account of the spring being late, a great many of the men did not put in much wheat. They sowed principally oats and barley for which they had to pay one dollar or $1.10 a bushel. In some cases they got it from the Board; in some cases they used their own money and on other occasions they got it on time. They even had to pay one dollar a bushel for oats for feed. This fall, as soon as threshing was well advanced, they could not get more than

thirty to forty-five cents a bushel or thereabouts for their oats and from sixty to seventy-five cents for their barley, although they had to pay up to two dollars a bushel for the seed. The same applied to other items; cows that cost $100 a year ago, and were considered good value at that, could now be purchased for $35 to $40. Expenses, however, went on as usual. Many settlers had no capital of their own; they did not get all that they required from the Board and had to borrow privately to pay their ten per cent deposits. Some of them had to run into debt in the purchase of implements and supplies.

I do not want to make a poor mouth on behalf of the soldiers; I do not think they would want me to do that, but I want to set some of these matters before the House. I feel quite satisfied that some consideration should be given to them, not simply by way of deferring payments and allowing them to be heaped up so that one crop has to pay for two or three years' payments, but by way of advancing the total payment, in cases where necessary, a couple of years without interest. I think the country can well afford to pay the interest on the amounts advanced to soldiers in this position, just as well or a little better than they can to pay large deficits for the Canadian National Railway. We cannot afford to neglect our men. Had prices been maintained, there would have been no complaints about the matter. I know, however, of as little as 15 cents a bushel having been paid for oats raised by soldier settlers. Those oats, when they were threshed, had probably got a little snow in them and would have been called tough, but they should have been worth more than that. The previous spring oats could not have been bought, snow and all, for less than 80 or 90 cents a bushel. It must be remembered that the soldiers have to maintain their families. They must also get good stock, and many of those who have settled on the land have not good stock, although that is not the fault of the Government and it is not their fault. Some of the conditions, however, could have been controlled. I do not think the condition of the soldiers was improved very much by the Railway Commission raising the freight rates for the railway companies, and had the Wheat Board been kept in existence, I think the soldier settlers might have done a little better. I do not, however, want to dwell on that; I just want to speak of things as I find them.

[Mr. MacNutt.[

At a meeting of returned men held in my constituency about a month ago, I was present, and I was asked to make a few suggestions to the House. The first one was to post-date the contracts from two to three years including stock and implements, that is, in cases where such action was necessary, the supervisor, in all cases, to use his own judgment. Another suggestion was that the soldier settlers be allowed a refund of the 10 per cent deposit, if suitable improvements were made to cover, the supervisor in all cases to advise. It will be understood that the soldier settler must put up 10 per cent of the money required to pay for his land. For example, if the land costs $4,000, he is required to put up $400 and he is charged for $3,600. The Government, having received this $400 from him might, when required, advance it to him again providing that the loan is covered by increased value by way of improvements in the land. An additional loan was also asked to cover the erection of a machine shed. I was further asked to bring before the House the advisability of making loans for housing in towns and villages to returned men, who were not farmers, and I can see no reason why this matter should not be handled in the same way as in the case of men going on the land. It was also considered only just that a man who voluntarily enlisted, and who, although discharged as unfit, was otherwise qualified, should be eligible for land settlement.

One case amongst others was cited, and I will use this as an example. A returned man enlisted on April 4, 1916, at Winnipeg, and he was discharged medically unfit on May 30, 1917, at Winnipeg, over a year afterwards. He does not receive a pension, but if he desires to take up land under the system, I think he should be more eligible than a drafted man with a pension. Conditions are entirely different from what they were a year ago; men can be outfitted for one-half the price and the chances are that they could make the thing go.

Amongst other things, many soldiers have to contend with the matter of exchange, inasmuch as the land that they occupy was acquired from owners in the United States. In some cases the loans would not stand the exchange and the deal was called off. In other cases, the settlers have had to pay the additional amount of perhaps $400 or $500 in order to close the transaction, and it is matters like these that militate against the success of the soldier. I am sure the House

will be as pleased to know as I was that, at the meeting that I spoke of and at others, I was told that those present utterly repudiated the arrangements proposed by Sergeant Harry Flynn and would have nothing to do with them. They are not anxious to endorse anything that he has endeavoured to do, supposedly in their interest.

I presume a committee will be appointed as heretofore to deal with the problems of the returned soldiers, and I trust that they will consider the suggestions I have placed on Hansard. I have other suggestions which I could give in detail before that committee, and I have no doubt that consideration will be given to them, because I am satisfied that every hon. member of this House is anxious to see the returned men properly dealt with. The returned soldiers do not want anything in the way of charity or over-paternalism, but they want conditions to be taken into consideration and they ask that, as a matter of business they should be assisted by being granted a further extension of time without interest, say for the first couple of years, in cases where that is found to be absolutely essential Otherwise they will simply lose heart and throw up the game. If they do so, the country will lose a great deal more financially, and the calculations previously made will be upset.

Something is to be said in favour of the amendment to the amendment, but I do not think it is practicable. The amendment itself is, I think, rather unfortunately worded, but it is my intention to support it. I do not like to speak in such harsh terms, namely, that I have no confidence whatever in the Government; but speaking politically, I have no confidence in their policy, especially in that policy which was set forth in the speech from the Throne, and consequently, I propose voting against the sub-amendment and for the amendment.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne and on the amendment and sub-amendment has now lasted since the 15th of February. In the first days of the debate the Government supporters would get up and answer in succession the speeches delivered from this side of the House, but for reasons which I do not know for the last three days the Government has been practically silent, and the only speech which has been heard from your right, Sir, has been the one delivered by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), who also holds in this Government the position of Solicitor General for Canada. The Solicitor General for Canada, as a rule, and according to law, is a lawyer, and a lawyer of some eminence. The Minister of Militia and Defence, according to custom, if not according to law, is a soldier. Now it was peculiar—it was extraordinary—that, when the hon. gentleman who represents South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stood up in this House to explain the position taken by the Government on this question, instead of speaking as a lawyer, and as the Solicitor General, when the question before us is a question of law, and solely of law, he should put aside his gown, and don a uniform and speak as a soldier. He rode rough-shod over our constitution, and he did not forget, in the course of his remarks, to put his spurs through certain parts of it. Such a speech coming from a lawyer was so surprising that it struck the Government dumb, and since then nobody has stood up on that side of the House.

The hon. gentleman made a statement that, I humbly submit, is not according to the facts. He declared that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) was the choice of his party. I do not intend to reflect in any way upon the character of the Prime Minister of this country, but I wish to discuss the choice of the leader of the Government simply and solely from the political viewpoint. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the choice of the leader of the Government was not the choice of his party. When the right hon. gentleman, who was Premier of Canada from 1911 to 1920, resigned, the party which he had left turned their eyes not towards the present leader but towards Toronto, towards the former member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White). The member for Leeds, or the former member for Leeds, came to Ottawa, but with his shrewdness and ability apprehended the situation aright and declined the position. When the first choice could not be made, the second choice of the party was my hon. friend the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I have nothing but complimentary things to say of this gentleman. The part he has taken in the debates in this House has shown that he wishes always to do his best for his country. The hon. gentleman is not a politician. He is a business man, and being a business man, and having lots of capacity as such, he also declined to become the leader of a moribund party. But the party

was not discouraged. They turned to one of the old war horses who had led the party many a time on the battlefield. They turned their eyes to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) but as you know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had very wisely taken other responsibilities, and he also declined. Then something extraordinary happened. The party turned, I understand, to the province of Quebec for a Prime Minister, to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), but if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was offered the position for some reason which is unknown to me, he also declined the post of leader, but readily accepted the honour of being the first man sworn into the new cabinet. The papers then, but for a very brief time, rightly or wrongly reported that in despair there was a possibility of putting the responsibilities of leadership upon the shoulders of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). But the very moment the matter was mentioned in the papers, the party had to change their choice, and direct their efforts to secure a new leader into another channel. Finally, the country heard that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-day was the choice of the new party.

The right hon. gentleman has great ability. Nobody denies that, but his choice, from a political and national standpoint, is a real danger to our country. This gentleman, Mr. Speaker, represents a policy of ultra-partisanship. Many years ago, in the year 1912 if I am not mistaken, when the late leader of our party, the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier rose in this House to defend the rights of Canada and safeguard our autonomy, the man who rose in his place to take away the word from the dying lips of our leader was the hon. member for Portage La Prairie, the present Prime Minister. Not only does the Prime Minister of Canada represent ultra partisanship, but he represents ultra-Imperialism. He has always been the mouthpiece in this House of those who wish to put aside the interests of Canada whenever the interests of the Empire are at stake. He is the gentleman who declared in this House and also throughout the country that Canada, whenever England was at war, should spend her last dollar and give her last man.

The Prime Minister of to-day is not only a partizan, but he is an ultra-Imperialist; I go further and say that he is the greatest Tory of all the Tories in Canada. He is the author of those laws that stand on our Statute Book as a blot on the constitutional liberties which we enjoy in this country. Who is the author of the War Measures Act? Who is the author of the War-time Elections Act? Who is the author of the Military Service Act? In a word, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. gentleman has entered the political field in Canada, he has always shown himself to be the representative of the most Tory traditions which we have in this country. But if his leadership is dangerous from a national viewpoint, in view of his antecedents in this House, it is more dangerous even in view of what this Government intend to do if the present Prime Minister retains office.

The right hon. gentleman has inaugurated a railway policy which is absolutely nefarious in the interest of Canada. He became the sponsor of the Canadian Northern Bill; he was the father of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill; and he was the defender of the Grand Trunk Bill. To-day, not satisfied with having been the representative of MacKenzie and Mann in this House and in the country as well, the Prime Minister and his Government wish to become the representatives of the Big interests and to inaugurate a policy of high protection. I say, Sir, that I am not judging the Prime Minister from a personal viewpoint, but solely from his political antecedents; I am judging him also from his present political declarations. His leadership is dangerous, and the sooner it is terminated the better, in the interests of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question which is before the House is after all a very simple one. It is this: Has this Government a mandate to further govern Canada? And, secondly, has this Government the confidence of the people of Canada? I intend briefly to discuss these two questions. As to the first—has the Government a mandate to further govern Canada?—that question is one of great importance and moment. It is important for us to know whether responsible government in Canada shall be maintained. Any student of constitutional history is aware of the struggle, the long and bitter struggle, that was fought in England in order to obtain responsible government, and before the principle of constitutional and responsible government was recognized, the head of Charles I had to fall. In Canada, we have also had a

struggle. That struggle lasted from 1828 to 1847, and the names of the leading actors in it who led the fight to secure for us liberties and the freedom which we enjoy are the names of those most held in honour by every patriot in our country. Is this government to be permitted to rob us of those privileges? Is it to be permitted to abolish the prerogatives won after such a hard struggle? That is really the question which is before the House.

The Liberal principle, as expounded by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), has always been the same; it has never varied, and that principle is that the Government should remain in power not merely so long as it is supported by a majority of the House of Commons, but so long, and only so long, as that majority in the Commons is an exact reflection of the opinion in the country at large. The Tory theory is altogether different. That theory in substance is that a government has the right to remain in power, notwithstanding the will and the desire of the people, so long as it can manage to muster on a division sufficient votes to secure a majority, no matter how slim that majority may be. That Tory principle has been put into practice not only by this Government but by the Administration of the late Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) since 1911. Since 1911, has the Government conducted affairs in accordance with the mandate given by the electorate of Canada? I answer that question unhesitatingly, Mr. Speaker. I say that the Government of 1911, the Government of 1917, and the Government of 1920, have none of them ever conducted the affairs of this country according to the mandate given by the people.

In 1911 an appeal was made to the electors of Canada by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and it was met in Ontario and in other provinces by the allegation that the Laurier administration was endangering the British Empire and that it was time for Canada to save itself from dismemberment from the Empire. In our province of Quebec it was stated by the Nationalists that Canada had no obligation towards the Mother Country, and that it was time she should secede from the Empire if remaining in it meant further obligations. The appeal to the prejudices of the people carried the other provinces; the appeal to sectarian nationalism carried to a certain extent the province of Quebec; and the party led by the late Prime Minister, who had received a mandate from the English Provinces never to forget our obligations towards the British Empire, the day after the election was over, turned round and made an alliance with the Nationalists of Quebec. Since that alliance was formed, never has the Government which was originally elected in 1911, carried on any policy in keeping with the promises made to the electorate of the English provinces nor, on the other hand, in fulfillment of the pledges given to the electors of Quebec.

In 1916, the Government applied for an extension of the parliamentary term, and that extension was granted provided that during the additional period no legislation of a controversial character should be introduced. A mandate was given by Parliament to the then Government. How was that mandate respected? The Government respected it by first introducing conscription when the Prime Minister had expressly promised that there would not be conscription in Canada. Secondly, the Government respected it by bringing in the War-times Election Act; and thirdly, the Government respected it by taking advantage of this opportunity to form a Union Government. In 1917 the Union Government was formed and an appeal made to the country. This appeal was based solely and exclusively on one question, the carrying on of the war. The Prime Minister declared to the electors of Canada, and his ministers made the same declaration, that the Government was for one purpose, the carrying on of the war, and that the moment the war was over the Government would consider that its mandate had expired. The elections were won by means and by methods which are well known to the people of Canada. The Government carried the day, but what did it do? In 1918 the war was over but did the Government resign? Not only did the Government not resign but despite a promise to the electors not to bring in during the war period, or during the period of its existence, any domestic question which could be controverted, it introduced the railway policy upon which the people of Canada had never been consulted. Further, the Government now wishes to introduce redistribution, although it has absolutely no mandate. Nay, it wishes to proceed further by sending representatives to attend the Imperial Conference in London and make decisions binding Canada, when the representatives who are to sit in London have absolutely no mandate from Canada, and absolutely no authority to speak for this country.

As to whether this Government has a mandate or not I will only say this: In 1917 the Administration called the Union Government was elected. Where is that Government to-day? It has disappeared. In 1917, during the war, the then Prime Minister led the Government forces in the electoral struggle, and the Union Government carried the elections. Where is that leader to-day? He has resigned. In 1917 a programme was submitted to the electorate of Canada. Where is that programme to-day? Mr. Speaker, that programme has been cast aside and a new programme has been propounded. In 1917, Mr. Speaker, a special franchise was passed, and nearly every member in this House sits as a member elected under the provisions of that franchise. Where is that franchise to-day? That franchise which gives life and existence and legal authority to this Parliament to sit has been taken out of our statutes, and the reasons why are well known to the people of this country. Not only has the Government disappeared, not only has the programme disappeared, not only has the leader disappeared, not only has the franchise disappeared, but even the issues have disappeared out of our public life.

To-day there remains absolutely nothing in this Praliament connected with the elections of 1917, but the fourteen members who were elected by the provisions of the War-time Elections Act when they were defeated by the electors of their constituencies. Mr. Speaker, this is true. There is not one man on the Government side that can deny the truth of what I have just affirmed. Nevertheless, this Government clings to office; this Government refuses to go before the people; this Government refuses to give to the electors of Canada the chance to decide who shall have the direction of public affairs. I have studied the history of England, I have studied the history of my own country, I have studied the history of the United States—nowhere in any of these countries do I find a single example of action on the part of a government which is to be compared with the action of the Government of Canada to-day. Only one precedent, Mr. Speaker, may be found and that precedent is to be found in the most unhappy and unfortunate period in English history—I refer to the period in England from 1640 to 1660. In those days there was a Parliament, a Parliament which was elected at first in a moment of public enthusiasm, as was the present Parliament. But it had outlived its usefulness. Although the people of England did not want that Parliament, it nevertheless persisted in remaining. It was called the "Rump Parliament" and I think the only proper appellation for the present Parliament would be the same title. The Rump Parliament had to be thrown out by a Cromwell. Will this Government wait until a Cromwell throws it out? I think the Government should be careful; the people of Canada have been patient. The people have displayed lots of forbearance, but the patience of the public like the patience of the individual has its limits. The Government has overstayed its usefulness, the Government should disappear.

Another question is as to whether this Government has the confidence of the people of Canada. I do not wish to discuss this point at great length, former speakers have discussed it much more ably than I can do; but I desire to recall to your memory, Mr. Speaker, that since 1918, if I am not mistaken, fourteen elections have been held and out of that number ten have gone against the Government. I do not wish to further discuss the meaning or the significance of the result in Peterborough. I simply wish to say that the electors of Peterborough voted in such a way as to give to this Government an imperative order to quit office. Peterborough has spoken in a most emphatic and unambiguous manner, and I hope the Government will at least understand the desires of the people as expressed by the electors of that constituency. It has been said that this Government is too weak. The Government knows that it has not the confidence of the people, and although its weakness is known to its own members, although the Prime Minister knows and acknowledges that his Cabinet should be reconstructed, he does not dare to do it. Why does he not? Because the Prime Minister knows that should the new ministers go to the country they probably would not be returned.

12 p.m.

The situation is most unfair. I see opposite to me the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid). This hon. gentleman has been working very hard for his country; he has been in office since 1911. Very often during our prolonged debates I see the hon. gentleman turning yearning eyes towards the Senate Chamber. Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, that he should have his rest? On the Government benches I also see my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), for whom

I have great respect. He, too, has worked arduously for his country. Very often, I am sure, he thinks what a beautiful and restful place the Supreme Court would be in the evening of his life. Why should not the Prime Minister send him to the Supreme Court? And behind these hon. gentlemen I see the younger members who are eager to supplant their elders. I see, for instance, my hon. friend the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). He is full of energy, he is full of activity, he is full of zeal. Why should not the Prime Minister give the hon. gentleman a chance to exert himself even more than he is doing now in the public interest? And, Mr. Speaker, what about the devoted Chief Whip (Mr. Middleboro) on the Government side? Many a night has he worked mustering the Government forces, many a time has he stood at the door to see that the stragglers came in and that those who were in did not go out. The time has come for his reward. If these old servants of the public do not get their reward, and if the young bloods like the member for Fort William and the very devoted Chief Whip do not get Cabinet portfolios in these days, it is because the Government knows its own weaknesses and does not dare to face a by-election anywhere.

For the last year there has been discussion in this House and in the press as to the situation of the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec in 1917 was a traitor. The province of Quebec in 1917 was compared to a province where open rebellion existed. No appeal to prejudice was strong enough against our province and against our people. These appeals to prejudice had their results—the Government carried the general election in that year. But if the Government carried the election, it lost any sympathy that it might have possessed in my native province. The war is now over. The big interests are appealing to this Government for high protection. The Government knows that the rest of Canada is opposed to protection. The Government knows that sentiment in Ontario is antagonistic to that policy. The Government wished to have new allies, and although, Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised, the Government turned their eyes upon this very province, inhabited by traitors, to find these new allies, to find this new blood which will give them new life. The press of Canada, which is heavily subsidized by the Government, as we all know, has published articles declaring that nothing is too good for Quebec, that Quebec is the sanest province in the Dominion. Quebec is being cajoled. We are told every day that we represent the best traditions of Canada and the highest Canadian aspirations. But the frantic efforts of the Government have had as yet no results but one, and that result has been very meagre for such great efforts—it has been the speech delivered in this House by my hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). It is with great regret that I have mentioned my hon. friend. In my native province we have fought many a battle side by side in favour of the principles which the Liberal party represent. My associations with the hon. member have always been of a very friendly character, and when I saw him rising to his feet, and when I heard the speech which he delivered, I can say that the feeling I had, Mr. Speaker, was a feeling of heartfelt sympathy and sadness.

In 1917 when I waged in my province a fight for Canadian autonomy, for Canadian spirit, for Canadian nationhood, when I ran against the former Minister of Inland Revenue, the Hon. Mr. Sevigny, one of the speakers during that campaign who enunciated the most Canadian of Canadian sentiments was the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe. The days have passed; I have remained what I was then, he has chosen to change. I am sorry for him, and, as a friend, I regret, and sincerely regret, the attitude which he has taken. Putting aside my personal sentiments and feelings towards the hon. member, I may say that when in this House he delivered his speech, we witnessed what is called in Japan harikari, or self execution. The hon. gentleman has chosen to hang himself publicly in this new Chamber. His corpse is now swinging. It is swinging on Parliament Hill, and may that swinging political corpse and the stench which it exhales be a lesson to anybody, the Prime Minister or any one else, who has an inclination to follow his example.

The attitude of my hon. friends towards our province is an attitude of promise, an attitude of flattery. But the papers of Montreal, particularly the Montreal Gazette, have announced that the Government, unless Quebec yields to their demands, will assume another attitude. That attitude would be a threatening one; to use their own expression, the Government would open a "barrage fire" upon Quebec. Their fire we are awaiting without fear. Mr. Speaker. Unyielding to promises, we shall

not bend to fear. We represent in this House an indignant province which has been insulted, and never will our province give in to the Government until a fitting apology is forthcoming from public men in this country for the crime committed against Quebec.

Their barrage fire has already been opened, by a gentleman, who claims to represent his province in the Cabinet, the hon. Mr. Blondin, Postmaster General of Canada. Represents the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker? He no more represents Quebec than I could claim to represent New Zealand in this House; he no more represents Quebec than I represent or claim or wish to represent the city of Toronto. Mr. Blondin is an outcast from our province. In 1917, having betrayed the most sacred interests of our province, he has come amongst his own people and to use the words of the gospel, he has "passed amongst them and has not been recognized." In some place the hon. gentleman has chosen to declare that never has he uttered disloyal words in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman has a very short memory. In 1910 during the election in Drummond and Arthabaska, on the same platform where I was discussing public affairs with him, in the parishes of Maddington Falls and St. Louis de Blandford, the present Postmaster General of Canada shot holes through the British flag. In the election of 1917 in my own constituency the hon. gentleman said to the people of St. Rose de Watford: "What does conscription matter to you gentlemen? You are close to the American border; should conscription be enacted you can escape over tne border to the United States." If the Government wishes to retain the Postmaster General as one of its members it is free to do so, but I ask the leader of the Government, if he lets Mr. Blondin remain in the Cabinet, not to let him call himself the representative of Quebec. Another gentleman has opened a barrage fire on our province, and that gentleman is the hon. Mr. Robertson. The hon. gentleman in another place—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot escape the well-known rule by making a veiled reference to a debate in the Upper Chamber by saying that it occurred in "another place." I think he would be well advised to adhere to old parliamentary traditions and not refer to hon. gentlemen in the other Chamber in terms of disrespect.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to refer to any other hon. gentleman in terms of disrespect. I simply wish to direct the attention of the House to certain statements by ministers or members of the Government, bearing on questions before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman would not be in order in doing so if the statements to which he refers were made in the other House of Parliament. That rule is well known.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, but I was under the impression that the rule was to the effect that we had no right in the House of Commons to quote from speeches delivered in the other Chamber, but that hon. members were perfectly free to discuss declarations of members of the Government as connected with Government responsibility and as connected with the attitude of the Government on public matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman would be perfectly in order in doing so if they were matters of record, but if he starts to traverse a speech made by an hon. member of the other House, he is not in order.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, I have read in the press that hon. members of this Government have started an attack upon our province, describing the condition of Quebec in 1917 as having been worse than that which exists in Russia. Any member of the Government who so represents the conditions in my native province in 1917 is not stating the real condition of things. When the Military Service Act was being put into force in 1917 the greatest agitation existed in the province of Quebec. The then Minister of Militia came to the city of Quebec, and the reception accorded to him at that time showed that if the people of that province were firm and solid in their principles and convictions, they also knew how to respect the laws of their country. It was represented by members of the Government that houses were burned and that dynamite was used. I say that the only dynamite used in Quebec in 1917 was dynamite bought with Government money and used by Government agents as was done in Montreal.

The hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) during the course of his speech in this debate, referred to the Liberal party on this side as being the remnant of a party. So far as we in this House from

Quebec are concerned, we represent those who in the greatest struggle ever fought by Sir Wilfrid Laurier remained firm, solid and loyal to Liberal principles. In this political fight of 1917, young and old members from Quebec were like the soldiers who had fought many battles under the guidance and direction of the great Napoleon. When the time and the hour of defeat came on the field of Waterloo, although the old guard was not numerous, in the face of obvious defeat those soldiers remembered the glories of former victories through their leader and protected him. When an English general, addressing those soldiers, and assuming the same attitude as the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) did the other day, called on the old guard to surrender, that English general was answered by the sublime word which has immortalized Cambronne, and I say that the province of Quebec, answering the request of the Government, uses that same sublime and immortal word.

The province of Quebec will hold in Canada the balance of power at the next election. No government can carry on the business of this country without the support of the province of Quebec, and the members from Quebec will see to it that never again in the history of Canada, if we can prevent it, will a government be given the power of the strength to try to crucify a whole race and a whole province. Our forefathers came to Canada as the pioneers of civilization; we love our province as we love our mother; we love the vastness of its forests; we love the romance and the grandeur of its rivers; we love the beauty and the picturesqueness of its landscape; Quebec is our mother; Quebec has been insulted, and it is useless for any member in this House to ask us to forget. We shall not forget.

Any man who states that Quebec can be disregarded in Canada's affairs is a man who shows his ignorance of Canadian history. Canada has been built up by the combined efforts of the great men of the other provinces, and of the great men of Quebec. No matter how far you go back in history, always amongst the most prominent workers for the grandeur and advancement of Canada, you will find French Canadian statesmen and politicians from Quebec. Who wanted constitutional government for Canada? The French Canadian statesmen who sat in the Legislative Assembly in 1791. Who carried to the battlefield the cry of responsible government? Who shed their blood for that principle? The French Canadian heroes of 1837, who, under the Union government obtained from England a full acknowledgment of responsible government—Lafontaine and Baldwin. Who rendered possible Confederation in Canada? Sir George Etienne Cartier. Who consummated Confederation and made of the nine provinces in Canada a nation united? Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is needless to try to cast aside the French Canadian race in this country. We are the pioneer race and we intend to remain so. We have done things in the past; we are doing things in the present; we expect to achieve even greater things in the future, and intelligent statesmen, instead of trying to threaten Quebec, should try to conciliate Quebec.

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in making my contribution to this debate, I wish to follow the time-honoured custom of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address on the able manner in which they have acquitted themselves, and I also wish to join with them in extending congratulations to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who has attained to the high position of Prime Minister of our country.

I intend that my remarks shall be brief. Since becoming a member of this House, the thought has often occurred to me that a large portion of many of the speeches, which are devoted to calling down the opposing party or parties, might very well be either cut out altogether, or the same effort applied to something constructive for the country's weal. It has been said that one of man's greatest advantages over the brute creation is the gift of language with which to conceal his thoughts, and, Sir, one is sometimes forced to wonder what the real thought behind some of the statements made in this debate might be. Consequently, Sir, I will be as concise as possible and as plain as possible.

In congratulating the leader of the Government, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not agree with some of the policies laid down by his party, and that I emphatically disagree with the policy of protection as outlined by that party and embodied in the speech from the Throne. This being the case, I could hardly be expected to vote for the motion unless I swallowed my convictions, which I have no intention of doing, and yet the amendment as it stands does not comply with the thought uppermost in my mind in regard to the present situation. But I feel forced

to follow the old advice that of two evils, or possibly, I might say in this case, of three evils, choose the least. Consequently, I will support the amendment. In doing so, I am fully aware of what the consequences may be, but I have no hesitation in telling the members of the Government that the situation has been created by them, and on them the verdict will fall.

In all fairness there is one thing I wish to give my right hon. friend the leader of the Government credit for, while he filled the portfolio of Minister of the Interior, and that is the establishment of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and the placing of thousands of returned men on the land. The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) has given the figures relating to the whole Dominion, and has made a plea for generous treatment of the returned men. I heartily endorse his sentiments in that respect, and I should like to give some figures particularly of the work done by the Board through the office at Prince Albert. The constituency of Prince Albert to-day has many soldier settlers who are making good in comfortable homes, and who are owners of fertile farms. These men are located not only in the district tributary to the city of Prince Albert, but you will find them all the way through the famous Carrot River valley right to the Manitoba boundary. Undoubtedly some are heavily encumbered, but taken broadly, the scheme has been a success both from the point of view of the re-establishment of the returned soldier, and that of land settlement and increased production. The office at Prince Albert reports 1,200 established settlers, with only some fifty adjustments, leaving 1,150 soldier settlers in actual residence, occupying in all 265,000 acres, and producing last season over 450,000 bushels of grain. Of these settlers 538 are married men; 164 of the wives are overseas brides, and there were at that time 1,002 children. So, Mr. Speaker, you will readily see that the element of increased production has not been overlooked.

Education has been handicapped in the settlement which was formed in that portion of the Porcupine Forest Reserve which was opened for soldier entry. Owing to the fact that the Government retained title to the land, debentures for the purpose of erecting schools could not be sold, and a condition exists there which should not be allowed. There are over one hundred children in this settlement, over sixty of whom are of school age but there is no school. Let me say in passing that in my opinion there is nothing the Government or this House can do for the returned man that would repay him for the sacrifices he made during the war, and when we find men who, after all the turmoil and upsetting experiences which they have undergone, are ready and willing to settle down on the land, or willing to qualify for the benefits of the Act, surely it is up to us to give them all the assistance and encouragement in our power.

But the one big want most keenly felt is the lack of transportation facilities. Some of these settlers are tremendously handicapped for lack of railways, but no worse than the civilian settlers who surround them. An extract from the report reads as follows:

> Transportation facilities north of Tisdale and north of Prince Albert are poor, and a railway operated at an early date would be of untold benefit to these areas. A line from Turtleford to Shellbrook would open up a very fine tract of country. The centre of this district is fifty miles from railway facilities, yet settlers are favourably reported upon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I most strongly urge upon the Government and upon this House the support of any scheme whereby these people may get the necessary assistance in connecting them up with the outside market. I believe the whole West has a grievance in regard to the heavy freight rates, but the high rates of transportation, individually, sinks into insignificance in comparison with the situation of those people who have no transportation at all.

I would like to say a word about the freight rates. In the West our lines of railway are much more easily and cheaply constructed, and with long unbroken hauls in bulk lots, much more easily and cheaply operated than similar lines in the East. You will easily see that both the producer who has to ship his products over thousands of miles to eastern markets, or what is more likely, eastern ports, and the consumer, who in most cases is also a producer and has to ship his supplies in over the same long route, is heavily handicapped by the situation—handicapped to such an extent that if there is any possible way of surmounting the difficulty, the West demands to-day that it be surmounted.

There is a way to overcome the difficulty. The natural outlet for the Prairie Provinces was provided by an all wise Creator in the shape of the Hudson Bay, and it only remains for the hand of man to supply the necessary transportation facilities, the funds for which have already been largely provided by the sale of western lands set aside for that purpose. The

work on this was proceeding fairly satisfactorily, even through most of the war period, but was finally stopped in 1918, and the present Government declines, or neglects, to complete the project, even though the West has, in season and out of season, been pressing for it. The Senate Committee which took evidence in connection therewith last year decided in favour of the scheme. I would impress upon the leaders of the Government that the West demands that the Hudson Bay route be completed.

In the matter of the investigation of the grain trade, I am sure that this group will gladly join in giving all the assistance in its power, and in that direction I wish to inform this House that it was the iniquities of the grain trade in the first place that forced the farmers of the West to organize in self defence, and I can assure you, Sir, from personal experience, that the fight in those days was an up-hill one. Where were the champions of the farmers' cause then who have lately come forward on the Government side, asking for an investigation of the grain trade? I venture to say that, with one or two exceptions, none of them knew or cared what the outcome would be at that time, but if the Government can make any improvement in the conduct of the grain business, the milling business, the shipping business, the textile business, the agricultural implement business, the packing house business, the sugar business, or any other business that affects the common good, it will get all the assistance possible from this group.

I wish to speak of another matter. Two days ago the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) referred to his speech in South York and made this statement, which will be found in Hansard on page 445:

> I said that the movement had its Genesis among the American farmers in the great west.

He was referring to the origin of the Farmers' movement. I want to tell the minister that his information is absolutely false. I have been intimately connected with the Farmers' movement since its inception in 1902. It originated first in the province of Saskatchewan. I have myself been for eleven years a director on the Board and I had the high honour of working in conjunction with the men who originated and organized the movement. I think it might be interesting to the House to learn the nationality of some of these men. As I look backward over the years and try to recall the outstanding men connected with the movement, it is possible that some of them may escape my memory; but I shall give the names of those who occur to my mind at the moment. Of the Canadian-born directors whom I can remember on the board some have been presidents and some vice-presidents. Of the Canadian-born, there are: Hon. W. R. Motherwell, Mr. E. A. Partridge and his brother Mr. H. O. Partridge, Mr. John Miller, Mr. Peter Dayman, Mr. Levi Thomson, Mr. E. N. Hopkins, Mr. David Railton, and, last but by no means least, Mr. John A. Maharg. The British-born are: Sir Richard Lake, Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan, Mr. Allan Hawkes, Mr. F. W. Green, Mr. F. M. Gates, Mr. Matthew Snow, Mr. J. A. Murray, Hon, C. A. Dunning, Provincial Treasurer in the Saskatchewan Government, Hon. George Langley, Minister of Municipal Affairs in the same government, and, in this category, last also, but not by any means least, the hon. member for Mackenzie who sits on my left (Mr. J. F. Reid). In all these years there was not a single American on the board, so far as I can remember, not that there is any reason why they should not have been there. The fact remains, however, that at that time very few Americans had come into the Canadian West. Many have entered the country since and some are on the boards, but they are in the minority, and the American idea has never influenced the movement at any time. I make this statement for the benefit of the minister who made the accusation. It has been stated by the hon. member for Last Mountain, (Mr. Johnston) that had the present situation and the present fiscal policy of the Government been predicted in 1917 in Western Canada, a very different result would have been recorded. And I quite agree with him. But no such policy and no such situation were in sight, nor were they considered in any way at that time. The Minister of Militia admits that the old Unionist party has passed out of existence and that a new party with an attenuated name has taken its place. This being so, and having no confidence in that party, I will support the amendment.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as this is the first occasion on which I address the House in French, I feel that I should offer a word of explanation, if not of apology, to those who, no doubt, believe in all sincerity, that

the French Canadians are in the wrong every time they do not address this House in their mother tongue. I understand and still more appreciate, such feelings on their part, for I do not forget that I once felt as they do, and that, until I had the honour of being elected to Parliament. Until then, I was one of those who believed that French Canadians should fully avail themselves of their right to speak their own language in the House of Commons at Ottawa, whatever the outcome. However, I must say that, as soon as I had acquired some experience in Parliament I soon had to alter my views; this I did at the very first session. It was then that I realized that, whatever our rights to the use of French in this House, if we wish to take a prominent part in the debates of this House, we are thereby under the necessity to speak, not our own tongue, which is ever dear to us, but one that is not our own. And it is for that reason, and at the expense of great sacrifices, as well as great efforts on my part, that, until the present time, I have spoken English in this House. Yet, as I believe that it is my duty to pay a modest tribute to the French language, I am taking the liberty to impose a French speech upon hon. members within these precincts.

Were it necessary to quote authorities in support of my assertion that, notwithstanding our right to the use of the French language, we are compelled for purposes of discussion to speak another language, I would but quote the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, our lamented leader, who, though he spoke one language as fluently as the other, used the English language almost exclusively during the time that he was a member of Parliament, that is to say, for nearly half a century. We could find only a few instances in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's political life when he spoke in French in this House.

What I have just said of our regretted leader might apply equally well to all the great and illustrious French Canadians of the House of Commons of Canada. I might say the same of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland); of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau); and of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe); I might also mention that Mr. Bourassa, who has made it his business to champion the French language in the province of Quebec—for which I am grateful to him—very seldom, if I am rightly informed, spoke French in Parliament.

At any rate, the question is settled; whoever wishes to take part in the debates of the House of Commons must use the English language; once more I say that if I have to offer any apology, I am quite ready to do so; my only excuse is the necessity which exists and will continue to exist in the future for all French Canadians to use a language which is not their own, however much they may regret having to do so, if they wish to join in parliamentary debates.

Mr. Speaker, were I to neglect to congratulate the right hon. minister on his accession to the high position he now occupies, I would be unfair both to him and to myself. Whatever be our opinions, whatever be our likes and dislikes—as far as I am concerned, I do not dislike any one—we are bound to admire and acknowledge talent at all times and wherever it may be found, particularly in our country.

It is an undisputed fact, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. Prime Minister is a man of great ability, and that this great ability has won for him the high rank he now enjoys, and, saying this of one who is yet a young man is giving him the greatest praise that his fellow citizens can bestow upon him.

Mr. Speaker, I have read very carefully the speech from the Throne. Must I repeat what has already been said so often in this House, that this speech is quite insufficient and incomplete? During this period of reconstruction, at a time when Canada needs all her vital strength and an effective legislation, must it be said that the speech from the Throne has failed altogether to reach the object in view? The great problems of the hour have not been provided for.

The speech from the Throne is a dry document which was presented to us as a simple matter of course; it is a food which has no fragrancy, flavour or taste. The Government, in presenting it, confessed their inability and weakness as well as the instability of their policies.

We are told that this is a new Administration which has been in existence only a few months and that our criticism, if we have any to offer, should not apply to the actions of its predecessors, because the present Government would not be responsible for the blunders committed by the previous administrations.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I hold a different view, and, moreover, it was not the attitude taken by the right hon. Prime

Minister throughout the country and in this debate before the House. It is one of two things: The present Government is either a new government or the continuation of preceding administrations. If it is a new government, then the question which the House has been discussing for the last three weeks, namely, that such a government must submit their new platform to the people, ought to be considered as being a fair proposal since the Government admit themselves that they are a new administration. Such is not, however, the stand taken by the Government.

The hon. Prime Minister says that this Government is nothing but the continuation of the preceding administrations, therefore, if we take him to his word and supposing, for the sake of argument, that this Government is nothing but the continuation of previous administrations, they are responsible for whatever their predecessors have done and they must bear the consequences thereof.

The right hon. Prime Minister has travelled throughout the country to state his policy or rather, as it is commonly said, to talk politics. The hon. gentleman knew that the preceding government was no longer in touch with the people, in other words had lost their confidence. Upon being called suddenly to lead the Government, the hon. gentleman, possessed as we know he is, of youth, ability, initiative and courage, started on a journey throughout the Dominion.

What was the result of that campaign? Have the arguments of the hon. Prime Minister convinced the people of Canada? Has public opinion changed? Has confidence been restored? Have the people of Canada any more faith in this Government than they had in the previous administration five or six months or twelve months ago? The question answers itself; you will find it in every tongue and in every heart. The people throughout the country, are asking just for one thing; that is a general election in which they will have the opportunity to express their sentiments. Hon. gentlemen opposite answering the leader of the Opposition in a somewhat ironical mood absolutely lacking in sincerity said: "You are asking us to vacate our seats for your own benefit."

To put the question in that way, Mr. Speaker, is to distort the truth. That is not the question. The question we are putting before the House and which we shall submit to the people of Canada in due time, is the following: Fellow citizens, you are called to elect the men who will form a new government. If they should be taken from the ranks of the Conservative or Unionist party, it is all very well. The moment the people have declared themselves, we shall be satisfied with the verdict, because they are the supreme masters of our destiny and they are to decide in last resort as to who shall rule the country. It is often said that the people get the government they deserve. I do not think it would be fair to make the same assertion now, because the people, for ten years at least, as I shall explain it later, have not had any opportunity to select their government.

All that we ask from the Government is to enable the people to select their representatives.

Once the people have voted, if they choose our friends opposite, those amongst us who are returned will be glad to come back and to work as we have done heretofore for the good of the people. Then our friends opposite will not have to submit to such humiliations as they must necessarily feel over a debate like the present one. I for one should not like to occupy a seat on the other side and listen to all that is said from this quarter. It is true that it can be claimed that this is politics and that what is said from this side is said for political objects. One may perhaps find a certain consolation in that, but if one wishes to go to the bottom of things, to examine the question sincerely, one is forced to admit that the position of our friends on the other side of the House is not only precarious, but also humiliating.

I remember that, about twelve years ago, when the British House of Commons was moved into Supply, Mr. Lloyd George insisted on elections taking place and thus taunted his opponents: "What! You are afraid to submit your Budget to the electors of Great Britain! Is it then so precarious that you, the Government in power, have neither the strength, nor the courage, nor the self-reliance that could induce you to submit this Budget to the electors of the country?"

Mr. Speaker, the same argument might apply at the present time, to our friends on the other side of the House. We might say to them, "You, gentlemen, who have been called to power barely three years ago, with a majority of more than 70, you who have won the war and covered yourselves with glory, you who claim to count in your midst the best informed and most capable politicians in the country, you who

receive almost with derision the arguments of the members of the Opposition, why then, is your policy so tottering, have you become so weak, that you fear to present yourselves to the electors and ask for a new mandate?

Hon. Mr. BELAND (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Mr. Speaker, after all that has been said during this debate; after all the challenges, more or less to the point if you like; after all the invectives which have been hurled from one side or the other; suppose that the right hon. Prime Minister would now rise and say to this House, speaking at the same time to all Canada, "Gentlemen, I have had enough of your taunts, I have had enough of your challenges; I have the right to remain at my post for two years more since I have behind me a majority in this House; notwithstanding this, I renounce the right, the privilege, not my own but that of this House, that of the Canadian people. Taking for granted that there may be some truth in all that you have said, I give you the benefit of the doubt, and I ask you to assume the responsibility of the stand you have taken. You summon me to go before the people; very well, I consent to do so, I am ready to go forth and give battle before the people and prove that the party of which I am the leader still has the confidence of Canada."

And suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. Prime Minister should ask for the dissolution of Parliament, should go to the people and find he had a majority; what a humiliating situation for us of the Opposition, the Liberals and the Farmers' party! Cannot you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the return to this House, in two or three months, of the member who would be re-elected? Cannot you see those of us who for the last three weeks have been talking against the Government, returning, crest-fallen to salute the new Government, recognizing that they had the confidence of the people?—recognizing at the same time that we had wrongly accused them in clamouring, for three weeks, or a year, or two, that they did not represent the opinion of the people! I vow that if such an event took place, the Government that would return to power would be the strongest since Confederation. They would have the right to impose their will, for they would have given the people, in a period of tranquility, their chance to vote for or against them.

There would then be no ambiguity and no evasion. It would be useless to say: "You have stolen the election during the war or otherwise. It would not be an election on the platform of reciprocity, it would resolve itself into a question of confidence. And if the hon. minister, after having advocated his policy all over the country, as he has been doing for several months, could get it endorsed by the electors, he would be one of the strongest men we have ever had at the head of the destinies of this country, since Confederation, and this while being still in the prime of life, while we, ourselves, on this side of the House, would be astounded and absolutely helpless for a long while to come.

One must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the challenge emanating from this side of the House is of as much consequence to the challenger as to the challenged. One must not imagine, for one moment, that the Liberals who are daring the Government to go before the people, "are not taking as great a risk as the Government would in accepting the challenge. Theoretically, the chances are even; but the Government does not wish to go before the people, because it knows beforehand, and has the intuition born of its deep knowledge of things, and of men, that it is impossible for it to come back to power, and that is precisely the reason why the Government does not pick up the gauntlet which has been thrown.

I have said that the right hon. Prime Minister had toured the country. I must remind you here that he came to the province of Quebec, and I extend my congratulations to him for the courage he has shown in paying a visit to our province.

The hon. Prime Minister knows that he has very few followers or partisans in the province of Quebec, and yet he came; he stated his policy, and, I must say, with great courage. On the other hand, the right hon. Prime Minister should not deceive himself as to the feelings of the province of Quebec. Our feelings are not those of spite, still less of hatred.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: (Translation.) Hear, Hear.

Mr. DENIS: (Translation.) The province of Quebec is the pivot on which revolves Confederation. Not only is the province of Quebec the pivot of Confederation, but it is also—I would have preferred that the compliment came from an outsider however I say it is the pivot of common and good sense in the Dominion.

When a year ago, or more, the Government was in fear of bolshevism; when strikes and disorders spread from city to city, in certain parts of Canada; when excitement was high and hearts were low, we saw our friends on the other side of the House turn and place their hopes in the province of Quebec and recognize that our province was as I have just said: The pivot of Confederation, of stability and of good common sense.

The province of Quebec is essentially conservative, if you consider that word in its broadest sense, which means the conservation of what we have, the esteem of what we possess, the belief in our traditions, and the attachment for our past. Such is the meaning of conservative, as applied to the province of Quebec.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that in the present circumstances, and on a particularly burning issue which I most certainly have no desire to discuss at the present moment, is it any wonder that the province of Quebec should have been of a different opinion from that held by the other provinces? Is it, forsooth such an extraordinary thing for a province, to differ on certain matters from the other provinces?

Since the beginning of the session, and more particularly since the beginning of the present discussion, we have heard many of our friends on both sides of the House declare, and that very rightly, that the opinion of every one must be respected, and that there is no harm in entertaining a different opinion from that of the majority; such is precisely the argument of our friends of the Agrarian party, when they start to discuss in this House problems which, evidently are not in accordance with the opinion of the great majority of this House, either on this side or the other.

The province of Quebec has its own ideas; it has its traditions, its inclinations, its affections. Unfortunately, the hon. Prime Minister has never understood what are the ideas, the affections, the inclinations and the traditions of the province of Quebec, and that is precisely the reason why he has always remained a stranger to our province.

That is also the reason why the province of Quebec has always stood aloof from him. I mean so far as politics are concerned. Outside of politics, we have all due regard for him and we acknowledge him as a capable and worthy man. But between that statement and political allegiance there exists quite a chasm and many things will happen before that chasm is bridged.

Mr. Speaker, since the last session of Parliament there has been an assembly of the League of Nations at which the Canadian Government was represented by three ministers, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. member from Durham (Mr. Rowell), then president of the privy council. I am pleased to see the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in his seat, the more so because I know that, having learned the beautiful French language, he will no doubt be able to hear and understand the compliments which I am about to shower upon him. It has been said on both sides of the House that Canada had been worthily represented at that meeting. Speaking with that moderation and fairness which I intend to maintain at all times, I would be doing an injustice to these hon. gentlemen who were our representatives on that occasion were I to neglect offering them heartfelt congratulations for the manner in which they represented us.

The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is endowed with an eloquence which younger members of the House should always emulate, and it was sufficient for us to hear him, a few days ago, reporting what had been going on at that meeting to understand how brilliantly and creditably he represented us. I must add that what I just said of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is equally applicable to the hon. gentlemen who accompanied him. Yet, was it not unfortunate that Canada should not have been represented by a French Canadian at that meeting? In this country French Canadians make up a third of the population in round numbers. This meeting of the League of Nations was held in Geneva. French and English were the official languages. I say French and English and I designedly put French in the first place because that language was chiefly resorted to. We had that admission from the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in his speech, an admission willingly made. With his usual frankness and outspokenness, when answering a question which I put, he said in a very candid manner that French was in much more common use than English at that meeting. However, this was already known to me, having myself had the privilege of attending for a week or over, sittings of the international labour conference, which was

held at Washington in the month of November, 1919, and seeing that the international labour conference was composed of the same nations represented at the meeting of the League of Nations, I had noticed that French was resorted to much oftener than any other language. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, French Canadians accounting for a third of the population and seeing that two thirds, at least, of forty odd nations assembled, spoke French, would it not have been reasonable, and I shall say proper, to have a French-speaking representative there? At that meeting which was held quite near Paris, at the intellectual centre of Europe, largely made up of peoples speaking the French language, would it not have been proper to make it known that there is in Canada another race than the Anglo-Saxon race—notwithstanding all the respect for this race, I shall go further —that there are men of high attainments and of great ability among that race forming a third of the Canadian population? Would it have been impossible to the Government to select as a third representative a French-speaking man who could have been a credit not only to the Government, but also to the French tongue and the French Canadian race? No, Mr. Speaker, such a step would have been two upright in the eyes of the Government, they did not think fit to select a French-Canadian representative and thus they led Europeans, at least those who do not know any better, to believe, that Canada is a country inhabited only by Anglo-Saxons and people who cannot speak any other language than English.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order. The hon. member is reading his speech and I believe that this is against the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: (Text) I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Mackie) raises the point that the hon member for Joliette is reading his speech.

Mr. DENNIS: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, never has a point of order been raised with so little justification. If there ever was an occasion in my life when I did not read my speech that is the present time, when I have barely a few notes before me. I would not like to leave the House under the impression for an instant that I am reading my speech. I would rather believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Mackie) is of my opinion when I claim that a French-speaking representative should have been sent to that meeting of the League of Nations.

Mr. MACKIE: (Translation) Yes, I agree with you.

Mr. DENNIS: (Translation) Being aware that my hon. friend knows French well, I think he is not forgetful of himself perhaps and believes that he should have been sent to that meeting. This is why, I surmise, he interrupted me, but I shall take no notice of his interruption and shall continue—I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been proper, eminently proper, for the Government, if the right hon. Prime Minister had wished to prove that he had some consideration and friednship for the province of Quebec, to have had a representative of the French Canadian element at this meeting of the League of Nations. At the International Conference of Labour, much less important, no doubt, which took place in a city nearer than Geneva, Washington, the Canadian Government was represented by two ministers, the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson.) I do not know whether any of these gentlemen were qualified to represent either the French element or the French language, and as I said just now the predominant language at the International Conference of Labour was French. The delegates of the forty-one nations represented there met daily, continually exchanging views, at banquets and elsewhere—and we had there only two representatives, very worthy ones, but who knew not a word of French. Mr. Speaker, I know for instance, of a banquet at which were present the South American delegates and at which French was almost exclusively spoken—Canada's two representatives were present, and did not understand what was being said—I do not reproach these gentlemen with not knowing French—it is hard to learn a foreign language—but I reproach the Government. Each time that an important occasion presents itself they try to give the impression to foreign nations that Canada is an English country in which there are only English-speaking people, and that the French-Canadians are a negligible quantity unworthy of representation.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: (Translation) Hear, hear.

Mr. DENIS: (Translation) If it were for no other reasons than these, I would say that the right hon. Prime Minister could not expect much sympathy from the province of Quebec. When the right hon. Prime Minister will have proved to the province of Quebec that he is ready to do it justice, not only by words but by acts, then perhaps that province may in part turn to him, because Quebec is not prejudiced, but is sincere, and the opinions it holds are not those of a day, but fundamental, based upon its traditions and its history. And if one looks back one finds that the province of Quebec was for many years Conservative. How does it happen that these old Conservative traditions have been abandoned and the province of Quebec has become what it is to-day? It is because, with the same reasoning and the same good sense, the province of Quebec at this time has no confidence in this Government. It feels that it has had enough of the Conservative party, and slowly but surely it has broken away from it.

As it has taken a generation and even more for the province of Quebec to detach itself from the Conservative party, so will it be before Quebec places its confidence in another party than the Liberal one, unless, and this we cannot foresee, the Liberal party by misdeeds should prove unworthy of its confidence.

I mentioned just now that the speech from the Throne was a very meagre document. If ever there was a question which should have been submitted or at least discussed in this speech, specially as it has been brought up in this debate, it is surely the financial standing of the country.

Mr. Speaker, we do not realize to the full extent the financial state of our country. The hon. members of this House must bear in mind that for the last twelve months our public debt has been about two billion and a quarter and while our revenues are daily decreasing, the debt is steadily on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, if such is our financial situation, with revenues steadily going down, where will this lead us to? The Government has both the responsibility and the duty to balance the finances of this country and from the moment it acknowledges its inability to do so it should make way for another Government. The present mismanagement conducing the ruin of the country would suffice to warrant us in demanding the dissolution of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, has it ever entered the head of the hon. members of this House that we are at present, and are becoming daily more and more dependent economically out of the United States. Probably this utterance displeases my hon. friends on the opposite side of this House. These hon. gentlemen are ultra loyal to England and when we say that we are becoming an economical dependency, the expression naturally wounds and shocks them. It is not a pleasure for me to use these words; however, one must admit the evidence of facts. We are at present and are becoming more and more an economical dependency of the United States. At present, in order to maintain our commerce, our industries, to meet our daily requirements and support our family we are forced to import to the extent of nearly one billion dollars a year. On the other hand our exports hardly amount to a little over half a billion. We buy from the United States in round figures for a billion and in return sell to the amount of five or six hundred million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, where will this state of affairs lead us to? We are simply drifting to bankruptcy or probably I may be more correct in saying, we are drifting towards annexation, that is we are becoming every day more and more an economical dependency of the United States. At the present time in order to trade with the United States we are losers to the extent of one hundred million dollars per year. For the products we purchase from them by paying the difference of the rate of exchange which has varied between 8 and a fraction, 19 and a fraction since 1912, we make them a present of one hundred million dollars per year. In other words when buying one billion dollars worth of goods, we pay naturally the billion dollars, but over and above that amount, we make them a present of over one hundred millions.

Mr. JACOBS: (Translation.) It is extortion, not a present.

Mr. DENIS: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, that is the situation we have to face at present. How will we stand in three, six or twelve months? No one knows. There are astute observers amongst the financiers of this country who contend that it is possible that the rate of exchange which was 19 and a fraction three months ago, might again attain that figure and perhaps reach 20 and 25 per cent. Should this happen, we should be absolutely at the mercy of the United States, for the simple reason that we are at present compelled to purchase

from them products which are absolutely indispensable to us. Amongst these products might I mention coal which we purchase to the amount of $70,000,000 per year. Has the Government done anything to remedy this depressed state of things? Has it made any efforts? With the exception of the tariff issue, is not this question as important as those of a secondary nature which were submitted in the speech from the Throne.

All that the Government wish now is to tell the people of Canada: We want to have a revision of the tariff and upon this revision we want to have elections. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Government have not understood the situation in which we find ourselves, and that with the speech from the Throne they have proved their unfitness and their inefficiency. I heard a few days ago the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) make in a speech the following statement which I quote to the House:

> One of the greatest mistakes this Government has made, in my judgment, was the acceptance of several were vessels from the British Government, resulting in our having to incur the additional expenditure, inevitably attendant upon it.

This is to be found on p. 283 of the unrevised Hansard.

The Government, although knowing that they are bound to the strictest economy, are embarking in all kinds of adventures. One day we are told of a naval programme and of the building of ships for Canada. Another day we are told of a gift from England, which is repudiated, as I have just shown, by the hon. member for Marquette—a prominent member for this House, since he is the leader of a party. Another day the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) submits Estimates double the amount of those last year. At the present time, when there is such a need for economy, do the Government show any foresight, any wisdom by indulging in such expenditures? I say, no. In thus quoting the hon. member for Marquette, it is not the opinion of the province of Quebec which I voice. If that came from Quebec, it would probably be taken as a proof of lack of patriotism. I quote the opinion of a former minister, of a man who has shared the ministerial responsibility, the opinion of a man who was not opposed to conscription, but in favour of conscription, the opinion not of a French Canadian but of a loyal Englishman—loyal just as we are ourselves. And it is this hon. member who says that the Government made a mistake in accepting this gift from England and they had no valid reason for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at the clock, I find that I have spoken much longer than I intended to. I will therefore hasten and confine my remarks to the question directly before the House, that is to say the speech from the Throne, the amendment to the Address in answer thereto, and the sub-amendment. The whole matter comes to this, that the Government offers us a speech from the Throne which contains practically nothing. They ask purely and simply to be left in office till the expiration of their term. The hon. leader of the Opposition says, "Your mandate has expired, and I want you to go to the people and have it renewed." An hon. member offers an amendment saying, "Your mandate has expired, it is true, but I am willing to give you delay in order to have a census taken and a redistribution made of constituencies before new elections." On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I see no difference in principle between the amendment and the sub-amendment. Both say to the Government, "Your time has expired, and you have lost the confidence of the people." Only, the amendment says, "We want you to withdraw right now," and the sub-amendment, "We ask that you withdraw a little later, when you have accomplished what we consider an imperative duty."

I for one, Mr. Speaker, speaking in all candour and fairness, do not believe that I am doing an injustice in saying that I will support the amendment, and that I am strongly of the opinion that the mandate of the Government has long expired. There is an argument which has been offered several times in this House, and which I cannot refrain from repeating. It is that we have not had elections since 1911. I may go further perhaps and say that we have had no elections since 1908. In that year we had general elections on the policy of the then administration, that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier presented to the House a Treaty of Reciprocity. The Opposition offered obstruction, asked for general elections, and as Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a very different man from those at the head of the Government to-day, instead of resisting the attacks of the Opposition as he might perfectly well have done, said to the then Opposition, "You want to have an election as you claim that I do not command the confidence of the people."

I am willing to let the country pass judgment upon my policy; I am ready to appeal to the people on the reciprocity issue. What

a difference, Sir, between Liberal principles and Tory, Unionist or Conservative principles! Sir Wilfrid Laurier said to the House and country: You are undecided; a doubt exists; I am willing to resign. I am not the master here; I am but a representative of the people, and as soon as a large number of the members of this House state that my policy is not the policy of the people, I am willing to submit it to them. The policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was submitted to the electorate and we are aware of the result. The elections of 1911 were held upon a single issue, that of reciprocity. But, let us admit for the sake of my argument that in the elections of 1911 the issue was based on the merits of the administration and that the Liberal Administration was defeated in that year. What remains? Their still remains an interval of ten years, from 1911 to 1921, during which no elections were held. Nobody can reasonably contend that the elections of 1917 were true elections. A single issue was then put before the electorate: conscription. I do not wish to bring up that subject again because it is a burning one, and the least said about it the better for the people of this country, for the harmony which should prevail among us. I do not want to discuss the opinions of those who took part in the elections of 1917 upon the issue of conscription; yet it is true that conscription was the sole issue submitted to the electorate in 1917. At that time, there were two parties in this country. They were both willing to exert themselves so as to win the war; but each had a different way of securing that end, and it was upon the best way to win the war that the people of Canada gave their verdict. Our opponents were saying—I heard it everywhere from one end of the country to the other; I read their speeches and everybody knows it—our opponents were saying: There is at present but one issue: shall we do our best in order to protect our soldiers and to win the war by means of conscription, following out the policy of our Prime Minister; or shall we stand idle—as Sir Wilfrid Laurier would have us? That is exactly the issue which was put forth in every Canadian province. I do not say it was put in the right light, far from it; but such was the issue brought forward at the time to the people of Canada and passed upon by them.

Prejudiced in that way the electors of every province in Canada except Quebec voted against Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his policy, not upon general lines, but only as to the manner in which the war was to be prosecuted.

Mr. McMASTER: (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. DENIS: (Translation.) And our opponents were proclaiming everywhere: "The government we have is a coalition one composed of Liberals and Conservatives; it is not a government which is expected to last long." Everybody knew at that time that it was a government which would not last forever, that it was a provisional government, a coalition in order to "win the war" as the saying was at that time. I have the greatest respect for the views of those who then formed themselves into a group to promote a policy which prevailed, but it must be admitted that the means they took were far from being legitimate.

To-day, that question having been settled and the war being over, we have to decide whether or not in 1917 the elections were held upon the general policy of the government. The following answer cannot be gainsaid: In 1917 the elections were not held upon the general policy of the government, but upon a single issue—then a burning one which is not so now, that is, in what manner were we to endeavour to win the war. That is precisely the ground upon which the elections were fought in 1917.

Now, events having taken another turn; the war being won, we may justly say that there have been no elections since 1911 because the people of this country were not called upon to give their verdict since then. However there is something more forcible and I would say more amusing, if I may use that term: it is that during this session we shall have to decide upon the fiscal policy of this country. Now, I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite whether or not Canadian electors ever thought that the representatives they were electing in 1917 would be called upon to decide the fiscal policy of Canada?

I remember that on many occasions when we came to this House in 1918 certain members on the opposite side raised fiscal issues and each time when questions of this nature were brought forward, interested friends, no doubt of those who made these enquiries, would rise and appeal to the whole House for support—each time such an issue was raised in 1918, immediately a minister of the Crown, or an hon. member would exclaim: We are not here to discuss fiscal issues, we are here to win

the war, this Government was elected to win the war and when this is done, we shall settle our accounts.

Is it not a fact that what I have just mentioned not only was said once, but twenty-five times in this House?

In 1918, our friends on the opposite side admitted that they were not here to discuss fiscal issues, but to carry on the war. Well, so far the war was concerned, the hon. members on the right were in perfect agreement because they were elected on a definite programme and they acted accordingly. They followed their programme as long as the war lasted, and I have no fault to find, they were consistent with their former stand. However, hardly was the war over that we witnessed their disaggregation. Hon. members followed one another declaring that, the purpose of the election was to win the war, but as the war was over, parties should return to their old lines; that those at present holding office had not been elected to govern the country in time of peace or to settle the fiscal issues, or to decide on questions which cropped up presently—it was a war government whose existence depended upon the war and the problems involved with it. Mr. Speaker, I beg to be excused for having taken up so much time. I might bring forth further arguments, but I am not so conceited as to hope that I could alter the views of my hon. friends opposite. I crave the indulgence of those I may have somewhat tired by this lengthy speech. I hope that when the vote is taken in a few minutes the Government will realize, that an Administration returned with seventy of a majority in 1917 and reduced to what it is at present, should examine their conscience, consider the necessity of returning before their masters and seeking a new mandate to present themselves before this House. But, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if this mandate will ever be granted to them.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but as the hour is early—we have the whole day before us!—I would like to offer a few remarks in reply to some of the suggestions that have been made by several hon. members on the other side of the House.

In the first place I think it is my duty to offer my congratulations to the Prime Minister, as the right hon. gentleman came into this House at the same election as I did. I had the pleasure of journeying with him to Ottawa. At that time we had about the same ideals, the same aspirations, and we did believe that perhaps we might in some way work for the benefit of that great western country whence we came. For the first session or two we got along very well together. At that time I was interested in the stock business in the West, and as conditions were not very favourable I put a resolution on the Order Paper in favour of a cold storage system to be operated by the Government. I received the support of every hon. member from the western provinces, but the best support came from the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government. As I say, at that time we shared the same ideals, but since then we have been drifting apart. I have watched my right hon. friend climbing upwards on a different path, and he has now reached the peak.

Mr. JACOBS: And is going down again.

Mr. WHITE: Yes. He has got to the peak of the greatest autocracy that ever controlled the destinies of this country. I suppose in the opinion of the masses he has travelled faster than I have and has become a much greater man.

Mr. JACOBS: No, no.

Mr. WHITE: But I stayed where I was, believing in the common people, still retaining the beliefs that I held when I came here, and which he also held at that time. I have stood where I was; he has advanced. Perhaps he imbibed a different spirit after coming down here. Believing, as I did, that certain things were in the interests of my country, I have been satisfied to stay where I still am, rather than attempt to follow my right hon. friend to the high position which he now holds. However, in all fairness to my right hon. friend I will say that only by his energy and his industry has he attained the highest honour Canada can give him, and if that position is to be held by any hon. member on the opposite side of the House, I do not believe there is anybody more deserving or more fitted to hold it than my right hon. friend.

I also wish to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address. In my observation extending over fifteen sessions I have never seen that duty performed in a more creditable and able manner. But my reason for rising to-night, Mr. Speaker, is not particularly to congratulate the mover and seconder of the

Address, but rather to offer some observations on certain features of the debate.

The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) discussed some grievances from which the western farmer suffered and dealt with the matter of the car shortage in that country, The hon. member pointed out that there was a shortage of equipment on the Canadian National railways and that the farmers suffered a great deal in consequence. I agree with every statement he made in that regard. The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Blair) followed the hon. member for Mackenzie, but he seemed to think that the disadvantages the western producers laboured under were due to the operations in grain. The hon. gentleman delivered a splendid speech. It was his maiden effort and I congratulate him upon it. But he must know better than to advance such an argument as he did. He and I were on two delegations that met the Prime Minister when he visited the city of Edmonton last fall.

The great grievance complained of then was not the spread in prices, or the matter in which the grain business was handled, but the car shortage. Had there been in the proper sense of the term adequate railway equipment, the spread of prices which the hon. gentleman mentioned would not have cut any figure at all. The producers were in the independent position that they would not have needed to deal with the line elevators, and might have ignored the street prices; they could have shipped their grain independently if they could have got the cars they needed. Had sufficient cars been available they would not have been affected by the spread in prices; they could have shipped their grain to the terminal elevators and sold it there. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) has made the statement that he ordered about double the number of cars contracted for by the Canadian Pacific Railway and had done twice as much as that company to relieve the congestion. Well, if that were the case, and if the cars were available, they certainly did not reach our part of the country. Every western member knows that the congestion of cars was felt all along the line of the Canadian National Railways. We were told by the General Superintendent at Edmonton that with the equipment possessed by the Canadian National Railways it would take three years to move the crop according to the estimates he had received. My hon. friend from Battle River was present at the meeting and heard Mr. Brown make the statement.

A demand has been made for a new Grain Commission to be appointed to deal with the existing difficulties. As my hon. friend from Red Deer pointed out, we already have a Grain Commission composed of men of ten or twelve years' experience. Surely another commission is not needed to deal with the matter. However, the point upon which I wish to lay stress is that had sufficient cars been available the spread of prices complained of would not have bothered the producers and they could have sold their grain in the open market. I raised considerable grain myself last year, in fact I come from a section where their was a bumper crop. We are holding that grain to-day because we could not dispose of it by reason of the lack of adequate equipment on the Canadian National railways.

The real grievance of the West to-day along the Canadian National Railway lines is lack of equipment. The member for Battle River (Mr. Blair) knows well that the prices are from seven to ten cents higher in the districts covered by the Canadian Pacific than they are along the Canadian National railways, because it is recognized that along the Canadian Pacific, where proper equipment is available, the grain will be brought out in the early part of the season, so that advantage can be taken of lake transportation. The suggestion on the part of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders) and other hon. gentlemen opposite that the great detriment to the producers in the West has been the spread of prices and that kind of thing is only a bugaboo; the real difficulty arises from car shortage. The hon. member for Battleford (Mr. Wright) was present at the meeting when Mr. Brown stated that if the estimate of this year's crop was correct, the Canadian National could not move it out with their equipment in less than three years. I would like to know how many farmers will go very far in the matter of production next year under circumstances such as these. Let hon. gentlemen who represent the western districts forget their party affiliations and truly represent the sections of the country from which they come; it is a simple matter.

There may be a great deal that is wrong about the grain business, and if a commission can be appointed that will make things better for the producer, why, I am willing to support anything that could be done along that line. But I take the same view as that expressed by the member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), when he suggests

that there is no reason why we should appoint one commission to investigate the doings of another. We already have a commission on the job; why appoint another to find out some imaginary wrongs, particularly when every producer knows what the real cause of the trouble is. We can get away from grain commissions altogether if we have proper transportation facilities for the shipment of our grain to the open market. The Minister of Railways says he has put into commission double the number of cars that the Canadian Pacific have put on their road. Well, if he has, they are not in evidence.

Some hon. members have spoken of redistribution. I want to make an honest statement in regard to this. Everybody will agree that the West is not bothering very much about redistribution. In fact, the West believe that they are not properly represented in the House to-day. There are very few members here to-day who represent the actual sentiment of the West. Who believes that hon. gentlemen from the West on the Government side represent the views of the people of the West? Nobody believes it. The real sentiment of the West to-day is represented on this side, not only by the two Liberal members from the West, but by what is called the Progressive group. They represent western opinion; there is no doubt about that—and the Government know it; let them test it and find out. The views of the West to-day are very well expressed by the Calgary Albertan, which says: We would like to have more representation in the West, but we would rather take a chance right now than wait to see how many more representatives we might have. No one will have the audacity to stand up and say that hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Treasury Benches represent the voice of the West.

What is this Agrarian group to my left? Do you not think, Sir, that this is a body of intelligent men who, when they found that they were not representing public opinion, left their party and crossed over to this side? No better evidence than that could be offered of their intelligence. I do not contend that I, as a Liberal, represent the whole sentiment of the West; there is no doubt that others were wise enough to know what public sentiment was, and when they found out that the people were not satisfied with the Government, they crossed over to this side. They did not cross over to this side to defy the electors of their constituencies; they crossed over because they considered they were the servants of the people. When they found that the people had no confidence in the Government, as honest, sincere representatives of the people, they followed public opinion and cut thmselves free from hon. gentlemen opposite. Nobody can believe anything else to be the case.

In conclusion, I want to say that, perhaps not in a very eloquent manner, but in the simple language that comes easy to me, I have tried to make an honest statement to both sides of the House. Although I know hon. gentlemen opposite are looking for their support to other sections of the country than that from which I come, I am trying as honestly as I can to represent the views and sentiments of the people who sent me here.

Mr. ADOLPHE STEIN (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, which has already lasted over two weeks, and especially at this stage it would be impossible for the humble member that I am to throw any light on the matters under discussion. But after reading in the Montreal Gazette of February 28 that the Opposition had failed in this debate to point to any wrong-doing on the part of the Government, I decided to endeavour to show, in as few words as possible, some of the innumerable pieces of mischief that have disgraced the record of this Government, elected in 1911 and re-elected, by accident, in 1917. The Gazette challenges the Opposition in the following words:

> The debate on the address, as have all debates for three years, has been remarkable in that there has been no suggestion of wrong-doing or maladministration on the part of the Government. Either the Opposition is too dense to perceive errors, or the Government has given Canada a wonderful example of administrative capacity and probity. The old charges of scandal no longer obtain. Nor are there likely to be any charges. The Government may have made mistakes, but no one has the courage to say that its members permitted the treasury to be plundered by themselves or party friends.

We on this side of the House were profoundly amazed when we read those words. We would never have imagined that the Government's friends would be bold enough to challenge the Opposition to reiterate the many scandals and numerous feats of maladministration that stained the Borden Government, and for which the present Administration rightly admits responsibility. For the sake of Canadian pride, we of the Opposition would have very much preferred to avoid publishing those terrible national misdemeanors, more especially

when it is a well-known fact that in other countries during the war those who dared to indulge in similar mischievous acts were either very severely punished with penalties or imprisonment or very often shot as traitors to their country, while in this country of ours the guilty remained undisturbed, when they were not held in favour for Canadian or Imperial positions of trust. But we accept the challenge and I will, therefore, give a list, though incomplete on account of the late hour at which I am speaking, of some of the very numerous scandals that we have already charged and that we claim to have proved against the Government.

There is a first group, known to the country as "war contract scandals," as investigated by the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons in 1915. It was proved before that committee that war contracts were let without any tenders, or any kind of competition whatever, and that the Government's purchasing system was loose, irregular and illegal. The Auditor General, before the committee on March 17, 1915, speaking of purchases, said:

> It was worse than that; they were not made in compliance with the Act.

Indeed, war goods amounting to over $1,000,000,000 had been bought without Orders-in-Council, as required by law. It was also brought out in evidence that the Tory patronage system then existing compelled the use of middlemen in all contracts. I shall give a very brief nomenclature of those scandals that the Gazette claims not to exist or to have been forgiven or forgotten: The horse scandal, which brought about the resignation of a Tory member of this House; the drug scandal which caused the resignation of another Tory member of this House; the binocular scandal and many others that will pass over without mentioning; the nickel scandal, which raised in this House a debate in which several members and especially one on the Government side laid considerable blame on the Government; the shell scandal and the fuse scandal, which alone meant a million dollar rake-off.

In another group not connected with the war, I might mention several other deeds of maladministration, such as, for instance, the padlock scandal, in the Post Office Department; the Carslake scandal in the same department; the Dorval military camp scandal in the Department of Militia, and the extravagant payment of several hundred thousand dollars to foreigners, Arthur Young and Company, and the Griffenhagen and associates, to perform a so-called civil service re-organization which could only have been properly performed by the heads of departments together with our Civil Service Commission.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the Montreal Gazette reporter has already forgotten all these wrong-doings! Is it not in this very same paper that I read, in an editorial of June 14, 1920, under the title "a condemnable contract," the following charge against the Cabinet in connection with the above expenditures:

> The whole episode reflects ministerial incompetency in a most unusual way, and the Government cannot too soon repair its mistake by terminating a contract repugnant to National pride.

And again, what about the creation, by Order-in-Council, on July 15, 1920, fourteen days after prorogation, of a Central Purchasing Board, a scheme which had encountered during a debate last session, the hostility of the great majority of this House? How many other scandals have there been, Sir, the mention of which would be much too long for my purpose? The gentleman who represents the Montreal Gazette in the press gallery is at liberty now to send again to his home office a despatch stating that we on this side of the House are "too dense to perceive errors."

It has been stated by previous speakers in the course of this debate that the people of Quebec would forgive, but could not forget, the treatment that they received from the Government. Well, I venture to say that the people of Canada at large will neither forget nor forgive those numerous scandals which have been detected and proved against the Government, whether they have been perpetrated with the connivance or through the gross negligence of the Government. In closing my remarks on this point, I wish to give credit to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) for his frankness in admitting, in a speech delivered in Winnipeg, on October 22, 1917, that he, as a member of the Conservative Government, was bound to share all the responsibilities assumed by the former Government, replaced, in the fall of 1917, by the Union Government.

During the recess and in the course of this debate, much has been said of the feelings of the province of Quebec towards the present Ministry, and of the very affectionate and touching friendship entertained by the same ministry not only for the province of Quebec, but towards the three million French-speaking citizens of this country.

The very eloquent member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), in beautiful and forcible, though mild and courteous language, has laid before the House undeniable evidence, showing to what a great extent the friendly words uttered by the right hon. the Prime Minister and by his colleagues are flatly contradicted by their own acts and deeds, when it is up to these same gentlemen to give concrete form to their flirtations with our French-speaking people.

The hon. member for Beauce mentioned several instances of recent injustice done to the French-speaking people by the Government. He particularly inquired from the ministry why not a single representative of the French Canadians had been invited to join in with the ministers who represented, or at least assumed that they held a mandate to represent, Canada at the Peace Conference and at the Assembly of the League of Nations.

I would go one step further, and ask the Government the reason why, if any, the only French-speaking member of the Cabinet was not invited, and even induced to attend those conferences as the representative of one-third of our population? If the hon. gentleman, who occupies the position of Postmaster General, was not then available, why did they not invite the very distinguished French Canadian who is the present Speaker of the Senate, and who is also, I am told, a member of the Privy Council? Has he not the confidence of the present ministry?—and what about the hon. Senators Beaubien, and Chapais? These also are two very brilliant French Canadian supporters of the present ministry. And, Mr. Speaker, a like courtesy to one-third of our Canadians would not have necessitated an election in Quebec!

May I be permitted to add a few more instances as a sequel to those brought forward by my hon. friend, the member for Beauce? When the late lamented Hon. S. N. Parent, the father of the hon. member for Quebec West, resigned from the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, in October, 1911, he was replaced by Major Leonard, an English Canadian, and the French Canadians were left without representation on this board, which was managing a railroad traversing the province of Quebec for several hundred miles. When the French Canadian head of the Government workshops at Sorel, in the county of Richelieu, Quebec, was compelled to go out of office, he was replaced by one Mr. Jackson, an English Canadian. When the late Thomas Côte was asked to resign, after September 21, 1911, as secretary of the International Waterways Joint Commission, he was replaced by one Mr. Burpee. Mr. Justice McDougall succeeded the late Judge Champagne in the French judicial district of Hull. Chief Justice Landry, in New Brunswick, was replaced by Mr. Justice Chandly. Mr. Blount succeeded Major Chapleau as clerk of the Senate, although a French Canadian was there available, in the person of the deputy clerk, who had been holding office for many years. Senator Webster succeeded the late Senator Landry in the Senate.

Who sat, may I ask, as a representative of the French Canadians, on the Public Records Commission; on the Board of Grain Commissioners; in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; on the War Trade Board; on the Canada Food Board; on the Canada Registration Board; on the Pensions Board?

Is it not a well-known fact that out of thirty "Trade Agents" that we have in foreign countries, the French Canadians are given but one representative? The hon. the Postmaster General recently stated elsewhere that he is representing in the ministry the hundreds of thousands of French Canadians, who, according to him, voted for the Government in 1917. I beg to submit that it would seem obvious, from the statements which I have made that this hon. gentleman is satisfied with holding a public office for his own self and sake, and that he lacks influence with his colleagues whenever an opportunity arises for him to exact the appointment of a French compatriot to an office of public trust. This failure in the hon. the Postmaster General's duty of procuring for his French fellow-citizens their just share in the public trusteeships reminds me of a statement made in October, 1917, by Sir John Willison, in a letter of appreciation of the Coalition Government to "The New York Tribune." This writer, a stalwart Union supporter, alluding to the present Postmaster General and to his former colleague from Quebec, now politically deceased, wrote as follows:

> In the new Cabinet there are only two French ministers, and these are among the least weighty of its members.

Is this statement a reply to our inquiry as to why this French minister was not invited to the Peace Conference or to the League of Nations with his English colleagues?

And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, while I am taking the liberty of dealing with the

hon. the Postmaster General, who holds this office as a member of the Senate, I would very respectfully suggest to the right hon. the leader of this House that the present vacancy in the county of Yamaska, Quebec, affords a unique and splendid opportunity for the Postmaster General to secure for himself a comfortable seat in this beautiful chamber. Indeed, this constituency of Yamaska happens to be the hon. gentleman's native county; he has even been residing therein as recently as a few months ago. Then why not try his chance there just now?

I will go still further in this connection. I assume, from the wording of the Electoral Act, as it now stands, and also from the amendment made to the House of Commons Act in the second session of 1919, that it would seem to be your own duty, Mr. Speaker, immediately to issue your warrant for this election. Let me explain myself.

Section 9 of the House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 11, reads in part as follows:

> If any vacancy happens in the House of Commons by the death of any member . . . . the Speaker, on being informed of such vacancy by any member of the House in his place . . . . shall forthwith address his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ for the election of a member to fill the vacancy; and a new writ shall issue accordingly.

Now, under the new law, as drafted last year, the Clerk of the House of Commons holds the office of the former Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. On the second day of this session, as shown on pages 7 and 8 of Hansard, it was stated by the right hon. the Prime Minister and by my hon. leader, who were both addressing you, Mr. Speaker, that our regretted colleague, the late member for Yamaska, had passed away during the recess. Hence, I take it for granted, Mr. Speaker, that you have been sufficiently informed, under the Act, as to this vacancy, and I very respectfully submit that it is your duty to issue your warrant accordingly.

At all events, in order to remove any possible misunderstanding I, myself, now from my place in this House, beg leave officially to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that the former member for Yamaska, Mr. Oscar Gladu, died over two months ago, and that, therefore, a vacancy has occurred in that electoral district.

It is true that a delay of six months is mentioned in section 11-A of the House of Commons Act. But this is a maximum limit; it was intended to mean that six months' delay might be allowed during recess. But I humbly submit that, when Parliament is called to meet in session, all the vacancies should have been filled before the opening of the session, in order to give to every constituency the representatives to whom it is entitled. I assume that this is a sound interpretation of this new law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, following again and further the argument made by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) in reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in this House, on the 18th of last month, I will quote from the remarks of the member for Frontenac the following, as they appear in Hansard at page 141:

> I challenge the leader of the Opposition, or any of those sitting behind him, to quote one single sentence, one single line, one single thought expressed in words by the present Prime Minister of Canada at any time, in this House or out of it, which has indicated the slightest feeling of hostility or unfriendliness to the people of the province of Quebec.

I will make a compromise with the hon. member for Frontenac; I will agree, but only for the sake of argument, that his honourable leader is, towards French-Canadians and in connection with the treatment that he has afforded to them, a sinner more by way of omission than by commission. But we feel the injustice just the same, whatever may be the artful mode of procedure adopted by the hon. member's leader when dealing with the Quebec people, or with French-Canadians in other provinces.

Before closing, I would call to my aid in this connection,—to prove that my remarks are accurate on this very important subject, which is a vital one for one-third of the people of this country,—a very remarkable editorial of the Montreal Gazette of May 17, 1920. This editorial, which was headed "French and the Franchise," had regard to the then pending debate in this House on the new electoral law. I will omit a few sentences, unfortunately, to save time, but I hope that the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues will read this editorial in its entirety and that, in the future, when boasting that they are giving equal and equitable treatment to all races and creeds in Canada, they will sincerely meditate upon the sound and sane principles of justice, as so thoroughly expounded in this article, which reads, in part:

> Several hours were devoted in the Commons last week to the discussion of a subject upon which we think there is no room for controversy, namely, the desirability of having the

Proclamation of an election printed in the French language in electoral districts in which there are a considerable number of electors who understand that tongue, but are not familiar with the English language. The matter was brought up by Mr. Turgeon, of Gloucester, New Brunswick, who, in a temperate speech urged the desirability of giving to the French population communication in their own language of proceedings relating to the very foundation of popular government, the election of members, and, with customary exceptions, the debate was conducted in admirable mood, though not upon a lofty plane. There was much citation of the Constitution to prove where begin the rights of the French people in respect of official use of their language, and where those rights end, and a disposition to place rigid and narrow construction upon the Confederation Act in a matter that fairly transcends the strict letter of the law. Constantly are we reminded that harmony and cordiality between the two great races, which inhabit Canada rest more upon sentiment and generous feeling than upon the text of a statute.

The editorial in another place says:

Mr. Turgeon told the House that "French people are sentimental; they appreciate anything that is done in their behalf; "but while sentiment must always receive recognition, there is a yet higher motive to move man, that of justice and of regard for the general good.

Finally it says:

It may not be a great matter that in French districts electoral proclamations should be issued in the French language; but it is of consequence that French-Canadians be not irritated by a sense of injustice, that they be not pin-pricked, and that their great part in forming and fostering Confederation should find expression in equitable legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. the Prime Minister appeared before the French-speaking people of this country some months ago, did he offer any explanation why he and his colleagues remained mute during the debate in question last year? Did he tender an apology for their refusal to grant, when it was most opportune to do so to the French-speaking minority, "Equitable Legislation," as their organ calls it, and thus to prove in good faith that their legislative acts, if not their administrative deeds, accord with their political performances?

No, Mr. Speaker, the law remained as it was. The Prime Minister did not utter one single word of ill-feeling towards the French-speaking people, but he committed another sin of omission.

I believe that I have already spoken too long, and I shall close with the following words: I shall vote for the amendment offered by our distinguished leader. I am sure that if the Hon. Robert Rogers were in this House, he who, as a true Conservative, organized the 1911 elections for the benefit of a number of our friends opposite, he, too, would vote for an election. Indeed, he stated very recently that the Government are only anxious for one thing, namely, to maintain themselves in office. What the people mostly need at present to obtain from the Government is not apologies nor promises, but elections.

An election at the present time would have—I dare say, with all due respect—the sanitary effect of a most complete whitewash in Government premises. It would clear the political atmosphere. It would afford every Canadian elector a proper means of expressing his views on the actual political situation.

Mr. EDMOND SAVARD (Chicoutimi-Saguenay): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night, I think it only right to let my hon. friends know that I shall be very brief. After the numerous speeches we have listened to, it would seem that I should refrain from raising my voice, being satisfied that I could not add anything new to the remarks made upon the address and the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

But on the other hand, I believe that the electors whom I have the honour to represent, may rightly expect that I take part in this important debate, one of the most important perhaps, of this Parliament, since it involves the life or death of the Government.

I do not hesitate to declare that my fellow-citizens will readily pardon me, especially at this late hour, if I do not linger over the speech from the throne. The dish which was served to us amidst extraordinary pomp at the opening of the session, was so very meagre that it seems to me it was long ago digested.

As to the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, (the hon. Mr. King) I say with the greatest sincerity, that from my point of view, never in our parliamentary history has a non-confidence motion been more justifiable than that one now submitted to the consideration of the country's representatives.

I shall content myself with approving what has been said of the mover and seconder of the address. These hon. members acquitted themselves of an arduous duty with honour to themselves and the counties they represent. We would have liked, no doubt, to have heard one of these

speeches in French, and the right hon. Prime Minister had on that occasion an opportunity to prove the sincerity of the advances he has been making to the province of Quebec for some months. But one must admit what is evident, everything French is as repugnant to the right hon. Prime Minister as to his colleagues. I do not believe that one could find outside these falls an intelligent man, honest and disinterested, who would dare to affirm on his honour that the Government has the confidence of the majority of the electors or even of the members of this House. How many are there in the House itself who would make such a statement. The right hon. Prime Minister has declared to us that he would carry on as long as he had the confidence of a majority of the people's representatives, but he knows as well as we do, and perhaps better than most of us, since he has been touring the country, that the people are certainly against him. The high position that he occupies, his undeniable worth, should induce him to refrain from making absurd statements and covering himself with ridicule, as certain of his partisans have done, in saying that the country is satisfied with its Government, and that in going before the people he would be returned to power. The hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) admitted the other day that the majority of by-elections since 1917 had gone against the Borden Government, but he said that the election had taken place since the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen) held his present office justified him in stating that the people are in favour of of the Government. It is impossible to believe that the hon. Minister of Militia was serious in making such a statement. And, Mr. Speaker, you must have remarked the satisfaction on this side of the House when the hon. minister declared that he was no longer a Liberal. Let us hope that this statement is more sincere than the other.

All the hon. members of the loyal opposition who have taken part in this debate have proved most clearly that the result of the last elections condemns the new Government, as the hon. Minister of Militia calls it. No, Mr. Speaker, there is not a sensible man, but is convinced that, in the event of immediate dissolution, the greater number of the hon. members sitting at your right, would not dare present themselves again to their electors, and would therefore be forced to say goodbye to those around them now. This, as has been shown by many hon. members of the Opposition, is the sole reason why the Government does not want an election. Redistribution is only a pretext. Never before has such a reason been invoked to delay the date of an election. Whatever may be the differences of opinion on the subject of the usurpation of power by the Government, it can not be denied that the last elections were fought over conscription, with the voting done according to the war-time election Act; therefore, as stated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McLean) former minister in the Union cabinet, the alliance of Liberals and Conservatives was to end with the war. The war ended over two years ago; if the Government does not hold the power unconstitutionally they have had no mandate to continue to administer the affairs of the country after the war. The right hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. Minister of the Militia as well as several other members, have cited a certain number of cases in England and Canada where there has been a change of Prime Minister without general elections.

I shall not discuss these precedents, for I should not do justice to them after the ability with which a number of my hon. friends on this side of the House have taken them up. The proof was very clearly brought out specially by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) who made one of the most admirable speeches ever made in this House. These examples do not apply at present to the Government. It gives me much pleasure to congratulate the hon. member for Quebec East on the great success he obtained. It did not come entirely as a suprise as we expected it, but let me add that his success surpassed our highest expectations. His eloquence and the force of his arguments were to all his friends a matter of great satisfaction. No further doubt can be entertained that the mandate given the Government of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden in 1917, or perhaps I should say the mandate which was extorted by the Union Government, was for war aims only. You may argue as you please, once the war was over, the mandate ceased. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Militia has argued like many others that the hon. leader of the Opposition has no right to speak for the whole Liberal party since he only represents portions of it. Let me say once for all that this declaration on the part of a minister of

the Crown or rather a member of a broken up and moribund government can only be termed despicable for he knows but too well that he was selected as leader of the Liberal party by their representatives from all the provinces of Canada. Moreover the party is proud of its leader. We recognize him as the worthy successor of our lamented chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In addition to the arguments brought forward by our leader we have an unlimited number of reasons which induce us to vote in favour of his motion. We have not forgotten the Borden Government. The hon. member (Mr. Stein) who has just taken his seat enumerated in detail the numerous scandals which croped up under his Administration and I therefore do not intend to review them again. However I shall draw your attention to the fact which is so well known that in 1911, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier went out of power, he left the country in a most prosperous state. It is equally well known that only a few years were necessary for the Borden Government to bring it on the verge of bankruptcy. No one can forget the innumerable misdemeanours that this Administration was guilty of. Under the guise of economy this Government dismissed hundreds of civil employees with the premeditated intention of replacing them, as we know, by thousands of their friends who to-day fill the departments to overflow. We have not forgotten the most out-crying scandal: the purchase of the Canadian Northern Railway. How shall we ever forget that most unjust enactment of the closure and of the Conscription Act, the sudden descent upon our peaceful country of regiments with machine guns to ferret with like wild beasts the sons of our farmers who had dared to think that they were not obliged to sacrifice their all for the cause of the Empire. Mr. Speaker, were I to enumerate all the misdeeds of this Government I should take up too much time and since I have promised to be brief I shall close my remarks by saying that it will give me great satisfaction to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DONALD NICHOLSON: (Queen's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I have not been requested to speak and I do not know in what political character I am to be recognized, whether as a Liberal, a Progressive, or a Tory. But I want to speak to-night especially from the Tory standpoint. First of all I heartily join in the congratulations which have been extended to the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who now ably leads the Government upon his elevation to the high position of Prime Minister. I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne on the excellent speeches which they made.

An hon. MEMBER—Louder.

Mr. NICHOLSON: If my hon. friend will be patient I will speak in tones loud enough for him to hear. The speech of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) who is one of the first lieutenants, I presume, of the Opposition leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) interested me. The hon. gentleman stated that the Prime Minister was a Tory. I am glad of that. In my opinion the Tories have done a good deal for Canada. My hon. friend also stated that the Prime Minister was in favour of contributing men and money in order to carry on Canada's share in the war. The statement was heartily applauded by hon. gentlemen opposite, even by the small group of Progressives. If there is one thing of which we on this side cordially approve, it is standing by Great Britain when she is in trouble. The adoption of that policy by the Government accounts for the large majority which they obtained at the election in 1917.

The leader of the Opposition had the temerity to demand by what right the Government continues in office. My answer to that is that the Government continues to administer public affairs by virtue of the mandate of the people, a mandate such as enables my hon. friend himself to sit in this House for the County of Prince, for the balance of the present term of Parliament which ends in 1922. In the course of his speech, my hon. friend also referred to the elections of 1917 and stated that the men overseas were coerced into supporting the Government. That statement is my chief reason for rising to speak to-night.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I received ninety-five per cent of the votes of the young men who went to the front from my constituency and I feel that the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition cruelly misrepresents them. I also wish to say that of that ninety-five per cent a large number were the sons of Liberals who had supported Sir Wilfrid Laurier during the fifteen years of his administration. I can further state that these young men at that time wrote home to their parents to support the Union Government. It therefore ill becomes the leader of the Opposition to indulge in such aspersions. I am surprised that a young gentleman who

aspires to become the leader of a Government in Canada should misrepresent these young men who, without reward, valiantly went to the front and patiently stood the hardships of such a terrible campaign by alleging that they were coerced into casting their votes as they did.

Coerced! That is a very improper word to my mind. How were they coerced? Did the Commander-in-Chief of the Canadian troops threaten those young men to compel them to vote for the Union candidates? That is what my hon. friend would imply. And I notice, Sir, that his hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) to-night repeated that slander, for it is nothing less than a slander on the free, independent young men who went from my county and who voted for me. Not only that, Sir, but the hon. gentleman comes down to Charlottetown and on a public platform states, by implication, that I have no right to represent my constituency, because his friend who was on the platform with him lost the seat by some wrongdoing on my part. As a matter of fact, so many men from Prince Edward Island went overseas that the Government was generous enough to send representatives from each party to conduct the polling, and I never heard from one of those representatives that there was any wrongdoing. I met hundreds of young men on their return from the front and I asked them the question: Were you influenced to vote for the Government candidates; were you threatened in any way in the event of your voting against the Government candidates? Not one answered in the affirmative. I have had hundreds of letters from young men who were ardent supporters of the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier saying: Here, we knew it was a critical time, it looked as though we were going to be defeated, and we wanted help from home. It ill becomes the leader of the Opposition to stand up here and say that those young men were coerced, and I take it that when an appeal is made to the people they will resent that slander. I am sorry for him, because he is a young man and will, I presume, perhaps sometime hold a prominent position in the public life of Canada.

He also in his speech in Charlottetown proclaimed, to my mind, a political heresy. He stated that the hon. Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) had not sufficient majorities to show that they had the confidence of the people. Well, that is a most extraordinary statement. The hon. Minister of Public Works had a 2,500 majority, and the hon. Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue had a 4,000 majority. What size majority does he want? I consider that they both had good substantial majorities on a straight clearcut issue.

I heard in this debate the hon. leader of the Opposition mention that the right hon. Prime Minister had stated at a meting in Truro that our friends on the other side were connected with the Bolsheviks. I was at that meeting, and I can affirm that I never heard a statement of that kind from the right hon. leader of the Government.

The election in Peterborough was a misunderstanding between our own friends. Mr. Burnham is a Conservative, and I am inclined to think that he was not treated right. As a matter of fact if he had been elected I am sure he would be standing on this side for what is right in the fiscal arrangement anyhow.

The right hon. leader of the Government made a tour of the West last fall, and the hon. leader of the Opposition also made a tour of the West. One of the latter's colleagues represents a riding which under the present fiscal system enjoys more protection than any other manufacturing centre in Canada. He did not tell his friends that in the West. What would those friends think of that? The same statement applies to the hon. members for Kent, Ont. (Mr. McCoig), for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan), for Joliette (Mr. Denis), and other hon. members. I should like to know if they would support the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) without the protection which they enjoy.

Reference was made in this debate to the Canadian Mercantile Marine. Our hon. friends from the West have had their say, and our hon. friends from Quebec have had their say, so I think it is time that I said something on behalf of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Go to it.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let me call the attention of the Government to the Pictou-Charlottetown-Magdalen Islands route. The Government should take this service over and build a suitable steamer to be operated in connection with the National Railways. There are some 8,000 people on the Magdalene Islands, hardy fishermen; yet the service now is not as good as it was forty years ago under the old Tory government. It is a crying shame that those people are so grossly neglected.

There should also be an additional boat for the Prince Edward Island route. I have it on the authority of the management of the Canadian National Railway system that they recognize the necessity for, and are in favour of providing an additional boat at an early date. My opinion is that the Government had better give a contract this year for the building of such a boat. The present boat is taken off the route for nearly two months each year, and the service provided is not satisfactory to our people. I know that some hon. gentlemen will state: We are used to that kind of talk from Prince Edward Island, and that province has cost the Dominion a large sum. Why, one of the hon. ministers is an absolute political paranoiac; he thinks that we have too good a boat service.

When Prince Edward joined the Canadian Federation in 1873 we were free from debt. Nearly fifty years ago we built a railroad—when you gentlemen in Saskatchewan were only in your swaddling clothes—at a cost of $3,400,000, and subsequently handed it over to the Dominion Government. One year after we entered Confederation Canada obtained an award of $5,500,000 from the United States, $1,000,000 of which was handed over to Newfoundland. I hope the Government will give heed to the earnest representations I have made with reference to the two steamers I have mentioned and gave a contract arranged for at an early day.

I want to say this with regard to the Magdalen Islands; the Magdalen Islands were settled before there was any settlement at all on the site of what is now the city of Winnipeg. The people there are fishermen, and they have not been treated properly by any Government of Canada. I have made representations on their behalf; forty years ago I was a member of the delegation that came to Ottawa to make certain requests with regard to that matter. We had a good old Tory government at that time, and they listened to our representations and subsequently put on a service, which was maintained for years. On account of the war and other considerations, there has not been in recent years as satisfactory a service as we ought to have for these people.

Let us indulge in a little retrospect, Mr. Speaker. The first Parliament of Canada under the Confederation was held in 1867. The total revenue of Canada at that time was $13,000,000. In 1878 it was $24,000,000; in 1896 it was $40,000,000; in 1910 it was $140,000,000, under the administration of the late Liberal Government—it had come up very well. But, Sir, last year, 1920, the total revenue of Canada was $380,000,000. Besides Canadians subscribed to war bonds $1,500,000,000. In 1895 the total assets of the banks were $316,000 000; in 1919 they were $2,754,000,000. The question that we are now up against is the raising of $400,000,000 yearly for the carrying on of the country's affairs. What does that mean? It means that every man, woman and child in Canada will have to contribute fifty dollars toward the running of the country. We have had a lot of talk during the last few weeks, but I have not heard anyone suggest how that money was going to be raised. It is a serious question, and one that ought to be actively taken up.

I notice that the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is in his right place—No Man's Land. He could not have been elected in Nova Scotia, so he is now in line with the Government of that province. I might say that in connection with the appropriation to aid the provinces in the building of roads, a contract was let by the Government of Nova Scotia under that highway scheme for St. Margaret's road and $280,000 was supposed to do the road work, but $780,000 was spent by the local government. Gentlemen down there say they are Liberals, but they are anything. That work cost the province $780,000—and that is characteristic of the history of Nova Scotia Liberalism.

The party on this side has adopted the name National Liberal and Conservative. I do not care about the name—it is too long. But I suggest that the name of the party opposite, judging from the speeches that have been made by some hon. gentlemen on that side, should be "Snatcher" instead of "Liberal," because they snatch at everything; they snatch at every policy imaginable.

The hon. senior member for Halifax opposed the Military Service Act. In his opinion it was an awful Act. He was against the party in power—the Tory party at that time. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) had to get in with the Tory party then, and he renounces it now. Toryism, he says, is not for freedom—but it is to be remembered that the member for Halifax and other hon. gentlemen have been enabled to hold seats in the House by virtue of legislation passed by this Parliament. If they are consistent

they will do what has been done in Great Britain in cases of this kind. They call it the Chiltern Hundreds. If a gentleman disagrees with the policy of the Government over there he says: "I am not satisfied with the Government; I am going back to the people." But not one of the gentlemen opposite did that, and we on this side stand here defending the policy that was inaugurated for the benefit of Canada.

Now, I want to take hon. gentlemen back a little; and I can take you back further than some of you gentlemen think. I will take you back to the days before the National Policy was inaugurated in this country, when the people of the lower provinces were leaving by the hundreds and thousands—and why? They were going to the New England States in order to obtain employment. Last year I heard, I think it was the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) say that there were at least 2,000,000 French Canadians in the United States. Does the same condition prevail now? No, they do not go to the United States to find employment. When our people went to the factories of New Hampshire and New England to obtain employment, what did they do there? They were manufacturing boots, caps, clocks, everything in the United States for use down in the lower provinces, and French Canadians and people from the lower provinces were migrating in thousands to the United States. The reason why they left this country was that they could not get employment in Halifax, Charlottetown or any other city in the lower provinces because goods were allowed to come in free from the United States. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say: "Oh, let us have free trade." The hon. member for Red Deer says: "I believe in freedom;" but there is a freedom that is not right, and some kinds of freedom are very wrong. We want to protect our industries, and I am not quite satisfied with the Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: That is a little comfort to my hon. friends opposite. I maintain that the Government ought to impose a high enough rate of duty to prevent United States goods from coming in here as much as they do. At the present time, too many articles of United States manufacture are being imported into this country, and I would impose a higher duty. I claim that this Government made a mistake when they took $31,000,000 off customs duties. I would not have taken off a dollar. Did they gain any support by their action? Not at all, and I contend that if they had taken off $150,000,000, they would not have gained any support. I ask my hon. friends to consider the situation in all seriousness. We have to raise $400,000,000 and the question is: How is that amount going to be raised? A prominent member of the Agrarian party suggested the imposition of a land tax; but when he got down into Ontario, Quebec and the lower provinces, he found that the people did not want that; that they wanted to preserve the fiscal policy that is at present in force. When the people of the lower provinces and the people of the West consider the situation, they will ask: "How are you going to raise the revenue?" At the present time we get $160,000,000 from customs, so much from excise duties and so much from income tax, and I hope more will be raised next year from the income tax. To take the duty only off agricultural implements would be selfish on the part of loyal Canadians, and if you take off the $100,000,000, give us your alternative and then we shall know where we are. I listened carefully to all hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate to find what alternative there was for raising the revenue that must be raised, but not a suggestion did I hear.

The other evening I listened with great interest to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), who has weighed this matter carefully and who has been a responsible public man for a number of years. He cannot see eye to eye with the Opposition in their policy, with the "snatcher" party, the Liberal party. He boldly stands up here and takes his political life in his hands, acting in the interest of this country, and I am sorry to say that one of his former confrères designated him a traitor. The hon. gentleman who made that remark is a student of history, a great admirer of Liberalism. The great Gladstone, when he first came into public life, was recognized as the fond hope of the unbending Tories, and surely my hon. friends opposite will not say that he was a traitor. It is time to cut out that sort of thing, and I may say that I consider the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, in the stand that he took, was a Daniel; he stood alone; he "dared to be a Daniel," and I believe the people of his province will eventually realize that he has taken a proper course in that regard.

I do not want to speak with regard to any particular province at all; I am a Canadian; but I just want to say to hon. gentlemen

opposite that they have been playing the political baby and crying that the Tories have ben insulting them. I have been in this House for ten years, and I have never heard an hon. gentleman on this side use an improper word towards a French Canadian; that is, for political purposes. I might go further and tell something which has happened, but perhaps it is better to leave such matters alone. From the Atlantic to the Pacific we are, and should be, Canadians in our endeavour to build up this great country, and I regret it very much if in this chamber things have been said that should not have been said. The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) in his recent speech, told us what the people of Saskatchewan had done in connection with the war, and I know that they have been loyal and good Canadians.

I have travelled in the West, and I do not fear but that there will be an overwhelming majority against the fiscal policy announced by the present Opposition. I have been in the constituency represented by the Secretary of State, the Hon. Mr. Sifton, and I know there are opportunities there for manufacturing that are not to be found in any other part of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the excessive prices paid for farm machinery. Why, you can make farm machinery right there; the rates are in your favour, and farm machinery will be made there some day. It is all very well for men to complain of hardships, but every province has hardships. The province of Nova Scotia has hardships. She has not enough protection. I am sure my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) thinks we have not enough protection. Coal, for instance, is not protected nearly as much as it ought to be.

With hon. gentlemen opposite it is the same old story. They have one story for Nova Scotia, another for Saskatchewan, and another for Alberta.

Mr. DUFF: Who is that?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The "Snatcher" party. They have a different speech for every province. We on this side stand on solid ground. We stand by the policy of 1878, the National Policy that was inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald. There may be modifications in the tariff; I hope there will be, but that is the policy we stand by in every part of the country, and I am confident that when there is an election the party now in power will be returned on that policy. Hon. gentlemen may sneer at the Tory party, but I can tell them that if it were not for the Tory party they would not have a Winnipeg or a Calgary to-day. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that, but I am old enough to remember the time when the Liberals bitterly opposed the building of a railroad out there. Everything that was done for the west was initiated by the Liberal-Conservative party of this country, although in saying that I do not wish to belittle what was done in the fifteen years of Liberal administration under the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Things went along those fifteen years until in 1911, he proposed a change in the fiscal policy of this country, and I think but for that he would have been returned to power.

I come from a farming county, the best county in Canada. We produce more mixed farm produce than any other county. We are not raisers of wheat, but we go in for mixed farming, and the farmers in our county work fifteen hours a day; there is no eight-hour day for them. I am pleased to say that we have in the home market the greatest market. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like that, but it is true. The home market has done a lot for the people of this country. I have travelled from one end of Canada to the other, and know something about the conditions, and what the National Policy has done for us, and I know that the people in the Southern States of America would give a lot to have the privileges that we have, that is, a national policy of their own. I know there are a lot of Tories in the province of Quebec who think as I do on this question. In fact, they were the missionaries that started this propaganda for protection. They have benefitted by it, and they are not going to turn it down. I believe my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe, will have the backing of thousands of people who loyally supported Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because, as my hon. friend says he retained the old policy and protection.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we are all Canadians. Let us tolerate one another, and cut out all this sectarianism and everything of that sort. I am somewhat older than most of the members here and I say that my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) will regret making the speech he did to-night. It is a very improper speech to make to a mixed audience. However, he is young, and may learn. He may be a minister of the Crown some day but before that time comes he must moderate his views very considerably, and he must not think so badly of our

friends from Ontario as he does at the present time. I thank the members of this House and you Mr. Speaker for your patient hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should say before submitting the amendment to the amendment that it is a well recognized rule that an amendment must amend; in other words, it shall not be a negative of the motion sought to be amended. The authorities are quite clear that if the word "that" in the original motion is left, this leaves sufficient of such motion to make the amending motion technically in order. The amendment to the amendment as submitted, while perhaps technically in order, does not convey the meaning which undoubtedly the mover had in mind, inasmuch as if it were construed to apply to the first word "that" it would hardly be intelligent. It seems to me that under the circumstances it would be far wiser if it were understood that the motion had reference to the second "that" of the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell) negatived.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messieurs

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Béland,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
Duff,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kennedy (Essex N.),
King,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McDermand,
McDonald,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysboro.),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Stein,
Thompson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Vien,
White (Victoria),
Wright.—91.

NAYS

Messieurs

Allan,
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Bristol,
Butts,
Calder,
Casselman,
Chabot,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Cronyn,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Doherty,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Richmond),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Keefer,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Lalor,
Lang,
Long,
McKelvie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (York),
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nicholson (Algoma),
Paul,
Peck,
Porter,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steel,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Yukon),
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Tweedie,
Whidden,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon).—116.

PAIRS

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messieurs

Loggie,	Maclean, A.K.
Borden,	Clark (Red Deer),
McGregor,	Maharg,
Stewart (Lanark),	Kennedy (Glengarry),
Crothers,	Reid (McKenzie),
Richardson,	Buchanan,
Hughes,	Knox,
Rowell.	Boivin.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was paired with the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell). Had I not been so paired I would have followed my usual custom and voted for the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOY: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer): I was paired with the right hon. member for Kings (Sir Robert Borden). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MAHARG: I was paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. J. F. REID: I was paired with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KNOX: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario (Sir Sam Hughes). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Main motion (Mr. McIsaac) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General agreed to.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen (Prime Minister) it was ordered that the said Address be engrossed and transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

SUPPLY

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House do on Monday next resolve itself into a committee to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

[Mr. Speaker.]

WAYS AND MEANS

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House do on Monday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 4.35 a.m.

Friday, March 4, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRESENTING OF PETITIONS

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker I think there used to be something on the Order Paper about presenting petitions. Has the rule been changed in that regard?

Mr. SPEAKER: Petitions may be presented on the Order "Motions", or they may be handed to the Clerk at any time during the day, with the endorsement of the hon. gentleman's name on them.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Summary Report of the Mines Branch of the Department of Mines for the calendar year ended December 31, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Copy of statement showing number of enfranchisements under the Indian Act, from April 1, 1920 to February 18, 1921 —Hon. Mr. Calder.

Copy of additional regulations made under authority of the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Returns showing the Orders-in-Council passed since the last returns under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, the Forest Reserves and Parks Act, and the Migratory Birds Convention Act.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Statement showing lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the year ended 31st December, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

List of permits issued to take intoxicants into the North West Territories during

the year ended the 31st Decemer, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Annual Report of Board of Historical Publications for the year ended March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19, to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to provide that, in cases of appeals from the decision of the Commissioner of Patents, in which case the Commissioner is entitled to appeal and to defend his decision, there shall be on the part of the Commisioner a right to appeal to the Supreme Court. There is presently on the part of the other party a right to appeal to the Supreme Court, and as the Commissioner figures in the proceedings as a representative of the public interest, it seemed only right that he should have the same right of appeal that the private party has.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CANADA-WEST INDIES TRADE AGREEMENT, 1920

On motion of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, (Prime Minister), it was ordered that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution aproving the agreement dated the 18th day of June, 1920, between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Government of certain of His Majesty's colonies in the West Indies, which agreement is termed, "The Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920."

Mr. BUREAU: Is there anything in the statutes making it plain that in this case 'to-morrow" means "Monday"?

Mr. SPEAKER: The phraseology that is always used is that on the next sitting day, provided it is a Government day, it is competent for the Government to take up the question.

Mr. McMASTER: A Joshua.

OLEOMARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. S. F. Tolmie, (Minister of Agriculture), it was ordered that the House do to-morrow resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution to amend the Oleomargarine Act, 1919, so as to permit the manufacture in and importation of Oleomargarine into Canada, and the offering for sale and the having in possession for sale of Oleomargarine.

PAIRS

CORRECTION BY GOVERNMENT WHIP

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, in looking over the list of pairs in Hansard this morning, I find that the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) has not been entered as being paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie). There was a distinct understanding that they should be paired until 9.45 last evening, and as the hon. member for Provencher was good enough to extend that, they should have been entered as paired accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The correction will appear in consequence of the statement just made by the hon. member. There is in the Votes and Proceedings no formal record of pairs.

THE ESTIMATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): When may the House expect to receive the Estimates for the coming year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Next week.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the Order "Government Orders:"

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): We will proceed with the Government Orders this afternoon; but in view of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is indisposed, and that of the four Bills which are marked as being printed in both English and French, three stand in his name, leaving only one to proceed with, with the unanimous consent of the House I will move that we proceed to questions, and after having dealt with them, we shall return to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to, and the House proceeded to questions.

QUESTIONS

Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.

CANADIAN PRESS, LIMITED

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Is it the intention of the Government to assist the Canadian Press Limited to the extent of contributing $20,000 yearly in order to buy an Imperial News Service from Reuter's?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has not decided to do so.

KIRKWOOD STEAMSHIP COMPANY

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Has the Government sold any patrol boats to the Kirkwood Steamship Company?

2. If so, how many and what was the price of said sale?

3. Was said sale advertised? If so, in what manner?

4. What was the price paid by the Government for said boats when they were purchased?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

LOANS TO GREECE AND ROUMANIA

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have Greece and Roumania paid the interest to date on loans made to them by the Government of Canada?

2. If so, what amounts have been paid and at what date?

3. Are there now any matured interests which are unpaid?

4. If so, when have they become due and what are the amounts?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 1, 2, 3, and 4. Greece has paid to June 30, 1920, as follows: To Decmeber 1, 1919, $7,834.79; to June 30, 1920, $53,160.61, being in full to that date. Interest account to December 31, 1920, amounting to $153,916.63, was rendered in due course and the Overseas Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce, London, has now been able to present same to the Representative of the recently established Greek Government in London for payment. Roumania has made no payment of interest. Interest due to October 1st, 1920, amounted to $909,526.34 and on April 1, 1921, the total interest due will be $1,475,234.96. Accounts have been rendered. The question of the payment of this overdue interest and future interest instalments, has been the subject of negotiation between Representatives of the Dominion of Canada and the Kingdom of Roumania. These negotiations are still in progress.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has the Government been made aware of the date of the next Imperial Conference in London?

2. Does the Government know what questions will be discussed?

[Mr. Meighen.]

3. Has there been any correspondence between this Government and the British Government on that subject?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to communicate its views to the Canadian Parliament on the different questions which will be taken up at that conference, and to fix a date for the discussion of these questions by the House, so that the delegates who will be sent to London might be acquainted with the opinion of the Canadian people on these questions in order to press their views at said conference.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No date has yet been fixed for the next Imperial Conference and there is no intention that it shall be held this year. It is anticipated, however, that a meeting of the Prime Ministers of the different parts of the Empire will be held in June next.

2. The agenda for this meeting of Prime Ministers has not yet been settled, but it is expected that among the subjects for discussion will be the question of the renewal of the Treaty of Alliance with Japan of the thirteenth July, 1911, and the question of naval policy based upon the principle of co-operation; while there will doubtless be a review and consultation upon the general course of the foreign policy of the Empire.

3. Correspondence is proceeding upon the subject for discussion at the June meeting of Prime Ministers.

4. Should there be an indication of a general desire on the part of the House of Commons for a discussion, the Government would be prepared to arrange facilities and would welcome expressions of opinion from all quarters; but in view of the fact that the meeting is of the nature of a conference, the Government could not depart from the invariable practice by making commitments in advance of the meeting. Necessarily any proposals resulting from the conference and affecting Canada must be subject to the approval of the Canadian Parliament.

LEASES FOR FEDERAL OIL LANDS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have the rules concerning the leases for Federal lands for the exploitation of oil wells been suspended by the Government?

2. If so, when and for what reason?

3. When does the Government propose to issue new Regulations?

4. Is not the Government aware that, by delaying the promulgation of rules, it is favouring the Imperial Oil Company and protects that company against the smaller prospectors?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Yes, in so far as the North West Territories are concerned.

2. By Order in Council dated the 22nd January, 1921, P.C. 146. The Regulations prior to that date were specially designed to encourage and assist a vigorous search for oil on lands the property of the Crown, and were not well adapted to the conditions which had arisen as a result of the discovery reported to have been made of oil in quantity near Fort Norman in the Provisional District of Mackenzie, which discovery appeared to be of national significance. Such conditions were, therefore, made the subject of careful enquiry.

3. New Regulations were duly established by Order in Council dated the 11th instant, P.C. 331.

4. No. The delay extended only from the 22nd January to the 11th February, and was the shortest possible period within which the careful enquiry necessary for establishing new Regulations could be made.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEEL SHIP CONTRACTS

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many steel ships are being built at Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to the order of the Canadian Government?
2. What is the name of the person or firm which entered into said contract with the said Government?
3. What will be the deadweight tonnage of said ships?
4. What is the contract price for said ships?
5. On what date were said contracts entered into?
6. What amount has been advanced to the contractors on progress estimates?
7. What further amount will the Government have to pay to complete these ships ready for sea?
8. Will the contractor complete the said ships or have the Government been compelled to make other arrangements to complete said ships?
9. What are such arrangements?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Two.

2. The Prince Rupert Drydock & Engineering Company, Limited.

3. Approximately 8,390 tons.

4. $198.00 per ton D.W.

5. The contract was negotiated with the John L. Mullen Construction Company (who afterwards assigned their interests to the Prince Rupert Drydock & Engineering Company, Limited) in October and November 1918. The Order-in-Council authorizing the construction of the ships is dated the 12th December, 1918. The formal contract was signed on the 21st February, 1919.

6. No. 1 ship, $968,204.07, No. 2 ship, $882,090.00.

7, 8 & 9. The Wallace Shipbuilding and Drydock Company, Limited, has contracted to finish the ships on the basis of cost of labour, and material, which they will have to furnish, plus 8 per cent for profit.

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many steel ships are being built at Vancouver to the order of the Canadian Government?
2. What are the names of persons or firms building said ships?
3. What will be the deadweight tonnage of said ships?
4. What is the contract price per deadweight ton for said ships?
5. What further amounts will these cost to fit them ready for sea?
6. On what date were said contracts entered into between the Government and the said contractors?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Two.
2. Messrs. J. Coughlan & Sons.
3. About 8,390 tons each.
4. $167.50 per D.W. ton each.
5. $65,000.00 each.
6. 7th April, 1920.

VICTORIA DRY DOCK CONTRACT

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government entered into a contract to build a dry dock at Victoria, British Columbia?
2. If so, what is the name of the contractor?
3. What was the amount of the tender?
4. What are the names of the other persons or firms who submitted tenders and what are the amounts of their tenders?
5. What was the amount paid for the land where said dry dock will be built?
6. From whom was said land purchased?
7. What will be the capacity of said dry dock when completed?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1, 2 & 3. Tenders were invited by public advertisement on September 14th, 1920, due December 9th, 1920, and on 30th December, 1920, an Order-in-Council was passed accepting the tender of the P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company, Limited, at schedule prices approximating $4,217,400 but the contract is not yet signed.

4. Sir John Jackson (Canada), Limited, tendered to construct at cost plus a fixed sum; the estimated value of work being placed by that Company at $5,021,000, and based on this the Company offered to carry out the work for a fixed fee of $750,000. If completed for less than estimate, the Company to receive 50 per cent of the saving in cost but if cost exceeded above

estimate, 5 per cent of the above fee to be deducted for every 10 per cent increase in cost, but in no case was fee to be less than $400,000.

5. About 17 acres of land was expropriated and $34,000 tendered but refused and the compensation to be paid will be fixed by the Exchequer Court. Two smaller parcels, one of 0.57 acres for which $285 and another of 0.36 acres for which $800 was offered.

6. The Hudson Bay Company owns the larger area; the Puget Sound Agricultural Company and the E. & N. Railway the smaller lots.

7. Length, 1,150 feet; width, 125 feet; depth, 40 feet.

PAINTINGS IN SENATE CHAMBER

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Will the paintings which decorate the Senate Chamber remain there permanently?
2. Does the Government think there is no Canadian scenery worthy of that Chamber?
3. Has the Government placed these paintings there in order to perpetuate in Canada the depressing spirit of war and armaments?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY: 1, 2 and 3: No.

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was there a promise given at the 1917 Imperial Conference that the embargo on Canadian cattle should be removed at the end of the year?
2. If so, was the promise carried out?
3. If not, why?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. At the Imperial War Conference of 1917 the then President of the Board of Agriculture undertook to remove the restriction upon the importation of Canadian cattle into Great Britain.

2. The restriction has not yet been removed.

3. Unceasing efforts have been made by the Canadian Government to secure such removal, and it is hoped such efforts will meet with success.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that there is at present an ambargo on Canadian cattle exported to Great Britain?
2. If so, has there been any representations made by the Canadian Government for the repeal of such embargo?
3. If so, when, and with what result?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I think this question may be considered answered by the answer that was given to the question immediately preceding, of the hon. member for Restigouche and Madawaska (Mr. Michaud).

[Mr. McCurdy.]

MONTREAL AND TORONTO POSTMASTERSHIPS—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Is there a pension attached to the position of postmaster in the cities of Montreal and Toronto?
2. If so, what amounts did the Government pay as pensions, annuity or indemnity to former postmasters for the last five yars?
3. To whom were these amounts paid?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The postmaster at Montreal is under the Retirement Act, and a deduction of five per cent is made from his salary monthly and placed to his credit in the Civil Service Retirement Fund. When he leaves the Service, the total amount deducted will be returned with interest, or to his estate in the event of his death before leaving the Service.

The postmaster at Toronto is under the Superannuation Act, and if superannuated he would be entitled to an annual retiring allowance based on his length of service and his average salary for the last three years of service.

2. Nil.

3. Answered by No. 2.

DOMESTIC LOANS

Mr. VIEN:

1. How much did the Government raise in connection with the Domestic Loan, during the years 1916, 1917 and 1918 and 1919 respectively?
2. How much did each province subscribe to each of the said loans?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Cash proceeds Dominion Loans, exclusive of cash receipts from War Savings Certificates, Debenture Stocks, etc.:

Year ended Mar. 31.	
1916	$ 97,003,600 22
1917	115,889,812 65
1918	517,430,056 35
1919	584,281,459 07

2. The accounts of the department are not compiled in such a way as to disclose information on this point.

OVERDUE INTEREST ON ADVANCES TO ROUMANIA

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has Roumania paid any of the instalments of interest due by her to Canada on account of the advances in wares and merchandise made by Canada to said country?
2. If so, when, and what amount was paid?
3. If not, why, and does the Government intend to take any action in this matter?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1 and 2. No.

3. The question of the payment of this overdue interest and future interest instalments has been the subject of negotiation between Representatives of the Dominion of Canada and the Kingdom of Roumania. These negotiations are still in progress.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETY

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that there is a Mutual Benefit Society under the direction, control and supervision of the Postmaster of Montreal?

2. If so, is such Mutual Benefit Society legally authorized by the department and ratified by it?

3. Is this within the scope and province of the duties of the Postmaster of Montreal?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. A co-operative system is in effect among the staff of the Montreal Post Office, but the department is not aware that it is under the direction, control and supervision of the Postmaster of Montreal.

2. No authority is necessary from the department for such an organization.

3. No, except in co-operation with other members of the Post Office staff.

GRANTS UNDER THE CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What is the general policy of the Department of Railways and Canals as regards the nature of construction or improvement necessary to entitle any particular road to a grant under the Canada Highway Act, 9-10 Geo. V, Chapter 54?

2. What sums of money have been paid to date to each of the provinces under said Act?

3. Have plans for an improved highway between Quebec and St. Simeon been filed with the Department of Railways under the said Act?

4. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The general policy is to require a type of construction or improvement that, in the opinion of the province and of the Dominion, is the most practical and economical considering the requirements of traffic; due regard being had to permanency. A copy of the Act, Regulations and form of Project Statement may be had upon application to the department.

2. Only payment made to date, $56,374.19 —to the province of Quebec.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

CHEQUES PAID TO HON. P. E. BLONDIN

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What are the amounts of the different cheques that were issued by the various departments of the Government to the Honourable P. E. Blondin, Postmaster General, for travelling expenses when in Europe as a colonel during the war?

2. Were any of these funds returned to the Government when he resumed his duties as Postmaster General?

3. If so, when and by whom?

4. If not, why?

5. Was there any correspondence exchanged between Sir Thomas White, then Minister of Finance, and the Honourable P. E. Blondin in reference to this matter?

6. If so, will the Government lay said correspondence on the table of the House?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Cheques amounting to $8,460 were issued by the Finance Department, on requisition from the Post Office Department, to the Postmaster General, Hon. P. E. Blondin, as against his salary as such, while he was also a colonel in the army in Europe, but during which period he received no pay nor allowances from the Department of Militia and Defence.

2. Yes. The full amount of $8,460 was returned by Hon. Mr. Blondin while still in Europe.

3. 11th May, 1918, by Acting Private Secretary.

4. Answered by Nos. 2 and 3.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

PRINCE RUPERT PUBLIC BUILDING

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government purchased a piece of land at Prince Rupert for the purpose of erecting a public building?

2. If so, (a) from whom was said land purchased (b) and when?

3. What is the frontage and depth of said lot in lineal feet?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes, lots 16, 17, 18 and 19 of block 34, section No. 1.

2. (a) From Vernon W. Smith, (b) on 29th April, 1913.

3. 100 by 100 feet, more or less.

HALIFAX DRY DOCK

Mr. DUFF:

1. Did the Government expropriate the property of the Halifax Graving Dock, Limited, commonly called the Halifax Dry Dock?

2. Did the Government purchase or expropriate the Marine Railways at Dartmouth?

3. When were said properties taken over by the Government?

4. What price was paid by said Government for these properties, and when?

5. Was said price arranged privately or otherwise?

6. What disposal did said Government make of these properties, and to whom?
7. Has the Government received payment for said properties?
8. If so, what amount and when?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Halifax Graving Dock property taken over on 7th June, 1918.
4. $1,545,137.35, including interest, on 7th October, 1920.
5. Award was made by the Exchequer Court.
6. Leased to the Halifax Shipyards, Limited.
7 and 8. Rent paid to 24th December, 1920, is $156,250.

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM CHINA

Mr. SMITH:

Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit the importation of eggs from China?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This information can only be given when the Budget is brought down.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL—DREDGES AND TUGS

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make necessary repairs, during this winter and spring, to the dredges and tugs of the fleet organized for the dredging of the St. Lawrence channel?
2. Is the Government aware that several vessels of this fleet have suffered serious damage for a number of years through lack of necessary maintenance and repairs, and that any delay in the carrying on of said repair works impairs all the more the value of said vessels?
3. Is the Government aware that a certain number of said vessels are practicaly discarded or abandoned along the shore on the St. Lawrence, in the vicinity of Sorel, and that they are liable to complete destruction?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes, to the equipment required for this season's operations.
2. The Government is aware of the usual deterioration which is consequent on the vessels being tied up.
3. No vessels of the ship channel fleet have been discarded or abandoned.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS—FRENCH INSCRIPTION

Mr. VIEN:

Who wrote the French inscription engraved on the base of the central column, in the entrance to the Parliament Buildings?

[Mr. Duff.]

Hon. Mr. McCURDY: The inscription on the central column is a translation of the inscription, as finally adopted, which was recommended by the special committee appointed conjointly by the Senate and House of Commons to report on the method of celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the federation of the Dominion. The translation was made by A. D. Decelles, C.M.G., D. Lit., M.S.R.C., former General Librarian of Parliament.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FREIGHT CARS

Mr. VIEN:

How many freight cars of the Canadian National Railways were available on January 15, 1921, at Quebec, Hervé Junction, La Tuque, Parent, Doucet and Amos?

Hon. Mr. REID: Quebec (Bridge), 236 empties; Hervé Junction, 39 empties; La Tuque, 66 empties; Parent, 85 empties; Doucet, 141 empties; Amos, 9 empties.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many vessels of the Canadian Government fleet are at present in service?
2. Between what ports do they sail?
3. Do they ply on regular routes?
4. How are they managed?

Hon. Mr. REID: 1. 48.

2. Between Canada and United Kingdom, West Indies, South America, British India, Australia and New Zealand, Newfoundland.
3. Yes.
4. By the Board of Directors of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, all of which Directors are Directors of the Canadian National Railways, and it is operated in conjunction therewith.

SOREL SHIPYARD DISMISSALS

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Why were a number of workingmen in the Sorel Shipyards recently discharged?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to have former activities resumed in the Sorel Shipyards? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: 1. On account of the lack of authorized work.

2. The Spring activities are starting and men are being re-engaged gradually.

INCOME TAX FIGURES

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the amount collected in each Province through the Income Tax?
2. Out of this amount, how much was collected from farmers in each Province?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Total amount collected under The Income War Tax Act as at 28th February, 1921, according to Provinces:—

Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island	$ 1,651,727 48
New Brunswick	994,727 35
Quebec	20,734,083 75
Ontario	28,061,667 25
Manitoba	5,040,695 73
Saskatchewan	1,466,184 49
Alberta	2,035,573 17
British Columbia	2,668,710 13
Yukon	33,888 67
Total	62,687,258 02

2. Statement of Income Tax paid as at 31st March, 1920, on income realized by farmers during calendar years 1917 and 1918 by Provinces:—

Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island	$ 2,721 72
New Brunswick	2,393 30
Quebec	9,500 78
Ontario	67,974 75
Manitoba	151,036 17
Saskatchewan	340,900 98
Alberta	361,218 39
British Columbia	22,203 63
Yukon	30 55
Total	957,980 27

The statistics for the calendar year 1919 are being compiled. Therefore, information concerning that year cannot now be given.

STRIKES IN CANADA

Mr. STEELE:

1. How many strikes occurred in Canada in each of the years 1913, 1914, 1919 and 1920?
2. What was the total number of working days lost through strikes in each of these years?
3. What was the estimated loss in wages in each year on account of strikes?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Number of strikes, in 1913, 113; 1914, 44; 1919, 298; 1920, 285.

2. Total number of working days lost, in 1913, 1,287,678; 1914, 430,054; 1919, 3,942,189; 1920, 886,754.

3. This is unknown.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONDUCTORS

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many railway conductors are employed on the Government railways, for the province of Quebec?
2. What are their names?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Canadian National Railways employ 296 conductors in the province of Quebec. It is not considered to be in the public interest to publish the names of these conductors.

RAILWAY SERVICES—WINNIPEG—QUEBEC

Mr. VIEN:

1. How much per bushel does it cost the Government railways for the transportation of wheat from Winnipeg to Quebec?
2. What are the fixed charges, cost of operation and the overhead charges?
3. What is the capacity of an engine on the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec?
4. How many passenger and freight trains per day or per week are in operation between Winnipeg and the Eastern stations on the National Transcontinental?

Hon. Mr. REID: The cost of transportation of wheat depends on weather conditions, number of cars in a train, number of trains moving over the different sections, etc., and varies with these changing conditions.

There are no fixed charges on section between Winnipeg and Quebec. See also answer to No. 1.

Passenger engines vary in tractive effort from 29,000 to 38,000 pounds. Freight engines from 30,000 to 53,000 pounds.

One passenger train daily, in each direction, between Winnipeg and Cochrane, and between Cochrane and Quebec.

One passenger train daily, in each direction, between Quebec and McGivney Junction, N.B.

One passenger train tri-weekly, in each direction, between McGivney Junction, and Moncton, N.B.

Mixed train daily except Sunday, in each direction, between Winnipeg and Redditt.

Mixed train tri-weekly, in each direction, between Redditt and Sioux Lookout.

Mixed train tri-weekly, in each direction, between Hearst and Cochrane.

Mixed train daily except Sunday, in each direction, between O'Brien and Doucet, Doucet and Parent and Parent and Fitzpatrick.

Freight service is provided to handle business offering.

LOYOLA COLLEGE, MONTREAL

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the building known as Loyola College Building, situated at 68 Drummond Street, Montreal, now being leased by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment or any other department of the Government?

2. If so, at what date was this lease made and for how long?

3. For what purpose is the building now being used?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes, leased by the Department of Public Works.

2. 1st January, 1919, to 1st January, 1924.

3. Was originally used by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment as a hospital, and part is still being used for that purpose and part by the Department of Militia and Defence as a barracks.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN TORONTO, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC

Mr. POWERS:

1. What moneys were expended by the Federal Government up to February 15th, 1921, on unemployment relief in the city of Toronto, Montreal and Quebec?

2. Through what agency were these moneys distributed and what was the cost of distribution?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No account has been received from any of the municipalities named and, therefore, no moneys have been paid.

2. Answered by reply No. 1.

GOVERMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government been negotiating with the Norwegian Government for the sale of thirty-five ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine?

2. What were the terms of said arrangement or negotiations?

3. What has been the result of said negotiations?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not the answer with me, but I may reply at once "No" to each one of the questions.

MISSISQUOI BAY—FISHING

Mr. KAY:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to permit fishing with nets in Missisquoi bay during the open season this year?

2. If not, what is the reason for not returning to the pre-war customs of permitting net fishing in these waters?

3. Has the Government re-opened the question of net fishing in Missisquoi bay with the Government of the United States?

4. If not, is it the intention of the Government to re-open this question for the taking of further evidence on behalf of the Canadian fishermen?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No change in the existing regulations is at present under consideration.

[Mr. Power.]

2. The prohibition of net fishing was not a war measure, but was found necessary for the conservation of the fish.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—GRADING

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. How many miles of grading was completed on branch lines of the Canadian National Railway in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta during 1918, 1919 and 1920?

Hon Mr. REID (Grenville):

Grading and Tracklaying—1918.

	Grading Miles.	Tracklaying Miles.
Manitoba	Nil	Nil
Saskatchewan		
Luck Lake	9.08	—
MacRorie W.	24.38	22.32
Moose Jaw	1.50	1.50
Swift Current	9.45	1.37
Thunderhill	1.11	—
	45.52	25.19
Alberta		
Hanna, Medicine Hat	48.11	2.17
Munson Double Track	7.25	2.01
	55.36	4.18

Summary

1918.		
Manitoba	Nil	Nil
Saskatchewan	45.52	25.19
Alberta	55.36	4.18
	100.88	29.37

Grading and Tracklaying—1919.

	Grading Miles.	Tracklaying Miles.
Manitoba		
Oakland Extension	11.68	Nil
Ochre River	9.31	—
	20.99	—
Saskatchewan		
Acadia Valley	11.5	Nil
Eston S.E.	25.81	—
Jackfish Branch	11.43	—
Luck Lake	16.04	19.75
MacRorie W.	1.26	4.90
Melfort-Humboldt	23.63	0.35
Melfort N.E.	18.72	—
Peebles-Lampman	17.96	—
Swift Current	22.11	18.03
Thunderhill	1.41	20.15
	149.87	63.18
Alberta		
Acadia Valley	8.21	—
Hanna, Medicine Hat	61.00	48.08
Munson, double track	7.15	6.75
Oliver N.E.	20.82	55.57
Peace River	0.48	7.50
Vegreville Calgary	0.44	—
	98.10	117.90

Summary

1919.	Grading Miles.	Tracklaying Miles.
Manitoba	20.99	Nil
Saskatchewan	149.87	63.18
Alberta	98.10	117.90
	268.96	181.08

Grading and Tracklaying—1920.

	Grading Miles.	Tracklaying Miles.
Manitoba		
Amaranth Extens'n	4.5	—
St. Rose de Lac.	9.63	—
	14.1	—
Saskatchewan		
Alsask S.E.	—	19.7
Acadia Valley	2.6	—
Eston S.E.	5.2	—
Humbolt—Melfort	3.9	31.87
Luck Lake	6.1	—
Melfort N.E.	11.7	—
Peebles—Lampman	1.8	—
Swift Current	4.1	7.14
Thunderhill Extens'n	5.8	7.25
Jackfish Lake.	5.9	8.00
Prince Albert N.E.	3.9	—
Turtleford E.	1.6	—
	52.6	73.9
Alberta		
Acadia Valley	6.9	—
Hanna-Medicine Hat	5.1	8.0
Oliver N.E.	0.4	20.9
Onoway	2.9	19.2
Red Deer Spur	3.8	6.1
Munson Double track	3.0	—
	22.1	54.2

Summary

1920.	Grading Miles.	Tracklaying Miles.
Manitoba	14.1	—
Saskatchewan	52.6	73.9
Alberta	22.1	54.2
	88.8	128.1

	Grading	Tracklaying	Grading	Tracklaying	Grading	Tracklaying
	1918		1919		1920	
Saskatchewan	45.52	25.19	149.87	63.18	52.6	73.9
Manitoba	.....	.....	20.99	.....	14.1	....
Albert	55.36	4.18	98.10	117.90	22.1	54.2
	100.88	29.37	268.96	181.08	88.8	128.1

Grand Summary

	Grading	Tracklaying
1918	100.88	29.37
1919	268.96	181.08
1920	88.8	128.1
	458.64	338.55

2. On what lines and in what respective provinces was the said grading done?

See answer to No. 1.

3. Was steel laid on all grading completed?

No.

4. If not, how many miles of steel were laid on branch lines during 1918, 1919 and 1920?

See answer to No. 1.

5. How many (a) new box cars, (b) stock cars, (c) cabooses for conductors, (d) new locomotives, (e) new passenger, day, standard, tourist and colonist coaches were put in comsion during the years 1918, 1919 and 1920?

New Equipment put in Commission during the years 1918, 1919, 1920.

Description—	1918	1919	1920
Locomotives—			
Mikado	60	..	—
Consolidation	60	..	—
Pacific	45	25	—
Switching	20	25	20
Medium Pacific	..	..	20
Heavy Pacific	..	..	10
Sante Fe	..	..	25
	185	50	75
Freight—			
Box Cars	9,728	2,892	2,285
Stock Cars	1,131	800	—
Cabooses	5	25	130
	10,864	3,717	2,415
Passenger—			
Tourist Cars	..	20	—
Colonist Cars	..	130	—
Day Coaches	..	..	20
Baggage Cars	..	30	—
Mail Cars	..	..	20
Dining Cars	7	..	9
Sleeping Cars	14	..	18
Observation Cars	..	..	13
	21	180	80
	11,070	3,947	2,570

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—STE. ROSALIE-BAGOT

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Are the claims made by the farmers with regard to the running of the Canadian National Railway between Ste. Rosalie and Bagot Station all paid?

2. If not, which of them have not been paid?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. The following is a list of right-of-way parcels still remaining to be compensated for:

Parcel No.	Owner.	Area.
2,	Mlle. O. Laflamme	2·069 acres.
5,	Moise Houle	1·921 "
8,	Narcisse Plant	0·116 "
9,	Albert Pierre de Grandpré	7·190 "
19,	Henri St. Laurent	1·449 "
21,	Ephriem Lecour (now Jos. Bilodeau)	1·397 "
22,	Henri St. Laurent	2·326 "
26,	F. X. Lapierre	0·708 "

Parcel No.	Owner.	Area.
27,	Wm. Boisseau	0·516 acres.
28,	Abram Roireau	0·764 "
29,	Arthur Cabana	0·540 "
30,	Louis Hebert	0·445 "
32,	Joseph Béland	0·352 "
36,	Joseph Bilodeau	0·340 "
42,	Leopold Lincourt	0·545 "
44,	Ambroise Lemonde	0·679 "
47,	Louis Lemonde	0·089 "

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the Government any intention of using the land now unused but formerly occupied by the Canadian National Railway between Ste. Rosalie and Bagot Station?

2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to hand back this land to the respective former owners?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The matter is at present under consideration by the Canadian National Railway management.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. How many employees have been appointed to fill the positions indicated in the notices sent to the members of the House of Commons by Mr. William Foran, Secretary of the Civil Service Commission of Canada, during the year 1920?

2. How many persons from the province of Quebec have been appointed to such positions?

3. What are the names of the said persons?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. 1,263.

2. 80. Every vacancy in the province of Quebec has been filled by the appointment of a candidate resident in Quebec where such has been available and qualified, and candidates from the province of Quebec have also been appointed to positions at Headquarters in Ottawa as their names have been reached on the eligible lists. In addition to the 80 appointments to positions of which notice was sent to Members of Parliament, there were 268 postmasters appointed in the province of Quebec during the year 1920, all of whom were resident in the province.

3. Robinson, R. E. (O.A.S.); Raymond, Abel; Boast, Chas. R. (O.A.S.); McDonald, Hugh G.; Dixon, Mrs. Margaret M.; Curtis, Nicholas (O.A.S.); Armstrong, Jas. H. O.; Rochon, Jos.; St. Onge, Joseph (O.A.S.); Desrosiers, Victorien (O.A.S.); McQuat, David D. (O.A.S.); Brophy, Maurice J. (O.A.S.); Lewis, Harrison J.; Samson, J. A.; Piché, Pierre; Barcelo, Jean J. E.; Rénaud, D.; Bourgeois, J. A.; Gagné, Jos. C.; Richardson, Anna M.; Lapierre, Jos. A.; Tremblay, A. A. (O.A.S.); Goyette, Jos. C.; Jackson, John (O.A.S.; Vechsler, Jack; Ruffet, Télesphore (O.A.S.); Beeho, H. A. (O.A.S.); Mills, S. (O.A.S.); Whiteaker, Frank (O.A.S.); Proulx, J. A. H.; Brisebois, Conrad; Bélanger, Regina; Graveline, Wilfrid; Benoit, Pierre G. (O. A.S.); Burmester, H. L. (O.A.S.); Reffret, L. A.; Clouthier, Philippe; Marman, Miss Augustus; Bergeron, Irma; Jarry, C. E. (O.A.S.); Church, Jos. R.; Gongeon, Armand; Monette, Henri (O.A.S.); Kite, Harry (O.A.S.); Côté, J. N. (O.A.S.); Worthen, H. R. (O.A.S.); Clarke, L. E.; Dumont, Joseph; Bilodeau, W. O.; Marcotte, François X. E.; Gélinas, Madame L. R.; Rolston, Wm. G. (O.A.S.); Trudeau, Irenée; McGillivray, Wm.; Villeneuve, R. A.; Dunn, Marion; Marquis, Maria; Pinard, J. A. (O.A.S.); Grisby, T. G. (O.A.S.); Fiset, Adjutor; Paradis, Chas. A.; Roy, Leopold J. A.; Caddott, Jean; Nadon, H.; Piché, Omer; Parent, Joseph; Barbeau, David (O.A.S.); Galipeau, Louis I.; Rombach, Harry; Daignault, Lucille; Roy, L. J. A.; Daignault, Ed.; Renaud, J. H.; Millette, C. E.; Tourigny, Olivier; Benoit, A. J. H. (O.A.S.); Séguin, Paul O.; Robitaille, Hortense; L'Heureux, Chas.; Morin, Jos. A.

Note.—(O.A.S.)—Overseas Active Service.

IMMIGRATION—INFECTION DANGER.

Mr. POWER:

In view of the quarantine measures placed upon certain ports in the United States with regard to immigrants arriving thereat, and in view of the fact that a large number of infected immigrants are arriving in the United States, have any precautions been taken by the Dominion of Canada to prevent these immigrants from being diverted to Canadian ports?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: It is true that typhus cases have arrived at New York and the Federal Health Service of the United States have established rigid quarantine measures to prevent this disease entering the United States. Any immigrants allowed to land in the United States will have passed so effective a cordon as to be assuredly free from danger and may safely be accepted by us should they cross our border.

The department, in anticipation of possible danger of this kind, some three months ago, sent Dr. H. B. Jeffs of the Immigration Medical Staff, to New York to look into and familiarize himself with the American system and report on any possible avenues of danger to Canada. On his return to Canada Dr. Laurin of Quebec followed him to New York for the same pur-

pose, and Dr. G. E. Martineau, Superintendent at Gross Isle Quarantine Station, Quebec, is proceeding to New York in a few days to continue the observations.

Our own quarantine stations on the Atlantic coast, namely, at Halifax and St. John, have been warned and are on the alert for any possible source of danger.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL AND A. Q. AND W. RAILWAYS.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals received any report from the Board of Railway Commissioners on the service given by the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway? If so, was any action taken on such reports?

2. If no action has been taken, is any contemplated in the public interest?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Chairman of the Dominion Railway Board has unofficially made certain recommendations to the Minister of Railways and Canals, which have been taken into consideration. The Government is, however, unable to hold out any immediate hope that these railways will be taken over and included in the Canadian National System.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any rolling stock been leased or sold by the Canadian National Railways to the Quebec Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western Railways during the past year? If so, what amount?

2. Was any application made by the companies mentioned for any such rolling stock?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Two coaches and one baggage car have recently been rented to the Quebec Oriental Railway by the Canadian National Railway management.

2. The Quebec Oriental Railway applied as indicated in answer to Question No. 1.

BONAVENTURE-GASPE RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Government taken any action during the past year to improve the railway service in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé? If so, what action?

2. Has any proposal been received from, or made to, the proprietors of the Atlantic Quebec and Western, and the Quebec and Oriental Railways, having for its object the linking up of those lines with the Canadian National System, by purchase, lease or otherwise? If so, what were these proposals and what action has been taken?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. There has been no complaint as to the service provided by the Canadian National Railway through the county of Bonaventure.

2. Proposals have been made from time to time looking to the lease or purchase by the Government of the lines in question. No action has been taken.

CAMPBELLTON-CROSS POINT.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Have any complaints been received by the Government or any of its members concerning the ferry service between Campbellton, N.B., and Cross Point, Quebec? If so, what was the nature of these complaints?

2. Is any action to be taken to remove the ground of such complaint? If so, what action?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes. That the ferry after 25th October, 1920, did not begin its trips until 7 a.m., instead of at 6 o'clock, as prescribed by the regulations, and that services were discontinued three weeks before the close of navigation.

2. Yes. Instructions will be given to comply with the terms of the license; (b) The District Engineer reports that navigation was officially closed and all buoys removed on 17th November, but ferry did not stop until 25th November.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Government or any of its members received a request lately for the erection of a highway bridge over the Restigouche river between Campbellton, N.B., and Cross Point, Quebec?

2. If so, (a) from whom and (b) what answer was given?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes.

2. (a) From the Municipal Council of Escuminac, the Campbellton Board of Trade and a large deputation which waited upon the Minister of Public Works in January, 1921; (b) the subject matter of the petition will have the most careful consideration.

QUEBEC—SHAWINIGAN SERVICE.

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is the Government aware that the Canadian Northern Local train from Quebec City to Shawinigan is of absolute necessity to maintain traffic between the two cities and the various parishes such as St. Augustin, Neuville, Les Ecureuils, Donnacona and others situated on this line?

2. Is it true that it is now proposed to cancel this train in the near future?

3. If so, is not the Government aware that such action will deprive the Canadian National Railways of a good revenue and occasion very serious damages to the population using this line?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. There have been two trains daily except Sunday, in each direction, providing accommodation between Quebec and Shawinigan Falls and the parishes referred to; the numbers of the trains being Nos. 9-10, 19-20. A portion of the same territory is also served by trains Nos. 13 and 14, which run daily.

2. It is proposed to discontinue one train in each direction; No. 20, leaving Shawinigan Falls 5.30 A.M., and train 19 leaving Quebec at 5.00 P.M. Train No. 9, leaving Quebec at 9.20 A.M., and train No. 10, leaving Shawinigan Falls at 4.45 P.M., will be continued, and should provide sufficient accommodation to meet local requirements.

3. The earnings of these trains, except during certain summer months, do not justify the continuance of the double daily service.

HICKMAN—ALLEGED DEPORTATION.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is it true, as reported in a press despatch from St. Catharines, on February 17, 1921, that a man named Hickman, who claims to be a British subject, has been deported from Canada?

2. If so, what were the reasons for his deportation?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

LAW AND ORDER IN THOROLD.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to a statement made by J. F. Hagerty, Vice President of the Thorold Plant of the Beaverboard Companies, and reported in the Canadian Press on February 19th., 1921, as follows:

"The seventy Royal Canadian Mounted Police who are on duty at present in Thorold and vicinity were despatched to that district by Dominion authorities at Ottawa. They were sent there to clean up the entire industrial district after Dominion secret service men had carefully made a survey of the conditions existing there."

2. Is the foregoing statement correct?

3. If so, at whose request and on whose authority were the Dominion Secret Service men and the 70 Royal Canadian Mounted Police sent to Thorold and vicinity?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. No.

2. No. But the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were sent to assist local authorities in maintaining law and order.

3. The 70 men of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were sent to Thorold at the request of the Attorney General of Ontario, and on the authoriey of the Hon. the President of the Privy Council.

[Mr. Parent.]

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—DIVISIONAL POINTS.

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many divisional points are there on the Government Railways, and what are their names?

2. In each of the said divisional points during 1919 and 1920, what were (a) gross receipts, (b) the operating costs, and (c) the surplus or deficit?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. There are 110 Divisional Points on the Canadian National and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways, as follows: Yarmouth, Bridgewater, Middleton, Halifax, Truro, Stellarton, Mulgrave, Point Tupper, Sydney, Pictou, Oxford Jct., Cape Tormentine, Charlottetown, Souris, Tignish, Point du Chene, Moncton, St. John, Fredericton, Centreville, Newcastle, Loggieville, Bathurst, Campbellton, Mont Joli, Rivière du Loup, Levis, Ste. Rosalie Jct., Chicoutimi, Rivière-a-Pierre, Quebec (Limoilou), Joliette, Montreal, Bridge, Chaudiere Jct., Monk, Edmundston, Napadogan, Fitzpatrick, Parent, Doucet, O'Brien, Cochrane, Heart, Grant, Armstrong, Sioux Lookout, Redditt, Winnipeg (Transcona), Ottawa, Brent, Trenton, Bancroft, Brockville, Westport, Picton, Toronto, Parry Sound, Capreol, Foleyet, Hornepayne, Jellico, Port Arthur, Fort William, Atikokan, Rainy River, Fort Frances, Winnipeg (Ft. Rouge), Dauphin, Kamsack, Humboldt, North Battleford, Vermilion, Edmonton, Edson, Jasper, Lucerne, Blue River, Kamloops Jct., Boston Bar, Port Mann, Vancouver, Victoria, Swan River, Hudson Bay Jct., The Pas, Prince Albert, Brandon, Kipling, Regina, Saskatoon, Kindersley, Hanna, Calgary, Neepawa, Rivers, Melville, Waterous, Biggar, Wainwright, Northgate, Riverhurst, Radville, Big Valley, McBride, Prince George, Endako, Smithers, Pacific, Prince Rupert.

2. Railway accounting does not provide for earnings being shown for each divisional point.

MONTREAL AND NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to build a railway connecting Montreal with the Transcontinental?

2. If so, has the location of said railway been made, and where?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Policy of the Government in this respect will be made known by the Minister

of Finance when bringing down his estimates.

2. Answered by No. 1.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—ARTICLE X

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Did the honourable the Minister of Justice, one of Canada's representatives at the meeting of the League of Nations held at Geneva in December, 1920, submit to the said meeting a motion asking for the elimination of Article 10 from the Covenant signed at Versailles?

2. If so, was the honourable the Minister of Justice expresing the opinion of the Canadian Government?

3. What became of the said motion?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Referred to a special Commission of the Council of the League for consideration and report at the next meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it a fact that the warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary has resigned?

2. If so, has the Government appointed a new incumbent and who is the appointee?

3. What are the qualifications required for such a post?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. The position has not yet been filled.

3. The position has been advertised by the Civil Service Commission, setting forth the qualifications as follows:

Education equivalent to high school graduation and preferably university training; five years of prison experience in a supervisory capacity or experience of similar character and standard; familiarity with criminology and prison problems; administrative ability. Thorough knowledge of both French and English is essential.

ARTHUR YOUNG CO.—GRIFFENHAGEN

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Did the representatives of the Arthur Young Company, or Griffenhagen and Associates, or both, ask that they be paid their fees, emoluments, or remuneration for services rendered to the Civil Service Commission of Canada in Unted States currency, in order to secure the advantage of the difference in the rate of exchange?

2. If so, were the requests granted?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes.

2. No.

"CANADIAN RECRUIT"

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the total cost of floating, repairing and making ready for sea, the Canadian Government steamship "Canadian Recruit"?

2. What was the amount of insurance on said steamer?

3. What was her value as appeared in the policies of insurance on said steamer?

4. What is the amount which the marine adjusters found that the marine underwriters should pay toward said floating, repairs, etc., of said steamer?

5. What amount of said adjustment has been paid or collected from said marine insurance companies?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Approximately $545,000.

2. Annual premium, $4,497.19, and £5,824 7s. 6p.; total paid, currency, $30,034.07.

3. Hull insured value, $578,571; disbursements, etc., $231,429; total insurance on vessel, $810,000.

4. Adjustment is not yet complete, but on approximate cost of sea voyages, repairs, etc., as above (No. 1) the insurance payable by underwriters would be approximately $540,000.

5. $350,023.79.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Department of Railways aware that the old superannuated employees of the I.C.R. have never received any increase in the rate of their pension, neither before the war, nor during the period of stress when the cost of living was soaring to an excessive level?

2. That the present rate of pension is a minimum of $15 per month and does not exceed $52.50 as a maximum in the case of the oldest employees?

3. That all the employees of the I.C.R. system were willing to pay a higher due to the general funds so that such older employees may be given a pension that would enable them to live fittingly?

4. Is the Department of Railways or the National Railways Commission willing to acceed to the fair demand of those old employees and grant them a pension such as will protect them from want in their old age?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. A revision of the present plan of superannuation is contemplated and under consideration by the management. It is the intention to submit any such proposals to consideration of employees before adoption.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

WAR LOANS AND INCOME TAX

Mr. RINFRET:

What is the total amount of the War Loans assented to by the Canadian Government, and as are exempt from the Income Tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The total amount of domestic War Loans issued and outstanding January 31 which are exempt from taxation, $1,381,783,400.

ALBERTA SUPREME COURT

Mr. GRIESBACH:

Have the Judges of the Appellate and Trial Divisions of the Supreme Court of Alberta, created under chapter 3 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1919, whose salaries were provided by chapter 56 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920, been appointed?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: No; the appointments cannot be made until the Judicature Act of Alberta is brought into force by the Provincial Government by proclamation.

BUSINESS PROFITS TAX.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

Is it the intention of the Government to re-enact the excess Business Profits Tax for the ensuing year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This question can be answered only when the Budget is brought down.

PERROT ISLAND BRIDGES.

Mr. LAFORTUNE:

Has the Government any intention of assisting in some way the construction of the bridges on Perrot Island, from the Ste. Anne de Bellevue side, on the part of the canal which it owns?

Hon. Mr. REID: The matter has not been considered.

SOULANGES CANAL ROAD.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the Government the intention of constructing this year the macadam road running alongside the Soulanges Canal, from Cascades Point to Coteau Landing?
2. If so, will new tenders be invited?
3. Have plans and specifications of this work been prepared?
4. If so, by which Department?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Under consideration.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Railways and Canals.

ST. JEAN POST OFFICE.

Mr. DEMERS:

What have been the receipts of the post office in the town of St. Jean, St. Jean and Iberville County, for the years 1918, 1919 and 1920?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: 1918, $19,532.25; 1919, $25,181.25; 1920, $15,365.96.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

CONTRACTOR DEMERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What contracts have been awarded to contractor Demers for the delivery of the mails in the city of Quebec, either through the medium of letter boxes, door to door delivery, etc.?
2. What is the amount of each contract?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Quebec and Clearance of Street Letter Boxes, etc., $11,995.00 per annum; Parcel Post Delivery Service, 40c. per hour for first vehicle, 50c per hour for each additional vehicle; Quebec Post Office and Railway Stations and Wharves, $6,425.00 per annum.

LT.-COL. BURNHAM

Mr. POWER:

1. Have any representations been made to the Canadian Government with reference to the mission of Lt.-Col. Burnham in Montenegro?
2. Is the Government aware that this Canadian officer was forced to submit to treatment distinctly contrary to that prescribed by the rules of international courtesy at the hands of the Serbian Government through its representatives?
3. It is the intention of the Government to intervene on behalf of this Canadian Medical Mission in order that it may be permitted to carry out the work for which it was intended, namely, the relief of the thousands of disease-stricken inhabitants of Central Europe in general and Montenegro in particular?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Representations were made to the Department of External Affairs in August last regarding danger to Dr. Burnham's mission in Montenegro, in consequence of which the matter was taken up with the Fereign Office and it was learned that a protest had been addressed by His Majesty's Minister at Belgrade to the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government against threats said to have been made against Colonel Burnham and that it had been intimated to the Serbian Government that it would be held responsible for the protection of Dr. Burnham's mission. His Majesty's Minister was further instructed, if a report of Dr. Burnham's arrest should be confirmed, to demand his immediate release.

A reply was received from the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government that the local authorities charged with having made the threats referred to denied having done so, and that Colonel Burnham had never been for a single moment under arrest.

2. The charges of harsh treatment as received in the Department were couched in general terms indicating rather friction with the local authorities during a period of disturbed conditions due to war with

Albania, than any serious denial of right, and they have been denied by the Serbian Government which asserts that Colonel Burnham was not threatened nor subjected to discourteous treatment.

3. As Colonel Burnham has withdrawn his mission from Montenegro and it is not apparent either that he wishes to return or that the return of the mission is desired by the authorities in control of that country, the Government sees no reason to intervene further in the matter now.

POUND STERLING VALUE

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. What is the present value of the pound sterling in Canada?
2. What is the value of the Canadian dollar in England?
3. Is the difference in exchange, if any, caused by the United States Control?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. March 1, 1921, $4.43.

2. Approximately four shillings six pence.

3. The value of the pound sterling in New York plus the premium on New York funds establishes the rate for the pound sterling in Canada.

ST. ROMUALD POST OFFICE

Mr. BOURASSA:

Is it the intention of the Government to construct at St. Romuald, Levis County, on land long ago purchased for that purpose, a post office replacing the present office which is an old shack?

Mr. SPEAKER: This question contains allegations of fact and therefore constitutes a contravention of the rules. I am issuing instructions that that portion of the question shall be deleted, and in the meantime the question will stand.

BONAVENTURE-GASPE MAILS

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Post Office Department received any complaints during the past winter regarding the mail service in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé? If so, what was the nature of such complaints?
2. Did the department authorize any curtailment or change in the railway mail service? If so, what, and why was such change authorized?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes—the complaint was in regard to the railway being blockaded by snow and thereby disorganizing the mail service. Regular train and mail service has been resumed.

2. The Department did not authorize any curtailment or change in the Railway Mail Service.

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER'S REPORTS

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Chief Electoral Officer made any reports under Section 74 of The Dominion Elections Act, 1920?
2. If so, how many and to which elections do they relate?
3. Will any legislation be introduced at this session as the result of such reports?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The reports, which contain full information, have already been made. They were laid on the table of the House on the first day of the session.

LOAN TO BELGIUM

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Has there been a loan granted by the Canadian Government to Belgium?
2. If so, to what extent has the Belgian Government availed itself of this loan?
3. Of the total Canadian exports to Belgium, charged against said loan, what portion of these exports represented manufactured goods, and what portion represented agricultural products?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes, by an agreement dated March 21, 1919 a credit of $25,000,000 was extended to the Government of Belgium, in order to facilitate the purchase in Canada by the said Government and by the citizens of the said Government of goods produced in Canada.

2. $1,762,789.63.

3. Manufactured goods (including steel rails), $1,485,045.16; Food Stuffs, $277,744.47.

REPRESENTATION OF ST. ANTOINE, MONTREAL

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it true that the member for Saint Antoine, Montreal, has sent in his resignation as a member of the House of Commons?
2. If so, when was it received by the Speaker of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The answer to the first question is, No. The second question is answered by the reply to No. 1.

CHARGES OF THE STANDARD NEWSPAPER

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Prime Minister aware of the protests and charges of The Standard of St. John, N.B., regarding the appointment of Mr. MacDonald, of Nova Scotia, to a seat in the Senate for one of the divisions of New Brunswick.
2. If so, is it his intention to cancel said appointment, or request the resignation of the Honourable Mr. Wigmore, his Minister of Customs, on account of the numerous applications coming from New Brunswick for said senatorship?

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: In reply to the first question, one article in

the nature of protest from the paper in question was brought to my attention. The answer to the second question is, No.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. VIEN:

1. Who were Deputy Ministers in the several departments of the Government, on January 1, 1910?
2. Who were they on January 1, 1921?
3. Who were heads of branches in the various departments of the Dominion Government in 1910?
4. Who were they on the 1st of January, 1921?

Mr. VIEN:

1. What are the names of the Civil Servants dismissed since the 1st day of January, 1918, and the year of their dismissal?
2. What are the names of the Civil Servants engaged since the same date?

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. How many bonded liquor warehouse licenses have been granted to the Province of Alberta by the present Government since 1917?
2. To whom were such licenses granted?
3. On whose recommendation?

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. How many commissions has the Government created since 1911?
2. What are the names of the said commissions?
3. Who are the present commissioners in the various commissions and what are their respective salaries?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

For a statement showing—1. The amounts loaned or the credits made by the Government of Canada since the 19th of April, 1920, (a) to Greece, (b) to Roumania.

2. The respective dates of these loans or credits to (a) Greece, (b) Roumania.

3. The nature of goods bought by the Government of Canada (a) for Greece, (b) for Roumania.

4. The names of corporations, firms or persons from whom these goods have been purchased, (a) the nature of the merchandise in each case, (b) the amounts paid by the Government to these corporations, firms or persons in each case and also the date of said payments.—Mr. Archambault.

For a copy of the regulations concerning the official censorship during the war, the articles of newspapers which have been censored, showing the dates and places where said papers were published along with copy of all correspondence between the office of the censor and said papers.—Mr. Archambault.

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: There is no objection to the motion passing subject to this reservation—that any documents, papers, or correspondence that may be necessarily of a secret character will not be included.

For a copy of all agreements, contracts, correspondence, both letters and telegrams, and all other documents, which have passed between the Government of Canada, especially between the Prime Minister, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Marine and the President of the Trade and Labour Congress, Secretary of Toronto Trades and Labour Council and the labour organizations connected with the shipbuilding industry, with regard to conditions and wages affecting the men previously or at present employed by the Dominion Shipbuilding Company; also all tenders, contracts, agreements and correspondence, in connection with the building of certain ships at present under construction in the yards of the said Dominion Shipbuilding Company at Toronto.—Mr. Duff.

[Mr. Meighen.]

FRENCH TREATY

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved:

For a copy of the new treaty of commerce between France and Canada.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I would prefer that this motion should stand. I am not certain of the position the matter is in at the present time.

Motion stands.

OIL IN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES.

MR. GRIESBACH MOVES A RESOLUTION WITH RESPECT TO OWNERS OF SURFACE RIGHTS.

Mr. WILLIAM ANTROBUS GRIESBACH (West Edmonton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, should oil be found and produced in or under any lands in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, in which ownership to the sub-surface is in the Crown, the owner of the surface right shall be entitled to one-sixteenth of such oil, provided that such owner shall have made a homestead entry, or other entry, for the said land prior to the date of the application for the oil lease in the sub-surface. And whereas, all existing leases contain a provision that they are subject to the provisions of the regulations in force at the time of the granting of the same and also any regulations subsequently adopted. Therefore alteration should be made in the regulations to give the owner of the surface rights a similar interest in the oil produced under leases heretofore granted in which no development work has been done upon the said lands under the said leases.

He said: The House may not be aware that a somewhat different system of land tenure prevails in the prairie provinces from that which obtains in the other parts of Canada. My information is that in the remaining provinces of Canada the old common law title exists, that is to say that the owner owns from the centre of the earth to the sky. That was the situation in the prairie provinces prior to October 31, 1887. Up to that time the Crown grant gave a title from the centre of the

earth to the sky, and the owner of the land owned all that there was to own. On the 31st October, 1887, the Crown began the policy of granting titles to the surface rights only, and reserving to the Crown the ownership in all mines and minerals which might underly the surface. During the past two or three years there has been much information to suggest that oil in large quantities would be discovered in the prairie provinces. During the last six months the evidence has accumulated to such an extent that it may now be reasonably assumed that the oil resources of Western Canada will prove to be in tremendous volume and ultimately of tremendous value to the Dominion. The State is interested, and this House is interested, having regard for this discovery and for its potential value. The House is interested in seeing that the State shall be safeguarded in this great discovery. It ought likewise to be interested in seeing that those persons more nearly and more directly concerned are equally protected in this great discovery. The situation now is that the Crown owns the oil and the landowner owns the surface, and the titles that exist in Western Canada are largely, if not almost entirely, of this class. It is true that the railway companies and the Hudson's Bay Company hold their land grants under the old common law title without reservation, but the vast bulk of land titles in Western Canada are as I have described. If oil is discovered, the Crown may upon application issue oil leases to any persons who apply in respect to lands which are owned by hundreds of thousands of homesteaders throughout the Prairie Provinces. It is quite true that the owner of the surface rights may himself apply for an oil lease, but whatever the theory may be, and whatever the policy of the law may be—and the policy is that all men shall be equal before the law—the actual fact is that the real owner of land in the western provinces, the homesteader, the farmer, the pioneer, is completely out of touch with this oil development. The man who files is the capitalist, the investor, the speculator, the man who has access to many newspapers and scientific works and who is in touch with geologists and other technical experts. The result is that the farmer, the homesteader, the pioneer, who has developed the country, who is paying taxes to build roads and bridges, and who has made it possible for people to come in and exploit the country will find that some day the Government has given a lease to drill for oil upon his property, and should oil be discovered he has to sit by with his hands folded while the oil lessee walks off with all the profits there may be in that discovery.

In the United States, where the old common law titles prevails, and where the owner of the surface owns the subsurface as well, the practice has grown up and has almost come to have the force of law, that if the owner leases his land for oil drilling purposes it is on terms that he shall receive one-eighth of the oil discovered. So that the owner of land throughout the United States almost entirely should oil be discovered on his property, is sure to receive one-eighth of all the oil discovered should he so provide in his lease.

In the western country the regulations provide that an oil lease may be granted without the knowledge of the owner of the land. True, the owner of the surface rights is entitled to be indemnified for any damage that may be done to his holding, but that is all he gets out of it. Any person can apply for an oil lease upon oil being discovered; pays a royalty of five per cent, subsequently rising to ten per cent on the oil which may be gained.

I propose by this resolution that while the interests of the state are safeguarded, and the state may continue to receive the revenues which it has legislated that it shall receive, nevertheless the owner of the land—who in our case is the farmer, the homesteader, the pioneer, the man who has made settlement and development possible, without which development it would be absolutely impossible for drilling machinery to be taken into the country—shall participate in the benefit accruing from the discovery of oil on his property, to the extent of one-sixteenth of the oil gained.

I pointed out a moment ago that in the United States the land owner is entitled by custom and as a matter of his own contract to receive one-eighth of the oil. Here I allow one-sixteenth, for two reasons. First in this country the owner does not own the subsurface rights, which remain in the Crown, and for which the Crown claims a royalty. Under my proposal the man who drills for oil under a lease from the Government would be required to pay to the owner of the land one-sixteenth of the oil gained and to the Crown five per cent, rising to ten per cent. If you equalise the royalty and the percentage, you will find

that on the basis of a royalty of one-eighth the equivalent is 12½ per cent, and that five per cent is equal to one-twentieth.

If the House agrees to this proposal and allows the owner to receive one-sixteenth for the oil taken under his property, which is equal to 6¾ per cent, the man who has the oil lease will have to pay the 6¾ per cent to the owner of the land and five per cent to the Government, or 11¾ per cent; whereas were he to make his private arrangement with the owner of the land in the United States the oil lease would have to pay 12½ per cent. Therefore my proposal so far as the oil driller is concerned is better than the arrangement that exists in the oil fields of the United States. And the advantage is this, that whereas under our system of titles ownership of the subsurface rights is in the Crown we have growing out of this discovery the possibility of the state participating in the value of the discovery, and we have at the same time given to the surface owner the opportunity of participating in the oil discovery.

I attach great importance to this matter, and I think the time to deal with it is now, instead of waiting until the whole country is upset with excitement should big oil discoveries take place. I venture to say that if the matter is not dealt with until then, and drilling begins everywhere, followed by oil discoveries in many places, the people of the West will wake up to the fact that they have had this great wealth under their feet and that now the full benefit is being reaped by those coming in from the outside and who have not borne the heat and burden of the day incident to pioneering in the West.

It may be that I should continue to read the resolution further to show how no principle of equity or justice is violated by the proposal. I go on to state:

—provided that such owner shall have made a homestead entry, or other, for the said land prior to the date of the application for the oil lease in the subsurface.

In the case of vacant land where an applicant for an oil lease has made application prior to any homestead right being granted, then the man who subsequently took the homestead would be doing so with his eyes open and would have no grievance. I provide that where the homesteader has his entry first, and somebody files an oil lease subsequently, then the discoverer of oil shall pay one-sixteenth per cent.

It is desirable, since the country is largely plastered at this moment with oil leases, that some attempt be made to deal with the situation where a homesteader has his homestead filed upon by the holder of an oil lease. The provision I would make in that respect is this: that the power which the Government have to alter these oil regulations from time to time—a power which they do exercise when they feel like it—be used to provide that the royalty of one-sixteenth of the owners shall be made effective in cases where, notwithstanding the fact that a lease has been issued, no development work has been done by the leaseholder. In cases where the leaseholder has done development work it might not be fair to interfere with the terms of his lease, but where he has done no development work under his lease his position is precisely the same, to all intents and purposes, as it would have been before he made his application, and in that case the regulations should be altered as I have suggested.

In this eastern country, from which the majority of the members of the House come, this may appear to be a very small matter, and my action on it might seem to be premature. It may occur to hon. members that as oil is not actually being produced there is no reason why the House should busy itself with a matter of this kind in anticipation of the production. But I believe it would be wisdom on the part of this House to deal with the matter now; to deal with it before a greater number of applications for oil leases are filed and before the people of the prairie provinces wake up to the fact that this great wealth which they believe to be theirs really belongs to somebody else; that the benefit and advantage of the discovery and the tremendous profits that accrue commence to go elsewhere, there will be grave dissatisfaction and grave unrest,

4 p.m. and ultimately the matter will have to be dealt with.

I do not propose to raise in this connection the question of the ownership of the natural resources of the West—a question which might properly be discussed under this head. But I do think that now is the time to go into this matter and to introduce such legislation as will ensure to the state its just and fair participation in the valuable discoveries that are about to be made, and at the same time to ensure fair and reasonable participation also to the private individual, the farmer, the homesteader, the pioneer of these western countries, to whose efforts are attributable the development of this vast and immensely valuable discovery.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this motion, had it been moved a year ago, would have been under the department over which I then presided. Now it is under the department of the hon. leader of the Senate, but I am more or less familiar with the history of oil regulations so far as the Dominion Government has control of oil, and I will endeavor to state to the House some considerations which bear upon the desire of the hon. member as expressed in this resolution.

The history of oil production in Canada has shown as yet a very meagre total output. I am not sure that my percentages are right—the hon. member for Lambton would be familiar with the figures—but I think that we in Canada as yet produce only about two per cent of the oil consumed in this country; consequently the record to date is rather a record of search and exploitation—of hope deferred, rather than hope fulfilled. So much has this been the case that for many years, in place of seeking to obtain a revenue by royalty from oil production, the Government of Canada has placed a premium upon oil production, and very considerable sums have, over a period of many years, gone from the treasury as a bonus on the production of oil in this country. Indeed, I question whether the oil industry of Ontario would have survived in any substantial degree had such a system of bonus not prevailed. There have of late years been very hopeful indications of oil discovery on a large scale in Western Canada. There has, of course, been oil production there already, but the record of the whole mater so far as the West is concerned up to date is rather a record of rentals paid and the administration of leases sold by speculators than a record of actual oil production by men who seriously intended to produce. The treasury has come off much better than the investor in relation to oil in Western Canada up to now. While it was the case that a bonus was being paid to encourage oil exploration and oil production about twelve years ago, it was deemed expedient by the then Government that this degree of encouragement should be given: that leases might issue up to 1931, which would contain a clause exempting the lessee from all royalty whatsoever. Many leases of that character were issued. About a year and a half ago that regulation was rescinded, as it then appeared that there might at any time be oil discoveries on a large scale. Not only was that regulation rescinded, but efforts were made to ascertain what leases were in arrears to such a degree as would justify cancellation, in order that as many as possible of the dead leases outstanding under the old regulations could be made to lapse, and provision was made that at any time thereafter oil royalties might be imposed. After I ceased to hold that office, the present Minister of the Interior introduced regulations, which were adopted, providing that in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta a royalty should be imposed grading upwards from 2½ to 10 per cent on leases thereafter issued and on leases issued since the date when the old regulations were rescinded, and it was possible to impose royalties on oils found under those leases. Such are the regulations today in relation to the three provinces, the royalty grading from 2½ to 10 per cent, I think the 2½ per cent being for five years, the 5 per cent for a little longer period, and the 10 per cent after that, and an entrant may enter for 1920 acres of land and obtain a lease therefor.

The prospect of oil appears, however, to be mostly in territory north of the three provinces, and some weeks ago regulations as to the Northwest Territories were put into effect, those regulations being of a character radically different from any yet imposed in Canada. They provided that the explorer or prospector may take out a permit for four sections; but until there is oil production, this is a permit and nothing more. He may get a lease upon actually discovering oil, but he can get a lease only for one section out of the four, the other three reverting then and there to the Crown. He thus becomes entitled to a lease for 640 acres only, and he becomes liable to a royalty of from 5 to 10 per cent, that is to say, 5 per cent until 1st April, 1926, and thereafter 10 per cent. The regulations comprise a series of 22 pages, but those are, broadly speaking, their outstanding features.

My hon. friend's proposal is to impose on all lessees who take out leases hereafter, as well upon those who have leases which make them subject to regulations imposed subsequent to the issue of the lease, the obligation of contributing one-sixteenth of the output to the owner of the surface rights, in cases where the Crown is the owner of only the sub-surface and where the surface itself is held by a homestead entrant who entered prior to the taking out of the lease, or where it is

otherwise held. It will be apparent to the House at once that, in addition to the regulations that now prevail, providing so substantial a return to the entire country in the event of oil being discovered in any quantity, to seek now to place another imposition of one-sixteenth upon the prospector might be a very serious deterrent to oil explorers in the North. I understand from my hon. friend that in the United States a share is provided to be paid to the owner of the surface rights, but I am not sure that the entrant there would labour under the other obligations which are imposed by the new regulations in Canada. I could not speak positively as to that, but I would doubt it. I understand the owner of a lease at the present time, the outright owner of the lease, cannot hope to secure and does not in practice secure, more than one-eighth himself for his entire right in the sale to the man who thereafter actually hopes to produce; and imposition upon him of one-sixteenth would, of course, take away the half of that. The whole question, however, resolves itself to this: Is there any special claim on the part of the man who happens to be owner of the surface rights? He undoubtedly has a claim to any damage he may suffer for anything done to the surface rights, or for access to the well over the surface rights; but it seems rather difficult to establish that he, as distinct from the rest of the community, has any further claim. For example, if there is an owner of surface rights on one side of the road where oil happens to be discovered, and another owner of surface rights on the other side of the road where oil does not happen to be, while the man who owns the surface rights on the side of the road where oil is discovered is undoubtedly entitled to be compensated for damage done to his property, after he is compensated for that, is there any difference in claim between him and the other man on the other side of the road where oil does not happen to be? Both have contributed equally to opening up the country and both have equal claim on account of the fact that they have made it easier for the explorer to come in.

Mr. GRIESBACH: In oil discoveries, the oil does not lie within the four corners of the quarter section, the oil lies in a pool or a field. If oil is discovered on a quarter section, the owner of that quarter section ought to have an interest in that oil. But what follows? The man across the road, who, the Prime Minister says, should be in the same position, is in fact in the same position, because now someone will come to him and lease from him his land with reasonable assurance that he too will strike the same field.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend is right, and if one man who happens to own the surface rights where the first oil well is sunk is in just the same position as the man across the road—because the oil will be under him too—let us proceed with that further: the oil will be under the whole country and all will be equally entitled.

Mr. GRIESBACH: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it will not. Therefore, my hon. friend's reasoning is wrong.

Mr. GRIESBACH: I am half wrong as you are wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps that is so, but there is a limit to the area which the oil traverses and the owners of the surface rights in that area seem to me to be entitled to compensation for what they suffer in relation to their property rights; but as between them and the owner of an adjoining area under which there is no oil at all, I am not yet convinced that they have any special claim. I am not convinced there is any difference in claim between the one set of owners and the other, but I am not giving that as a final determination. I am sure the hon. member would not at this time ask that, with the consideration that is possible to be given to a subject of this kind and importance in a discussion in the House, oil regulations should be here and now passed. They must naturally be the subject of scrutiny by the experts of the department, assisted by the best possible advice they can get, and I assure my hon. friend that the suggestion he makes will have consideration by the Government. If he would prefer, there would be no objection at all to the adjournment of the debate in order that others may take part in it at a later date to better advantage, or he might withdraw his motion, whichever he chooses. If it is his desire that the debate be adjourned, I, being on the floor, will so move.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

DESTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AT PRINTING BUREAU

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a drastic investigation should be held in connection

with the wanton destruction of most valuable documents alleged to have taken place during recess at the Printing Bureau.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House with this motion. It was drafted merely to call the attention of the House and the Government to the very serious—accident, shall I say—which took place a few months ago at the Printing Bureau. From the press reports it appears that several tons of most valuable documents were destroyed. I understand that a firm was appointed by the Government not very long ago to investigate various departments, and especially the Printing Bureau, and we were informed by the press—I do not know whether it is a fact, but such was the report—that whilst this firm was proceeding with its investigation many very valuable documents which had accumulated in the Government buildings since Confederation, and even prior to that, were ordered to be destroyed. I remember reading in the papers at the time of this destruction, that some of the blue books which were destroyed or sold would have been most valuable to the public archives of Canada; in fact, one of the archivists told me that some of these documents could not be found elsewhere in the world to-day, and their value could not be estimated in terms of dollars and cents. I am told that on different occasions from different countries of the world, especially from Great Britain, requests have come for some of these documents, which dated very far back in the history of the Confederation. Now the object of my motion is to ascertain who was responsible for this destruction, what documents have been destroyed, and whether the Government intends to make a drastic investigation so that punishment will be meted out to the parties who are found to be responsible. I cannot for one moment believe that the gentlemen who were engaged in the investigation of the Printing Bureau were authorized by anyone in the Government to destroy these documents. Blue books are published from year to year, and sometimes a great many of them remain on the shelves; they may not be wanted presently, but they may be wanted later on, and we must always provide for future needs. I remember reading the history of the Parliament Buildings' fire in Montreal in 1849. The story of that fire, which occurred under circumstances with which we are all familiar, was told by a gentleman who occupies a very enviable position in the world of letters, and he gives a list of the public documents and blue books which were destroyed and cannot be found anywhere else in the libraries of Canada. What a national loss such a fire was for the writers on the history of Canada! With regard to the destruction that has taken place recently, an archivist in the employ of the Government told me that to his own personal knowledge some of the blue books which have disappeared were invaluable and could not be replaced.

I shall not delay the House further, but I should like to know from the right hon. the Prime Minister if an investigation is being held, and if so, the nature of that investigation, and whether the Government intends to take the necessary steps to punish the guilty parties?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The question raised by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is also referred to in one, if not more, questions that appear on the Order Paper to-day. The first time this matter came to my attention, speaking from memory, was about four months ago, perhaps only three. I made such inquiry as I was able to make of other members of the Government and elsewhere. The complaints that were raised were very much of the same nature as those expressed to-day by the hon. member to the effect that valuable books had been destroyed, or rather, it seems to me the way it was put was this—that they had been turned over to the contractor who had the contract for the waste paper that gathers around the Parliament Buildings. Valuable documents that had been stowed away were, either by mistake or design, turned over to him. I think that is the way it was put to me. At all events, these documents had been put out of the road and were no longer the property of the Government. I am glad to be able to say to the hon member that the Government took action in this matter some time ago. I cannot recall the exact date, but it must be now a matter of some months. The inquiry was ordered under the Inquiries' Act, and his Honour, Judge Snider, of the County Court of Wentworth, was appointed a Commissioner under that Act with the fullest possible powers, because the Act itself gives the powers. The wording of the Order in Council was in the amplest language, to investigate and ascertain who was responsible for the destruction and removal of these books and documents.

There has been no report from that commission as yet. I know they have held sittings, but I do not know whether they have concluded their investigation. The Government requested Col. O. M. Biggar to act as Government Counsel on the enquiry to assist Judge Snider in the investigation. The House will remeber that under the terms of the Dominion Elections Act which passed last session Col. Biggar was appointed Chief Electoral Officer, and to him was also assigned the duty of assisting as Counsel for the Government in investigations of this character. Consequently he was the appropriate Counsel to select in this instance, and I know that he has been engaged with Judge Snider in the investigation. I made enquiries a moment ago of the Minister of Justice to ascertain whether he had any word as to reports from the investigation, and he tells me he has not. I am therefore of opinion that His Honour Judge Snider has not yet reported, but I can assure the hon. member that I am awaiting the report with interest, and if it shows that there are parties guilty of crime in any degree they ought to be punished, and it is the intention of the Government not to refrain from proceeding with their punishment.

Mr. VIEN: Can the Prime Minister tell us whether any steps were taken to recover any property that was possible of recovery?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I understood the complaints, the property was gone past recovery. If that turns out not to be the fact, of course we shall take every step to recover what has not been lost.

Mr. VIEN: No investigation was held to see whether the property was recoverable?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is the part of the investigation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no need of the motion being adopted. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it should not be adopted because the enquiry has already been under way.

Mr. BELAND: My desk mate, the hon. member for Russell, (Mr. Murphy), intended to say something on this subject and I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

STANDARDIZATION OF PARTS OF AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

Mr. ARCHIBALD BLAKE McCOIG (Kent) moved that to-morrow the House do go into Committee of the Whole on the following proposed resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the standardization of parts of agricultural machinery, and to enact,—

1. That from and after the first day of November, 1922, all agricultural implements and farm wagons manufactured in Canada for use within Canada, shall with respect to the following parts, namely:—Grain Binder Knife Sections, Knife Heads and Pitman's, Mowing Machine Knife Sections, Mowing Machine Knife Heads, Mowing Machine Pitman's Clamps, Mowing Machine Guards and Guard Ledger Plates, Hay Rake Teeth, Land Cultivator Teeth and Cultivator Points, Sprocket Chains —different sizes, Plough Points, Plough Sole Plates, Plough Clevises, Ensilage Blower Pipes, Nuts for Waggon Arms, Machine Bolts and Nuts; be made to conform to the standards prescribed by regulations to be made by the Minister of Agriculture prior to the first day of November, 1921, and approved by the Governor General in Council; and that further and other regulations may be made by the Minister from time to time.

2. That from and after the first day of November, 1922, no agricultural implement or farm waggon shall be manufactured in Canada for use within Canada which with respect to the said parts fails to comply with the regulations then in force, and any manufacturer of agricultural implements or farm waggons for use within Canada violating these provisions or regulations shall incur a penalty of not less than $200, and not more than $1,000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will you be good enough, Mr. Speaker, to inform the House what action was taken in respect to the resolution just read?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This resolution, Order No. 30, is a resolution which precedes the introduction of a Public Bill relating to trade. The action taken was a decision that the House be moved into Committee of the Whole to-morrow on the said proposed resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only point that arises in my mind is whether or not the passing of the motion to go into Committee in respect of a resolution preceding a public Bill involves the acceptance by the House of the principles of the resolution. I should not like to take that responsibility without further study of the resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The action taken by the House cannot involve the acceptance of the principle of the resolution. The rules provide that such resolutions shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any decision or vote of the House is passed thereupon. The motion was not debatable and is in effect only a notice that the resolution will be

considered at the next sitting of the House, that is to say, the first time that Public Bills and Orders may be reached.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is satisfactory.

CANADIAN NATIONALS DEFINITION ACT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill number 17 to define Canadian Nationals.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the Minister please explain the purpose of this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not contemplate to-day going further than getting the Bill into the committee stage. The purpose of the Bill is to define Canadian Nationals, and it would seem to me that the discussion of the definition might very properly he held in Committee. It seems to me highly probable that I may feel desirous of amending the Bill so as to make more complete the definition that is therein contained. I would suggest to the House that the Bill have its second reading, and when we get into committee stage I would move that the committee rise. We could then deal with the question later.

Mr. McMASTER: On the understanding that we can discuss the principle?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, there would be no objection to a discussion of the principle in committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that one or two members on this side of the House desire to speak on this Bill and possibly to refer more particularly to the principle involved. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that the minister do not press his motion.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, in the event I will not press my motion at the present time. It does seem to me that for the purpose of the discussion of a principle it would be desirable that we should have before us a complete definition. Therefore, there is a desire for discussion upon the motion, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that we were not expecting to go on with this Bill to-day, and that a good many members are absent.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that, and I was rather impressed with the idea that that might very probably be the case. I realize that there is room for a very interesting discussion, and I would therefore move that the debate on the motion for second reading be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MINISTERS AND DIRECTORSHIPS

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10 to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere of the Chamber this afternoon lends itself to the observations which I have to bring before the House, as the matter is of an essentially non-partisan and, I trust, of a non-contentious character. The atmosphere, the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) suggests sub-rosa, is of a chilly nature and certainly the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker might endeavour to prevent the draughts which circulate in the Chamber from affecting members from time to time. However, that is not the subject of my remarks this afternoon. The object of this Bill is to make it incumbent upon ministers of the Crown to resign all directorships which they hold in incorporated companies when they accept their portfolios. The first argument I wish to make in favour of the principle of the Bill is that it is in consonance with the best Canadian practice. My information is, Mr. Speaker, that when the member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) the former Premier, accepted office in 1911 he resigned all directorships which he held, and encouraged all his colleagues to do so. Had that wholesome practice been followed, there would have been no necessity for the debate which is going to take place this afternoon.

My next point, Mr. Speaker, is that the abandonment of directorships by ministers of the Crown is in line with the best British practice. It is not always the case in Great Britain that men who occupy the positions of ministers of the Crown resign their directorships, but my opinion is, and I believe it is correct, that it is the best British practice to resign directorships when accepting a portfolio. I read from the British Hansard, Fourth Series, Vol. 93, Page 216, a citation which I take from a discussion of a similar character to the one we are now entering upon, held in the British House some years ago. The precedent of Lord Rathmore had been alluded to. He was a very honourable man, but his case

formed a very bad precedent for his was a most striking case of a minister of the Crown uniting with that position the directorship of innumerable companies. According to the directory of directors that gentleman was a director in no less than ten companies. Now, I think that at least the ministers of the Crown will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, when I lay down as one of the premises of my argument that the life of a minister of the Crown in this country is one of arduous and unremitting toil.

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I have rarely thought, Mr. Speaker, that I would have the pleasure of hearing the Prime Minister of this country say "hear, hear," to anything that I said. I welcome his concurrence with great gratitude, and I know that what I have said applies most fully in his case. Now that is what I believe should be the life of a minister of the Crown. He has not only, under our practice, heavy departmental or administrative duties to perform, but he should be at the same time a student of the current events which are passing in the world, and he should do his share in forming public opinion by the holding of meetings and by the discussion of public questions both inside and outside the House of Commons. Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that such a life will leave no leisure, or no more leisure than is required for reasonable recreation and recuperation. That is my first point.

What is the duty of the director of a company? The duty of the director of a company is first of all to give thought and attention to the policy, the business policy of the company, and to see that the details are carried out along proper business lines. He is not expected to attend to details, but he must see that provision is made for details being carried out on proper business lines. I say that no man who is a minister of the Crown in this country has any time left to fulfil the duties of a director. That is my first proposition, and I think it is a proposition which will appeal as a reasonable one to members of this House. We have the best of authority for the statement that no man can serve two masters. Either he will have to neglect his duty as a minister or he will have to neglect his duty as a director, if he holds both positions at one and the same time. It may be stated —well a director may merely give his name; he may take no real active part in the administration of companies' affected. That, I say, is open to objection. I say it is open to objection because it is possible that the business to which the minister has given his name may not be a successful business. It may be that those who have been induced to place their money in the stock or bonds of a company, relying on the fact that the name of a minister of the Crown appeared among its directors may be disappointed, may find that their investment is not as safe as they thought it was, and they may be deceived, they may be disappointed by the fact that they thought the man of ability and prestige was giving his attention to the affairs of the company. They find he has not done so, a loss is incurred, and the prestige and reputation of the minister suffers.

I am not talking as an opponent of the Government—I generally do—but I am talking now as a Member of the House of Commons, to whom the reputation and usefulness of this House and the Cabinet, which, after all, is the committee of this House, is a matter of importance and of interest. Then, of course, Mr. Speaker, I am not making charges, I am not dealing with the matter on any assumption that there has been wrong doing; but I say that there is always a possibility for undesirable things to happen when a man is put in two conflicting positions. It may be argued that ministers of the Crown when they come to deal with matters which have a personal interest for them will always set aside their personal interest and prefer the interest of the state. But where ministers of the Crown are directors of companies there is one fiduciary interest set up in opposition to another fiduciary interest: as ministers they are trustees for the whole people; and as directors they are trustees for the shareholders of the company.

That argument had appealed to me in my consideration of this matter, and I was interested in reading some debates of a committee of the British House of Commons to find that the present Prime Minister of Great Britain had come to the same conclusion. It was perhaps somewhat like the Anglican curate who said, "I say so, and the Apostle Paul agrees with me." In British Hansard, fourth series, volume 93, page 232, this passage will be found:

> He did not think that any man ought to put himself in a position where his private interests conflicted with his public duties. He would put it higher. He did not think a man

ought to put himself in a position where his duty as trustee for a corporation conflicted with his duty as trustee for his constituents.

I think it is rather harder for a man to decide between fiduciary allegiances, if I may use the expression, than between his duty as a trustee, and his own personal interest. I am speaking, I know, to a number of men who now follow or who have followed in years past the legal profession. How careful we of the legal profession all are when the possibility of conflict of interests between clients whom we have represented arises to ask that one or the other, or perhaps both, confide their business to other members of the profession for the time being. It is always hard to deal justly when you have two fiduciary interests.

Now, we should be, and I trust we all are, jealous for the good name of this House. We are told by authority, almost as great as the authority I have just quoted, that we are to "abstain from the very appearance of evil." Years ago Tennyson wrote about "the fierce light that beats upon the Throne." Well, I do not think that light is comparable to the fierce light that beats upon men who enter Parliament at this time of the world's history. I do not think that I am using the language of extravagance when I say that all governmental institutions are on trial and are being subjected to criticism which is not only strong but often bitter and often unjust. Last Sunday I listened to an address by the late Commander-in-Chief of the Canadian army in the course of which he said:

I suppose it is within the knowledge of every man within sound of my voice that it is generally regarded that political life has got something unclean in it.

I did not like to hear that, but I am afraid in making that statement he expressed a common, and, I trust, erroneous, view of public life. Suppose these things happen —and I say in advance, Mr. Speaker, that I am putting purely hypothetical illustrations,—suppose the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) has a contract of under $5,000 to let for the building of a wharf largely composed of cement, and suppose at the same time he is a director of the Canada Cement Company,—I do not believe he is, I am only supposing that for the purpose of my argument—and suppose that contract goes to the Canada Cement Company. Will there not be a great number of people in this country who will say: The reason why the Canada Cement Company got that contract was because the minister who had the letting of it was also a director of that company.

Let me give another illustration. Let us suppose that the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has got to appoint a financial agent for Canada in, say, the city of New York from among the Bank of Montreal, the Merchants Bank, the Royal Bank, Molson's Bank—

Mr. LEMIEUX: La Banque d'Hochelaga.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, La Banque d'Hochelaga, La Banque Provinciale—in my hypothetical case we will give the province of Quebec and the French institutions full and ample representation. Now, suppose at the same time the Minister of Finance—and this is a hypothetical proposition, absurd on its face—was a director of the Bank of Montreal, and suppose he gave this position to the Bank of Montreal, what an outcry there would be, and how the people would think that something was wrong. How easily the public would think he had been influenced in making his choice by the fact that he was a director of that bank. Those are merely hypothetical illustrations, but I say they show the advisability of making it impossible for such things to happen by providing that when ministers of the Crown accept office they should cease being directors of companies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the possible objections to my proposal? They are, I imagine, certain possible objections. It may be said that laying down the proposition as I have done in the Bill which I have introduced I have been too wide and sweeping. We can imagine a case of this sort, a minister of the Crown being a director of a mutual life insurance company. Such a company is of a quasi-benevolent nature. I suppose there is no truer philanthropy that a man of moderate means can practice than to insure his life for the benefit of his wife and children. It may be that our insurance laws are so carefully administered that loss in such a company is practically impossible, and that the minister in giving the influence of his name to a mutual life insurance company is merely encouraging people to do what is right. The same sort of argument might apply in large measure to a director of a savings bank. I can quite imagine that hon. members may bring to the consideration of this question arguments which may tend to show that the proposal is too wide. Why have I brought it in this wide form? Because I believe that if you try to draw the line you will meet with more trouble than if you do not admit the wisdom

of directorships of any sort or kind being held by ministers of the Crown. Suppose a man has built up a business and subsequently turns it into a one-man company. It may be said: Well, it is unfair to ask that man to give up the directorship of that company if he joins the Government. There may be something in that, but the answer I would make to this: that if he is going to do his duty as a minister of the Crown he really will not have time to attend to his business.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will my hon. friend permit a question here?

Mr. McMASTER: Certainly.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the hon. member carry it this step further: that if a man was engaged in business—had not formed his one-man company, but was in a firm or was carrying on business—he should abandon or liquidate his business upon becoming a member of the Government?

Mr. McMASTER: No, I would not say that. I grant, Mr. Speaker, that the line is pretty narrow. It is much the same as in the case of the age at which a person may legally make a contract; if a man is twenty-one years of age he may legally make a contract, but if he is twenty years and nine months of age any contract he makes might be subject to attack. I admit that the distinction is pretty fine, but I do not propose to go so far. I do not think it would be in the public interest to say that a man should give up all his private business when he becomes a Minister of the Crown. I do think that if he can so arrange matters that he will be able to give up all active participation in his private business, leaving it to others, and to devote his whole time and attention to the public business, that is the ideal thing for him to do. After all, Mr. Speaker—we are discussing this matter in the most friendly fashion—how much practice of the law can the Prime Minister carry on at present at Portage La Prairie? Not very much; he has had to give it up, and there are members on this side who, if they went into the Cabinet, would have to lay aside their law practice for the time being. And the man who lays aside his law business is not merely giving up, so to speak, the interest on his capital; he is jeopardizing even his capital and is jeopardizing his practice.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, somewhat more is expected of lawyers than of other classes of the community.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. McMASTER: There is a great deal in that. I do not know any class of the community which renders more unselfish public service than the lawyers do. The doctors, too, give a great deal of unselfish public service, and perhaps more unselfish private service than the lawyers do.

Mr. BELAND: Why has the hon. gentleman set a period of fifteen days as the limit of time within which a man must resign his directorship after becoming sworn in as a Minister of the Crown? I should think it would be better to provide a period of fifteen days after his election, because it might so happen that after the election there would be no occasion for his resigning any directorship.

Mr. McMASTER: That is a matter which, I think could be taken up in committee. As the father of the Bill, I would be prepared to accept an amendment in that connection.

Mr. CHAPLIN: To be a director in a concern a man has necessarily to be a shareholder. Must a Minister, in resigning his directorship, also part with his shares?

Mr. McMASTER: No, I do not propose that for a moment.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then his interest is there just the same.

Mr. McMASTER: His interest is there, it is quite true. But a shareholder has not, as a rule, the same control of policy that a director has. Quite often in large companies a man is asked to subscribe to shares, or is sometimes given qualifying shares, so that the company may enjoy either the direct benefit of his experience and business ability, or the

5 p.m. prestige of his name.

I frankly grant that you may ask me questions which are difficult to answer as regards the differentiation of private interests as between the shareholder and the director. I can imagine a case in which the private interest of a large shareholder in a company is much greater than the private interest of a director would be who might be a small shareholder. We could not, in fairness, shut out people who were shareholders in all companies from membership in the Government, because if we did we should too greatly limit the choice.

Mr. STEVENS: Suppose a man holds twenty-five per cent of the stock of some institution, and is a director and prominent member of it. He enters the Government, he resigns his directorship and retains his

stock in the company. All he does is simply hide from the public his active interest, still retaining his real interest in the company. What is the difference?

Mr. McMASTER: Well, there is this difference: It is true that he retains his personal interest, but his fiduciary interest disappears. My hon. friend will realize that an honourable man will be more careful of the interests which he represents as a trustee than he will be of his own interests, and the cutting off of directors from portfolios does cut off from the Cabinet the possibility of conflicting fiduciary interests—the fiduciary interests of the director who represents his shareholders and that of the Minister of the Crown who represents the whole people. I quite agree that the personal interest of the shareholder remains; that is something which I do not think we can get rid of without unduly limiting the choice of Ministers of the Crown. But it is quite possible to prevent the carrying of interlocking directorates—which, I think, are now far too prevalent throughout the country—into the circle of the Cabinet itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member not think that if his Bill is to be accepted it should, under our present practice, apply as well to the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I would have not the slightest objection to its applying to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And to the leaders of both Oppositions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly.

Mr. McMASTER: I know my own leader and can speak for him; I am sure he would not have the slightest objection to having it apply to him. As regards the leader of the Opposition sitting angularly opposite, I cannot speak for him.

Mr. DOHERTY: But does the principle apply?

Mr. McMASTER: There is, of course, the consideration, as the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) remarks, that there is no salary attached to the position of the leader of the other Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point.

Mr. McMASTER: That is not the great point, I admit. If that is the only thing standing in the way of the Government's acceptance of my Bill, I would be willing to go one step further and have it apply to the leader of the Opposition as well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be of no use to have the one without the other.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I should say right at the moment that I should feel it distinctly in the public interest to have the provision apply to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really had not my hon. friend in mind; I was just leading through him to the other.

Mr. McMASTER: A sort of *oratio obliqua*. In bringing my remarks to a close, I must thank the House for the kindly, friendly and patient attention that has been given to my remarks. I am asking only that we place upon the Statute Book what I regard to be the best and the prevailing practice. I do not believe the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), who leads the Government to-day, is a director in a company. He indicates by a shake of the head that he is not. I know that the last leader of the Government, the present member for King's N.S. (Sir Robert Borden), resigned his directorships. I remember, shortly after he became Prime Minister, having to examine the books of a very small company down in Nova Scotia and seeing on the books that he had sent in his resignation because he had become a minister of the Crown. I know that the only directorship which my late leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, ever accepted, was in a mutual life insurance company. Therefore, I am asking this Government to accept legislation that will merely crystallize in the form of a statute the best prevailing practice. It may be said, of course, and it will be urged, perhaps in this debate, that we should leave this matter to the individual feeling of delicacy and propriety of the ministers themselves. That has not been done in regard to senators and members. Under the Senate and House of Commons Act, their obligation to refrain from bringing before the House legislation in which they are interested, as lawyers, for instance, is very clearly set forth, and their inability to have an interest in a contract with the Government is also very clearly set forth. Therefore, that argument is offset by the fact that we have crystallized in the form of a statute the best prevailing practice as to members of Parliament, and I submit that what I ask for is right, and that it is calculated to enhance the honour and prestige of public men in this Dominion of Canada.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Toronto East): Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say regarding the question which has been brought to the attention of the House through the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). In the first place, I should like to compliment him on the manner in which he has approached the question. I believe he is quite sincere in his proposal; but at the same time, it seems to me about as novel a proposal as I have ever heard in this House. In this way. What my hon. friend proposes is to have legislation passed stating who may not become members of a Government, and I do not know that there is any precedent for that. I think it is open to any Canadian citizen to become a member of the Government, provided that he is qualified for such a position. In these modern days of business, it is no news to members of the House to be told that business is carried on, not so much by, say John Smith as by John Smith, Limited. While, perhaps, twenty, thirty or forty years ago, the greater number of businesses were carried on by private individuals, nowadays, by far the greater number of businesses are carried on by corporations. John Smith may be carrying on business to-day with a capital of say $25,000 or $50,000, and to-morrow he may find it in the interest of organization to procure a charter from a provincial Government or from the Dominion Government and to organize his business into a joint stock corporation, but he still controls the corporation practically just as much as he did before it was incorporated. If he was a man of experience and integrity and was qualified in other ways to become a Cabinet Minister, if a new Government was being formed this man might be looked upon as pre-eminently one who would be of service to his country; but under those conditions, if the legislation proposed by my hon. friend were passed, that man would be disqualified.

Mr. McMASTER: He would not be disqualified; if he accepted the portfolio, he would have to resign his directorship. His directorship would not prevent his being chosen; but after he was chosen, he would have to choose between the retention of his portfolio and the retention of his directorship.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I quite understand that, but that, to my mind, is rather a technical argument. A man publicly has his name on his letter head or bill head or whatever you like as a director of the company in which he is interested; he then becomes a member of a government, and he removes his name as director, and if he is asked across the floor of this House, if he is a director of this company, he says: "No," but practically his position is the same as it was before; he does not sell out; he cannot dispossess himself; he cannot sacrifice his rights; it is not likely that he would sacrifice his rights, and yet he may be in a position to be of great service to the government of whatever party it may be. My hon. friend probably did not have that matter which I have outlined as much in mind as he had what he termed interlocking directorates. If you stand several individuals up in line, all of them in different occupations and professions, how is it possible to say who is best qualified for Cabinet rank? A man might be a director in one or two or more financial corporations—let us get away from the smaller businesses—a government might be formed, and his services, because of his wider experience in the affairs of this country might be thought to be better than those of another man whose name is not connected with any corporation. The men whose names appear as directors of corporations are generally understood to be men who understand the affairs of this country as well as and, in most cases, have wider experiences in our country's affairs than other men, and consequently they would be more useful to this country. I cannot, therefore, see how you can pass a law to debar such men from becoming members of government in this country any more than you can pass a law saying who shall be members of government, and what occupations they shall hold in order to be members. My hon. friend gave some precedents in England, but the situation there is very different from what it is in Canada. Ninety per cent of the members of this House, whether they are in professions or in business, have risen from the ranks, and everybody, if he is looked upon generally in the community in which he resides, as a man of sufficient experience to become a member of a government, is supposed to be qualified in one sense or another for such a position. As I said when I rose, I did not intend to say more than a few words on this question, and I have not covered the subject at all; but it seems to me, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Brome has approached the subject in what appears to be a very impartial way, his argument is full of inconsistencies.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I was struck with the speech of the hon. member for Toronto East (Sir Edward Kemp), but I think he has forgotten the fact that Parliament has already taken the step that he thinks is a hardship. Parliament has provided that a member of this House must not do any business with the Government. We have gone so far as to debar every member of the House of Commons in this respect. If my hon. friend will refer to the provisions of Chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes, he will see that the most drastic provision to this effect is made. My hon. friend's illustration of John Smith in his personal capacity, and John Smith Limited, does not apply, because even now if John Smith is not Limited he cannot be a minister and do business with the Government. He cannot be a member of this House and do business with the Government.

My hon. friend points out how difficult it would be to find a man to accept a position as minister of the Crown if he was prohibited from engaging in business. But we prohibit them already, because if John Smith is in business and becomes a member of this House, or a minister of the Crown, in his personal capacity he must not do any business with the Government. If he does, he becomes disqualified as a member of the House and as a minister of the Crown. So we have that prohibition already. Why should we make any distinction between John Smith in his personal capacity and John Smith Limited? Why should we prohibit John Smith in his personal capacity from doing business with the Government, if we are not at the same time going to prohibit him as John Smith Limited? The same principle is involved in both cases. If my hon. friend is not willing to pass this Bill, I think he ought to be willing to repeal Chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes, which provides that John Smith must not do any business with the Government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is sound. Shareholders are excepted under the law because, of course, it would be a hardship for a man of any means to have to dispose of his shares; that would be throwing away his property. But a director is in a much different position. My hon. friend from Brome has pointed out very clearly that it is the duty of a director acting in a fiduciary capacity to try and get a contract from the Government for his firm; it is his duty to do everything he can to make money for the shareholders that he represents. On the other hand, it is his duty as a minister of the Crown probably to give the contract to somebody else. These are two conflicting duties, and I can see no great hardship in compelling a man who accepts a position as minister of the Crown to resign his directorship in any company he is interested in. My hon. friend from Brome has pointed out that that is the practice already with some members of this Government. Very recently my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) after joining the Government resigned his position in the firm in Nova Scotia with which he was formerly connected. Similar instances have been pointed out by my hon. friend from Brome. The practice exists now. I think it is a good practice, and that it would be a good thing to have it embodied in the statutes.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with very great interest, and with my hon. friend from Toronto (Sir Edward Kemp) I commend the tone adopted by my good friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) in discussing this important question. While I have not gone deeply into the matter, I must say that I differ from my hon. friend from Toronto in the view which he takes of this Bill. He says that men ought not to be debarred from joining the Government by the fact that they have large interests in limited companies and are directors on their boards. My hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has just cited the section of the Revised Statutes which debars members of parliament from entering into any contracts with the Government. But there is a more glaring instance. My hon. friend will also find that the Revised Statutes of Canada provide for the independence of the Bench. Some years ago this Parliament amended the Judicature Act to provide that judges who had been appointed directors and were drawing directors' fees in joint stock companies or in any other company must resign. I may be told at once that no judge was ever accused of being partial in his decisions because he was a director of a company. That may be the case, but there is a great principle involved in this matter, and it is that the public must

have absolute confidence in the integrity and probity of those who administer the law. It was for that purpose—that the public might respect the more the Bench of Canada—that this Parliament decided that judges should not be directors of any company. The legislation evoked considerable discussion at the time, and some of the judges protested against what they called this hardship being imposed upon them; yet public opinion ratified the action of Parliament. Every litigant approved of it because, as we say in common parlance, Caesar's wife must be above suspicion. Justice must be protected not only by herself—and I use the word "herself" because I see her living on the Bench, personified by the judge who administers the law—she must also be protected against her own self, and that is the reason why Parliament decided that judges should have no interests as directors of companies. I may be told that ministers of the Crown are not judges. True, in a sense; but they make the laws. They decide long before-hand what laws shall be introduced, and therefore it seems to me they have an equal, if not a greater responsibility than the judges themselves.

I might give another illustration to show how sensitive public opinion is in regard to those who administer the law. My right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) knows that in our province —I do not know whether the same plan has been adopted in other provinces—the relative of a judge to the second degree is debarred from pleading before the judge, nor can any member of his firm appear before him. So intent is public opinion that justice shall be above suspicion. I commend again my hon. friend from Brome for his remarks this afternoon. This is a matter that applies to both parties, to ministers of the Crown of to-day, and to ministers of the Crown of tomorrow. It is in their interests that they should be protected against their own weaknesses; for we are all human. Public opinion should be saisfied that they have no monetary interest which might conflict with their duty as ministers of the Crown.

I may be told, as stated by my hon. friend from Toronto a moment ago, that business men of great ability and of substance might be debarred from giving their country the benefit of their experience. Well, let me recall to my hon. friend first of all the fact that the salaries of the ministers of the Crown have been increased. But I put that aside and I say is not the honour of being a minister of the Crown, the honour of being sworn in as a Privy Councillor, a reward by itself? In my humble judgment, no man should hesitate, when accepting that honour, to put aside his private interests. I think I am right in this, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to say that never since Confederation, up to the present time, has there been any reason on the part of the public to suspect the personal integrity of the Prime Ministers of Canada, and I include with pleasure in this statement the name of the right hon. gentleman who to-day as Prime Minister presides over the destinies of this country. But I say that it is in the interests of the ministers of the Crown, and of good government and of the good reputation of Parliament, that public opinion should be satisfied that there are no conflicting interests between ministers as such and any directors of private concerns. Why, it is obvious that any day of the month a minister of the Crown who has charge of a large spending department—let us take, for example, the Public Works Department, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of the Interior—might be put in a very awkward position as between his fiduciary interests as member of a board and his public duties on the other hand. It may happen any day, and therefore I think, without having gone very deeply into the matter, that my hon. friend is living up to British custom, to precedent, and tradition in advocating this legislation. My hon. friend from Toronto spoke of the difference that existed between public men in this country and public men in the Old Country. Let me tell him that in the Old Country of late there has been a hue and cry in the public press and elsewhere against members of the House of Lords, ministers of the Crown—and that is not done very often with ministers of the Crown —lending their names as promoters or directors of boards. Mr. Speaker, if I were not afraid of hurting the feelings of any one, I could mention the name of a gentleman I have in mind who played a very great part in the history of the British Empire, a name which brought to his family and to his country much honour and glory. And yet that name was besmirched. Why? Because in a moment of weakness the bearer of that great name allowed it to figure in a promoters' scheme. I think of that name because it is so very eminent. But there are dozens and dozens of such names which have been lent to satisfy some promoter's greed. Now, do

you believe that it is making for the honour and respect of public life that such things should be? I should like to have this discussion go a little further so that we might hear both sides of the question. It strikes me, after having heard my hon. friend and the objections that were made by some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side—mild objections I must say—that this is a needed reform and one which is consistent with British traditions.

Mr. FRANCIS HENRY KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): The manner in which this discussion has been carried on shows clearly that there is no ulterior motive behind it. But I think that the hon. gentlemen who have been advocating this proposal have not given to it the fullest consideration which its ramifications warrant. I cannot see why a minister of the Crown should be compelled to resign his directorship in any company, whether they might or might not have anything to do with government business or with Parliament, unless you carry the principle to every member of Parliament. I would not object at all if it were laid down as public law that no member of Parliament should be a director in any company, if that were deemed advisable. Personally, I think it inadvisable, because there are thousands of companies that have no transactions with any of the offices of government. But to say that no Cabinet Minister should be permitted to hold any directorship in any corporation is going too far, unless you apply the principle also to members of Parliament. The public are well protected to-day by the independence of Parliament Act, Chapter 10. There it is laid down most specifically in Section 14 that no person, directly or indirectly, shall be allowed to have any interests in any contract or agreement, either through trustee or otherwise, if he is a member of Parliament.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. member think that that includes a member who is a director or has a controlling interest in an incorporated company?

Mr. KEEFER: As I understand, it includes any person. The Act reads as follows:—

Mr. PROULX: I am referring to the statute as at present.

Mr. KEEFER: Chapter ten?

Mr. PROULX: Yes.

Mr. KEEFER: Section 14 of chapter 10 says that no contract with the Government is permitted if a person has any interest in it directly or indirectly. Then, section 18 says further that in every such contract there must be a clause providing that no member of Parliament is to have any share or interest in such contract, or commission, or benefit to be derived therefrom. Such is to-day expressly forbidden. There is a penalty and this qualification for any contravention of the statute. There is only one exception, you are allowed to be a shareholder. Now is it not the interest in the company as a shareholder, that should be in question? The attack is only made upon the principle of the minister of the Crown being a director. I think the Bill as drafted has not been carefully thought out. There are many things which might receive further consideration. Why should the Independence of Parliament Act be at all restricted and apply to only ministers of the Crown as directors when that Act strikes directly at every member of Parliament? I see a great deal of force in what the member for Toronto said. If a man is carrying on a business as a partnership or as an individual, which might be a very large business, there is no interference. But if he finds it advisable to incorporate a company and to retain a seat on the board of directors in order to have some guidance of its affairs, why could he not as before incorporation, be a member of the government?

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): I strongly approve the principles of the Bill presented by my hon. friend from Brome. The measure serves two purposes, one being to leave the minister free to devote his whole time to public business. I think that when a gentleman enters the Government of Canada he should be prepared to devote his whole time and attention to the country's affairs. At the last session of Parliament the salaries of the ministers were increased so as to render them independent of their ordinary profession or calling, and to afford them a decent living. Another important purpose to be served by this Bill, which is perhaps more important, is to secure the independence of a minister so that his private interests or the interests of his friends, or of his company, should not conflict with the public interests. I would go further, and I would say that a minister should not invariably have to sell his interests in any company when he enters the Government. I would permit him to be a shareholder so long as his company did not do any business with the Government. But

the moment that company engaged upon any Government business the minister should be disqualified from remaining any longer as a shareholder in it. I would extend the principle of this Act to members of Parliament as my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) suggested. But I think my hon. friend misapprehends the meaning of section 10 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. Section 19 permits a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of a public works. A few years ago I presented a Bill to this House to disqualify any member, or any Senator, from having a seat in Parliament if he were a director, or had a controlling interest, in any company doing business with the Government. During the war many companies, in which members of Parliament and senators were directors, or had a controlling interest, sold supplies to the Government. As my hon. friend from Toronto has said there is a great difference in the manner of carrying on business to-day compared with that of twenty-five or thirty years ago. To-day business is not so much done by individuals as by incorporated companies. At the time the Act was framed business was transacted mostly by individuals. The statute, as quoted by my hon. friend from Port Arthur, provides that no person directly or indirectly, or with any other, can do business with the Government, but it excepts any shareholder in an incorporated company. Well, I would not go so far as to disqualify a member of Parliament or a Senator who might be simply a shareholder in a company doing business with the Government. But I would disqualify a member of Parliament or a Senator who was a director, or had a controlling interest in a company which was doing business with the Government. If we want to preserve the independence of Parliament, and to have a Parliament independent of the Ministry, we should provide all the safeguards possible to secure that independence. When the Act was framed I believe such was the intention of its framers. But by reason of the fact that the method of doing business has been changed this independence is not fully secured, because incorporated companies in which members of Parliament and members of the Senate have a controlling interest can do business with the Government. We know that some of these companies are one-man institutions or family organizations; strangers have only a few shares in them to qualify as directors. I think more wrong has been done by companies doing business with the Government than by particular individuals. I strongly endorse the principle of the Bill now before the House, but I would go further and exclude members of Parliament who are directors and have a controlling interest in incorporated companies doing business with the Government. Two years ago, when I presented a Bill to have the statute amended in this respect, I was met with the objection that some members of Parliament might be directors of printing companies who publish newspapers, and if their newspapers published Government advertisements they would be exposed to disqualification. In the Act respecting members of the Ontario legislature I believe there is a provision excepting members of the legislature who are shareholders or directors of companies publishing newspapers which in the ordinary course of business contain Government advertisements. I would be willing to incorporate that exception in the Federal statute. We have a provision similar to that in our Municipal Act to prevent the disqualification of members of the municipal council who, in the ordinary course of business, do any printing work for the municipality. I think with these exceptions the Act could be safely amended, and that we should amend it and secure fully the independence of ministers and of members of this House and of the Senate.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): I should like to ask my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) if he is aware whether there is any English statute of similar character to the one he is introducing?

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. BRISTOL: I would have been surprised if he had found one because I recollect being in England when the late Lord Rhondda bought control of a nerve tonic called " Phosphozone," and although he was then a member of the British Government he promoted a company and put the specific on the market. He told how much good it had done his nerves and the nerves of others suffering from the effects of the war. That struck me as carrying things rather far. But I think it indicates that to-day there is no such statute in force in England as that now proposed by the hon. member for Brome. In this country we

have had this Independence of Parliament legislation on the statute books, I suppose, for nearly fifty years without any change, and suddenly we get this bill of my hon. friend, which to me seems to be an unintentional reflection on members of the Government past, present or future. Ministers from time to time have usually been men of good standing in business and of high personal honour, and it has been the custom of this country and of Parliament to trust them implicitly, in the belief that they will give to the country their best service; and I think we can well trust to the honour of our ministers to give us the same faithful service in future as we have received in the past.

What my hon. friend from East Toronto (Sir Edward Kemp) is putting before you is, I understand, this: If a gentleman under the name of John Smith, or John Smith & Company, has an enormous business it does not matter whether it is a partnership or not, he has a capital of say, one, two, or three million dollars, and although he may be dealing in every thing that the Government wants, he cannot enter into any contract with the Government because our Independence of Parliament Act prevents it. But adopting the system under which most modern business is conducted, he forms a joint stock company. Then under my hon. friend's Bill as brought in to-day that man on becoming a Minister of the Crown would have to resign as president or director of that company. When all is said and done, we want to get into Parliament men from all walks of life. It is the successful business men of the country who have arrived at an important position in the business world that a Prime Minister is anxious to bring into his Government, and it would be very hard indeed if any business man had to resign even from the directorship of the company which he has made a success. It is not in the public interest to ask him to resign from directorship or control of his company. So long as we are protected by the statute as it is, and so long as a member of Parliament who is a partner in a firm, as such cannot enter into a contract with the Government, and so long as a member who is a shareholder in a company cannot have his company take a contract for any public works, it seems to me the public are amply protected. On the whole I think it would be better to leave this matter to the good taste and good sense of present and future ministers rather than to pass special legislation to deal with it. It is certainly very much in the public interest that a minister's conduct should be above reproach. I think in the past our ministers have been men of the highest standing, and I am sure that that standard is not likely to go down but rather will go up. For myself, I think it will be better to leave the law as it is.

Mr. PROULX: Does it make any difference between a contract for public works and a contract to supply a large amount of goods?

Mr. BRISTOL: I am afraid the statute does make that difference; I am not making it. The statute is very clear, and I thought you read it.

Mr. PROULX: Yes.

Mr. BRISTOL: The section reads:

> This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being,—
>
> (a) a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of any public work.

It might be quite proper to amend the Act and cover other things, but that is a totally different matter. I would be quite willing to consider any such amendment when it does not deal with the question of a man having to resign as a director if he wants to take a Cabinet position. My contention is that it is better to leave the law as it is, and that it is not in the interests of good administration in this country to force men to resign business affiliations which they have built up during the period of a lifetime.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, it is said that in this discussion we need not be affected by party ideas, and, it seems to me, there can be no criticism whatever of the way in which the matter has been presented by the hon. member who gave us his reasons why the legislation he proposes should be enacted. But unfortunately I rather resent Bills of this kind, in that they are a statutory invasion of the realm of private honour and private morality. I always feel, and always have felt, that when Parliament attempts by statute to regulate the conduct of public men or judges they are doing something which in the end does not help the public. If the public gets to believe that everything is done by statute, then there will be not so much anxiety to preserve private honour. I feel like being rather a drag on the wheels of justice when they go outside the

realms of crime and take up private matters.

In addition to that, I have an idea that it is not good to present to the public a predication of possible impropriety of conduct of gentlemen who are chosen as ministers of the Crown. The public should not have the idea spread upon the statutes that ministers of the Crown would do anything which would interfere with their conduct of public business or their own dignity. It is true that a statute was passed a few years ago limiting the activities of judges, but, as I recollect, it was not for the reason that judges would try cases in which they were interested, but that some judges, on account of the inadequacy of their salaries were inclined to go into business and were not giving sufficient time to their work on the bench.

It seems to me that if my hon. friend from Brome had suggested that the circumstances at the present time required this legislation, he would have made his argument much stronger, because I believe none of us know of any cases which have in any way indicated that ministers of the Crown have swerved from their duty simply because they happened to be bank or company directors.

There is another reason against this Bill, although perhaps this might be better discussed in committee. The Bill goes too far in that it makes no distinction between a large company which might affect a man's action and mind, and a small company in a man's home town which has nothing to do with the Government business at all. By passing the Bill in its present form we would to a large extent interfere with the rights of people in the country who had invested their means in companies only for the reason that they trusted the men who afterwards become Cabinet ministers. It is most unusual to find a man fit for a Cabinet position who is not a director of one or more companies, especially companies of a local character, and the people of the district in all probability invested their money solely for the reason that a prominent local man being president or director of the company they knew their money was safe. If by statute we do away with the right of that man to be a director, then we affect the rights of those who have invested their money. In other words, in the case of a man who becomes a Cabinet minister and is a trustee for people who have invested their money, any restrictive legislation of this kind is not in the public interest. For these reasons, I think that the matter might very well stand for the present, especially in view of the fact that no suggestion has been made that there is any urgent need for such legislation at this time. We are going too far, it seems to me, to think out possible improprieties when no case has presented itself to us to justify any such conclusion.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS, (Vancouver Centre): There are only a few moments before six o'clock, and as I should like to make a number of observations in connection with this matter, I shall say just a few words before the Houses rises.

I think it has wholly escaped the attention of the hon. member (Mr. McMaster) who introduces the resolution what the practical effect of a measure of this kind might be. There is also the question whether it would serve any really useful end. With regard to the latter point, I fail to recall at the moment, and during the short time I have had to consider it, any outstanding instance where a minister of the Crown in Canada— speaking now of all parties—has in any way flagrantly abused his position and thus given occasion for the measure which my hon. friend now brings forward. I think it is a sound principle for this House to follow to avoid legislation that is not called for. We have altogether too much legislation in this country—altogether too many artificial safeguards, if you like, or imaginary safeguards, and it is about time that we as a Parliament studied how we could avoid legislating on various subjects rather than seek out subjects to legislate upon. I submit, in the same spirit in which my hon. friend so admirably introduced the matter, that no evidence has been forthcoming in support of this kind of legislation. That is my first point, and I think it is an important one.

Another point relates to the practical side of it. Take, for instance, the co-operative associations. I have not particularly in mind my hon. friends across the way, but it is a fact that all over the country, in nearly every county throughout the provinces, there are co-operative businesses. Now, a director of one of these co-operative associations would be debarred from membership in the Government. Or take the case of a man operating a real estate, insurance and ordinary loan business, a financial brokerage business. Invariably that class of business is carried on under some corporate name, and fre-

quently two or three men may be partners and own virtually all the stock; or the business may be entirely controlled by one man. If a member of such an organization became a minister of the Crown, he could resign his directorship on the understanding with his colleagues that when he should cease to be a minister of the Crown he would come back to his old position. In that way the Bill would, I think, put a premium on subterfuge and evasion, rather than maintain what the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) very properly referred to as the high standard of honour which has characterized the public life of Canada, from before Confederation down to the present time. There are other points to which I wish to refer, Mr. Speaker; I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, March 7, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS.

Copies of the Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920.—Sir George Foster.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 20, to incorporate The Mayo Valley Railway, Limited.—Mr. Thompson (Yukon).

Bill No. 21, respecting The Oshawa Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 22, respecting The Thousand Islands Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

REPORTED INCREASE IN CUSTOMS DUTIES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire to direct the attention of the Government, and of the Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) in particular, to a statement sent out by one of the larger New York banks to its Canadian correspondents, and by them passed along to their branches throughout Canada, intimating that the New York bank has information that the Canadian Government will, within a very short time, increase the customs duties by adding 30 per cent to the already existing duties. I am sure that if this information is not well-founded, the Government and the Finance Minister will see the importance of at once giving it a flat denial; otherwise, it will stimulate imports that are not immediately needed. On the other hand, if it is well-founded, someone has been indiscreet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I thank the hon. member for bringing the matter to my attention. This is the very first I have heard of it. My hon. friend is well aware that it would be entirely improper for us to make any declarations on the subject matter of the report one way or the other, at the present time. I may say, however, that the imposition of an additional 30 per cent is not even being considered.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the provisions of the Audit Act which require that a copy of the Auditor General's reports shall be laid on the Table, within fifteen days after the opening of the session, and to ask why the Act has not been complied with this session.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I shall have very great pleasure in looking into the matter immediately.

CENSUS OFFICIALS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture when we may expect the official list of the Chief Census officers for the districts in my riding.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): That matter comes under the Department of Trade and Commerce now, not the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Then I will put the question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I think the lists are already published, with the exception of the province of Quebec and the latter will be ready in a day or two, if not already published. I will send my hon. friend a copy.

MACKENZIE BASIN OIL REGULATIONS

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to a matter of great importance and urgency. Under an Order in Council passed in January, the oil regulations governing Mackenzie Basin district were suspended. Under another Order in Council—

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust that the hon. member does not propose at this stage to make a speech as on a matter of urgency. If he desires to submit a question to the Government, of an urgent nature, and of general application, he might perhaps be in order, but not in making a speech.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I cannot very well put my question before stating the facts in connection with the case. However, I might start with the question, and then give the explanation. I will put it this way: When will it be possible for the Government to issue leases for oil in the Northwest Territories, having regard to the statement in the last Order in Council passed by the Government?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The hon. member was good enough to intimate to me this morning that he would ask this question, and I have sought since to get in touch with the Minister of the Interior so as to procure the desired information, but without success. I will have an answer for my hon. friend to-morrow.

GERMAN REPARATION—ALLIED TROOPS' MOVEMENTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I should like to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Government,—and I hope I shall not embarrass him by asking—whether in view of the cables of to-day that Allied troops are marching on Berlin; in view of the further fact that Canada is vitally interested in all these questions, for causes upon which I need not expatiate; in view of the further fact that we have been assured again and again recently that Canada is a nation,—is the Government being kept fully informed of what is proceeding in these areas, and would my right hon. friend like to make a statement to the House at some date convenient to himself?

[Sir George Foster.]

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I am justified in saying that generally the Government is kept informed by secret despatch of proceedings in connection with the difficulties between the Allied Powers and Germany. Definite information of the nature of that stated by the hon. member has not reached the Government; consequently there is nothing further than this that I can say.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 3, to incorporate The Canadian Bar Association.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 4, respecting The Dominion Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 5, to incorporate Fidelity Company of Canada.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 6, to incorporate The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 14, respecting Gilmour and Hughson, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 15, to incorporate North American Trust Company of Canada.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 16, respecting "Les Révérends Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée des Territoires du Nord-Ouest."—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

THE JAMES MACLAREN COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. ALFRED ERNEST FRIPP (Ottawa) moved the second reading of Bill No. 8, respecting The James MacLaren Company, Limited.—Mr. Fontaine.

Mr. BUREAU: Before the motion carries, may I submit that it might be well to refer this Bill to the Law Clerk of the House for the purpose of ascertaining to which committee it ought properly to be referred? I see they are asking leave to build railway terminals and telegraph lines, and to do other things that come more within the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee, and I think that the matter might be referred back to the Law Clerk for his advice.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be quite competent for the committee to do that in the case of a private bill in which there are provisions that might be referred to another standing committee of the House. It may however be as well to let the motion stand.

Motion stands.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REV. CANON SCOTT

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Government aware that the Rev. Canon Scott is alleged to have stated in Calgary on the 14th of October, 1920, that thousands of lives of Canadian soldiers have been lost through the defects of the Ross rifle, and that he was asking for an inquiry?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to hold such an inquiry?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. The Government has no information on the subject of Canon Scott's alleged statements other than some newspaper reports based very largely upon misinformation.

2. No request has been received for an enquiry regarding Canon Scott's alleged statements.

ALLEGED DESTRUCTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is it true that a great numbers of public documents and publications have been recently burned or sold for almost nothing?
2. If so, what are the said documents and publications, at what date were they burned or sold, and if sold, to whom?
3. Under whose orders were the said documents or publications burned or sold?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to hold an inquiry into this matter?

Sir. HENRY DRAYTON: The subject of the above question is under investigation by His Honour Colin George Snider, Judge, of the County Court of the County of Wentworth, in the province of Ontario, under a Commission of Inquiry dated the 27th of December, 1920, authorizing him to investigate into and report upon the circumstances under which certain publications were delivered by the Distribution Branch of the Government Printing and Stationery Office to Messrs. Florence & Son, the contractors for the collection of waste paper, and the destruction thereof.

BOARD OF COMMERCE—TOTAL COST

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

What has been the total cost to the Government for the Board of Commerce, from its institution up to date?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: $140,412.97.

C.P.R. IN UNITED STATES—DOMINION GOVERNMENT NOTES

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that the notes of the Dominion of Canada are not taken even at a discount, in the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Detroit, and at other points in the United States?
2. If so, what action, if any, does the Government intend to take in this regard?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The Government have no such information.

2. Answered by No. 1.

SHIPBUILDING AT VICTORIA

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many wooden ships have been built or are being built at Victoria, British Columbia, on which the Government has advanced or will advance sums of money?
2. What is the name of the Company building said ships?
3. What is or will be the dead weight tonnage of said ships?
4. What amount of money has the Government advanced to said builders, and what further amount will be advanced?
5. Under what authority or what statute is said amount being paid, advanced or loaned to said builders or owners of said ships?
6. On what date was said arrangement between the builders or owners and the Government entered into?
7. What are the names of the owners of said ships?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Four.

2. Cholberg Shipyard.

3. Calculated dead weight cargo capacity 2,400 tons.

4. Advanced to date, $600,000.

5. Appropriation Act 1920—item 549—Supplementary Estimates fiscal year ending March 31, 1921.

6. Agreement between Owners and builders, January 19th, 1920.

Agreement between Owners and the Government, March 16th, 1920.

7. Victoria (B.C.) Shipowners, Limited.

NEXT GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF LORD BURNHAM

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Have any representations been made to the Government, or to any member thereof, by Lord Northcliffe, or by his secretary, Sir Campbell Stuart, relative to the appointment of the next Governor General of Canada?
2. If so, in whose behalf were such representations made and will the correspondence, if any, be brought down?
3. Has the appointment of Lord Burnham as Governor General been suggested or urged? If so, is there any correspondence on the subject and will it be laid before Parliament?

Sir Henry Drayton:

1. No information.

2. and 3. answered by No. 1.

DEPARTMENTAL MOVING PICTURES

Mr. POWER:

1. Does the Department of Trade and Commerce produce moving pictures?

2. If so, by whom are these pictures distributed to the theatres?

3. What general arrangements are made with the distributing company or person?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Motion pictures are produced by the Exhibits and Publicity Bureau in the Department of Trade and Commerce.

2. These pictures are distributed twice a month to moving picture theatres in Canada by the Canadian Uiversal Film Company, Ltd., of Toronto. In England these pictures are distributed by Jury's Imperial Pictures, Ltd. In South Africa, arrangements have been made for distribution through the African Films Trust, Ltd. In China, distribution is being made through China Theatres, Ltd. In other countries non-theatrical distribution is arranged through the offices of the various Canadian Government Trade Commissioners.

3. Arrangements have been made with the Canadian Universal Company, Ltd., and Jury's Imperial Pictures, Ltd., by the Department of Trade and Commerce, on a percentage basis. In South Africa and China films are being distributed free.

FISH FROM U. S.—DRAWBACK

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government refunded to the East Coast Fisheries of the United States, an amount of $14,500 paid by them as duty on fish exported from the United States to Canada?

2. If so, why?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. No refund of duty has been paid to the East Coast Fisheries on fish exported from the United States to Canada but drawback of $14,720.30 was allowed, representing 99 per cent. of the Customs duties paid on imported fresh fish cured in Canada by the East Coast Fishing Company and exported.

2. Payment made under general drawback regulations established by Order in Council 20th August, 1904, under authority of Section 288 of the Customs Act.

WELLAND CANAL—SAND

Mr. PROULX:

1. Who has the contract for supplying sand to the various contractors engaged in construction work on the new Welland Ship Canal?

2. What are the names of the parties interested in the sand contract?

3. What is the date of the sand contract?

4. Since the said contract was made has it been varied in any way? If so, by what authority, and in what respect?

5. Was the said contract let by tender? If not, why?

6. Are the moneys earned under the contract payable under power of attorney to any bank? If so, what is the name of said bank?

[Mr. Power.]

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. National Sand and Material Co., Welland, Ont.

2. Their contract bears signatures: D. Dick, Jr., President; L. M. Stapf, Sec.-Treasurer.

3. Sept. 16th, 1919, August 20th, 1920 Supplement Agreement.

4. Yes. By Order-in-Council of June 18, 1920, an additional charge of 27c per cu. yd. was allowed for extra work in transferring sand from bins at points of delivery to stock piles or contractors' cars.

5. Yes; public tenders were called for.

6. Yes. Imperial Bank of Canada, Welland, Ont.

OPERATION OF LUXURY TAX

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. (a) When did the Luxury Tax go into operation and (b) on what date did it cease to operate?

2. What was the total cost of bringing into effect and operating the luxury tax?

3. (a) How many metal perforators for cancelling stamps were purchased by the Government and (b) what was their total cost?

4. (a) From whom were these metal perforators purchased and (b) on what terms?

5. Were tenders called for said perforators? If not, why?

6. Have these perforators been left with the retail merchants, or what has become of them?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. (a) May 19th, 1920. (b) On and after December 20th, 1920.

2. As the officers are employed for the collection of other Excise Taxes, it is not possible to separate the cost in such manner as to state what portion of said cost relates to the Luxury Tax.

3. (a) 49,965. (b) $77,695.75.

4. (a) W. H. Banfield & Sons, Ltd., Toronto. (b) F.O.B. Factory Toronto. Net cash 30 days from date of invoice. Price first 25,000—$2.00 each; on quantity in excess of 25,000, $1.55 each.

5. Yes.

6. As these perforators have simply been loaned to retail merchants, Collectors have been instructed to recall them.

CIVIL SERVICE REORGANIZATION—ASSISTANCE TO GRIFFENHAGEN & CO.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. In connection with the work of reorganization of the Post Office and Customs Departments by Griffenhagen and Associates, how many accountants, clerks, or other employees of the public service of Canada were detailed to assist said firm in the work of reorganization?

2. Was the assistance so rendered by officials of the different departments to Griffenhagen and Associates given in the country's time, or in the private time of those so employed?

3. If in the country's time, has a corresponding deduction been made from the $10,000 per

month remuneration, which it was agreed to pay to Griffenhagen and Associates?

4. If any public servants assisting Griffenhagen and Associates were required to work outside regular office hours, will the Government see that Griffenhagen and Associates, before they leave the country, pay these the said public servants for their services?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The present staff of departmental assistants who have been assigned for full time consists of twenty-two people whose average period of service has been but 59 days each. Seven others are at present assigned for part-time service. These have given to date (February 19, 1921), an average service of 31 days each. At various times during the work other persons than those indicated above were assigned temporarily, their services later being discontinued. The total number of these temporary assignments was 19, and the average period of such service was 17 days.

2. These employees were assigned from the various departments to assist in the reorganization work, under the direction of the special staff employed by the Council sub-committee. Such employees retained their connection with the department from which they were assigned as before.

3. The assistants detailed to this work retained their departmental status. The firm employed gave certain professional service as provided in the contract made with them. The work of departmental assistants was an extra, beyond that service, for which the Government received the direct benefit, through expediting the work and abbreviating the period for which it would be necessary to retain special outside service.

4. See answer to Question 3.

RECRUITS FOR MOUNTED POLICE

*Mr. CAHILL:

1. (a) Did Commissioner Perry, of the Northwest Mounted Police, go to England since last session of Parliament? (b) If so, by whom was he authorized to go and for what purpose?

2. (a) Did Commissioner Perry travel in company with a late member of the Government? (b) If so, which one?

3. Were recruits for the Northwest Mounted Police brought from the British Isles as a result of Commissioner Perry's visit or following said visit?

4. (a) If so, how many? (b) And where have they been stationed?

5. What efforts, if any, were made to obtain men in Canada for the positions given to the recruits brought from Great Britain?

6. What was the total cost of Commissioner Perry's trip?

7. (a) What was the total cost of bringing the recruits from Great Britain to Canada? (b) and stationing them at different points in Canada?

8. (a) Is there any difference between the Mounted Police force as now constituted and a standing army? (b) If so, what is the difference?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. (a) Yes. (b) Authority of Prime Minister and President of Privy Council.

2. (a) Was passenger on same boat. (b) Hon. Mr. Rowell.

3. (a) Yes.

4. (a) 125 recruits. (b) 99 stationed at Regina depot; 26 stationed at Ottawa depot.

5. Officers commanding districts throughout the Dominion were instructed to secure suitable men. Posters were printed and distributed.

6. $1,146.48.

7. (a) Expenses from England to port of debarkation in Canada (Quebec), nil. (b) Expenses of recruits from Quebec to Ottawa and Regina, $5,370.91. Expenses of recruits from point of enlistment in Canada to depot recruiting base are defrayed from public funds.

8. (a) Yes. (b) The Mounted Police is a purely civil force and organized for the purpose of maintaining civil law and order.

MOUNTED POLICE—WITHDRAWALS—DAMAGE TO BUILDINGS

*Mr. CAHILL:

1. How many members of the Dominion Police Force have ceased their connection with it since the force was merged with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?

2. (a) How many ex-members of the Dominion Police Force are in receipt of a monetary allowance, and (b) what is the total annual amount of such allowance?

3. How many buildings occupied or used for any purpose by the members of the Mounted Police Force have been destroyed or damaged by fire or otherwise during the last nine months?

4. (a) Were investigations held? (b) If so, in how many instances and what was the result in each case?

5. What was the total amount of such damage and by whom will it be paid?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Thirty. For reasons as follows:

Purchased discharge	12
Dismissed	2
Unsuitable	1
Invalided	2
Pensioned	4
Died	2
Time expired	7
Total	30

Two of the above time-expired men have since re-engaged.

2. (a) Four (b) $2,980.83.

3. Six buildings.

4. (a) Yes. (b) Fairmont Barracks, Vancouver, damaged. Cause: Originated

in attic over No. 2 barrack room. Origin of fire given in opinion of board "that it probably started from the result of the extreme hot weather assisted by some cause or causes unknown." Building, government property; approximate loss, $18,000.

Riding School, Regina. Cause: Unknown, probably incendiary origin. Government building; approximate loss, $15,-200.

Stables, Brandon. Cause: Investigated by Board of Mounted Police Officers and Fire Commissioner of Provincial Government. This fire broke out on the second floor of the building used for poultry exhibits by the Winter Fair Board immediately above the Mounted Police stables. The board is of opinion that this fire was caused through defective wiring coming into contact with rubbish stored in the place before mentioned. This was a rented building, therefore, the Government not liable. Three smaller detachment fires occurred at Hazelton, B.C., Broadview, Sask., and Gliechen, Alta. They were all rented buildings, therefore, Government not liable. All three fires were due to accidental causes.

5. Damage to government buildings at Vancouver and Regina approximately $44,-200, chargeable to public funds.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—CANADA'S REPRESENTATIVES

*Mr. MARCILE:

1. How many persons were employed by Canada in her representation in the League of Nations?

2. What are the respective salaries?

3. What is the total amount Canada is called upon to pay her representatives owing to the fact that she belongs to the League of Nations?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a little doubt in my mind as to what the hon. gentleman wishes in the information he asks for, but taking it for granted that it is with regard to the representation of Canada at the first assembly of the League the information is as follows:

1. Canada was represented by the Rt. Hon. Sir George E. Foster, the Rt. Hon. Charles J. Doherty, and Hon. N. W. Rowell as delegates to the assembly; Mr. Loring Christie as legal expert; Messrs. Payne, Ahern and Robinson, secretaries.

2. The expenses of the delegates were paid in addition to the regular departmental salaries.

3. Nothing.

BOARD OF COMMERCE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Board of Commerce still in existence?

2. If so, who are the present members of the Board?

3. When were they appointed, upon whose recommendation, and at what respective salaries?

4. How many enquiries have been held by the Board since last Session?

5. Where were they held and what were the decisions or rulings rendered by the Board?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. The Board of Commerce under the Statute still exists but the organization has been reduced to the following: the secretary, one stenographer and one messenger.

2. None.

3. Answered by reply to No. 2.

4. Four.

5. As follows: Montreal, Sugar.—Decision permitting increase in price. Ottawa, Sugar.—Decision reducing price and limiting buying and selling of sugar. Toronto, Milk.—Enquiry re price of milk; decision reserved;—Reduction in price effected subsequently. Toronto, Boots and Shoes.—Order restraining dealers from certain practices deemed to be unfair.

Enquiries were in progress at various points with a view to formal hearing by the Board, which ceased on resignation of Commissioners.

IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION—DUTIES PAID

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What were the total values of imports for home consumption of each of the following classes of goods during the calendar year 1920, —Agricultural and vegetable products; animals and their products; vegetables; agricultural implements; mowing machines; lawn mowers; and harvesters (self binding)?

2. What was the amount of duty collected on each of the above classes?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1 and 2.

	Imports entered of consumption Value	Duty Collected
Agricultural and vegetable products mainly foods (This group includes vegetables)	$183,673,789	$19,848,308 49
Vegetable	4,095,420	686,500 75
Agricultural and vegetable products other than foods	92,223,738	18,231,382 82
Animals and their products	77,622,632	6,254,991 66
Agricultural Implements (including mowing machines, lawn mowers and harvesters self-binding)	25,259,071	1,901,259 68
Mowing machines	80,432	10,054 08
Lawn mowers	60,959	19,783 10
Harvesters, self-binding	1,006,361	125,795 24

APPROPRIATION FOR PRIVATE SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. EULER:

1. What portion if any of the sum of $20,000,000 appropriated by the Parliament of Canada in 1920 for the construction of ships by private shipbuilding concerns, has been used for that purpose?

2. If the fund has not been drawn upon, what is the reason?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No such sum was appropriated. Chap. 70, 10-11 Geo. V. provided for endorsements of notes not exceeding $20,000,000.

2. Some applications have been received but none recommended.

DESTRUCTION OF STATUTES OF CANADA PLATES

*Mr. HALLADAY:

1. Did either Messrs. Bailey or Wolffe, who were engaged in the work of reorganizing the Printing Bureau, as reprentatives of the Arthur Young Company, of Chicago, issue instructions for the destruction of the plates from which the Statutes of Canada are printed?

2. On whose authority did Messrs. Bailey or Wolffe adopt this course?

3. Was the concurrence of the King's Printer asked before this step was taken?

4. When was such destruction carried out?

5. How many years' Statutes are covered by this action?

6. Are the originals of all the Statutes since Confederation still in the possession of Parliament, or were they destroyed in the fire of February 3, 1916?

7. How much will it cost to re-set and electrotype the Statutes, the plates of which have been destroyed, should it be found necessary to reprint them?

8. What officer of Parliament could verify as to the accuracy of the Statutes so reprinted?

9. If either Messrs. Bailey or Wolffe, as representatives of the Arthur Young Company, acted in the manner indicated without the authority of the Civil Service Commission or any member of the Government, will an action for damages lie against the Arthur Young Company for the unwarranted course pursued by their employees?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

The subject of the above question is under investigation by His Honour Colin George Snider, Judge of the County Court of the County of Wentworth, in the province of Ontario, under a Commission of Inquiry dated the 27th of December, 1920, amended and extended so as to authorize the said Commissioner to inquire into the particulars of all material and equipment purchased, sold or otherwise disposed of, in or from the Printing Bureau since 1st January, 1919.

PRINTING BUREAU—DOCUMENTS AND MACHINES DESTROYED

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Government aware that, since the Classification has been made by the experts, documents printed at the Printing Bureau have been destroyed on account of their being defective, and that the reprinting of same caused a loss of over $100,000?

2. Is the Government aware that machines said to be in perfectly good condition, which had been in use at the Printing Bureau, have been sold for scrap iron?

3. If so, what sum was realized by such sale?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.

2 and 3. The subject of these questions is under investigation by His Honour Colin George Snider, Judge of the County Court of the County of Wentworth, in the province of Ontario, under a Commission of Inquiry dated the 27th of December, 1920, amended and extended so as to authorize the said Commissioner to inquire into the particulars of all material and equipment purchased, sold or otherwise disposed of, in or from the Printing Bureau since 1st January, 1919.

REMISSION OF MOTORBUS TAX

Mr. BOURASSA:

Are motorbuses subject to the tax of fifteen per cent as per paragraph "A", section 4 of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

No. Tax was remitted by the Order in Council on and from 20th December, 1920.

PARLIAMENT FOR SOUTHERN IRELAND

*Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Ministry received any communication from Sir Hamar Greenwood or from the British Government inviting some of His Majesty's Canadian Ministers to take part in the inauguration of a Parliament for Southern Ireland?

2. If so, has the Government accepted the invitation?

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The answer to the first question is, No. The second question is answered by the answer to No. 1.

PERROT ISLAND BRIDGES

*Mr. LAFORTUNE:

Has the Government any intention of assisting in the construction of the bridges on Perrot island for which undertaking the Quebec Government has promised to vote, during this present session, the sum of $600,000?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

As this is a work entirely within the Province, the Federal Government has no liability for the construction of these bridges and therefore is not called upon to make any monetary contribution but has agreed to assist to the extent of providing engineering services to assist in preparing plans and estimates for the Isle Perrot Bridges Commission.

ST. ROMUALD—POST OFFICE

Mr. BOURASSA:

Is it the intention of the Government to construct at St. Romuald, Lévis County, a post office replacing the present office?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY: Not at present.

MURRAY BAY—PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government received petitions from residents of Little River St. François, Ile aux Coudres, Murray Bay (St. Etienne de la Malbaie) and Point au Pic, St. Fidèle and St. Siméon, requesting the construction of certain public works or buildings at these places?
2. If so, has the Government considered the advisability of proceeding with the said works?
3. If so, when are said works to begin?
4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Petitions were received for the construction of a post office at Pointe a Pic, a wharf at Murray Bay (St. Etienne de Malbaie), and improvements to the wharf at St. Fidèle and repairs to the wharf at St. Siméon.

2, 3 and 4. Information will be given when the Estimates are submitted to Parliament.

MONTREAL—POST OFFICE ETC.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has an inquiry recently been asked for with regard to the administration in Montreal district of (a) Post Office; (b) Inland Revenue Office; (c) Customs Office, and (d) Public Works Office?
2. If so, at whose request were the said inquiries made?
3. What reasons were given for said inquiry?
4. Has there been any correspondence between the parties interested and the department in question in these inquiries? If so, will the Government produce such correspondence?
5. Have inquiries in each case been made upon request?
6. If not, why were they made?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

Post Office Department:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. There has been no investigation in so far as complaints against the Montreal Post Office are concerned, the only investigation being in connection with the re-organization which is being undertaken throughout the Postal Service generally.

Inland Revenue and Customs Office:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. No information.

Public Works:

1. No.

2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 1.

[Mr. McCurdy.]

GRAND TRUNK EQUIPMENT TRUST CERTIFICATES

Mr. McMASTER:

1. During the fiscal year 1920-21, was there borrowed by the Grand Trunk Railway on equipment trust certificates, the sum of $12,000,000?
2. If so, did the Government guarantee these certificates?
3. If not, were they issued with the full consent and authority of the Government and is the Government in any way responsible for their payment?
4. Did the commission and cost of distribution for this $12,000,000 worth of certificates cost $1,002,000?
5. Is 6½ per cent the rate of interest being paid on these certificates?
6. Is the interest and principal payable in New York?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Issued by authority of Government, but Government in no way responsible as they are a mortgage on the rolling stock purchased.
4. Certificates were sold at 91.65 and realized $10,998,000 in New York funds.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.

CANADIAN NORTHERN BONDS

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Did the Government on December 1, 1920, guarantee Canadian Northern Railway Bonds to the amount of $25,000,000?
2. Was $950,000 paid as a commission for selling these bonds in New York?
3. In addition to this commission what other expenses were incurred?
4. Is 7 per cent the rate of interest being charged on this loan?
5. Is the interest and principal payable in New York?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No; bonds were sold at $96.20; net proceeds $24,050,000 New York funds.
3. Expense accounts not yet rendered.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.

GRAND TRUNK BONDS

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Did the Government on October 1, 1920, guarantee Grand Trunk Railway bonds to the extent of $25,000,000?
2. After the commission and other expenses had been paid did the railway company receive only $23,595,205.31 for the sale of these bonds?
3. Is 7 per cent the rate of interest being paid on these bonds?
4. Is the principal and interest payable in New York?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.

2. These bonds were sold at 94½ and realized $23,595,205.31 in New York funds.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Did the Canadian Northern Railway Company or any of its subsidiary companies issue certificates on May 1, 1920, to the amount of $15,000,000?

2. If so, what is the name of the subsidiary company issuing these certificates?

3. Were these certificates or bonds guaranteed by the Government?

4. If not, why not?

5. Did the commission for selling this $15,000,000 worth of bonds, and the expenses connected therewith amount to $766,568.85?

6. What were the net proceeds received from this loan after commission and expenses had been paid?

7. What rate of interest is being paid on these certificates?

8. Is the interest and principal payable in New York?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Canadian National Rolling Stock Company.

3. No.

4. Not necessary as they are a direct charge on the rolling stock on which they were issued.

5. No; the bonds were sold at 95 and realized $14,250,000 in New York funds.

6. Net proceeds after deducting expenses, $16,568.85, $14,233,431.15.

7. Seven per cent.

8. Yes.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. How many new rural mail delivery routes were established during 1920?

2. In what municipalities were said routes put into force?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Fifteen.

2. St. Andrews, Antigonish and Guysborough, N.S.; Londonderry, Colchester, N.S.; Yarmouth, Yarmouth & Clare, N.S.; St. Stephen and St. James, Charlotte, N.B.; Beresford, Gloucester, N.B.; Mount Murray, Charlevoix & Montmorency, Que.; Low, Wright, Que.; Clinton, Lincoln, Ont.; Medonte, Simcoe, E.R., Ont.; Hallam, Algoma, E.R., Ont.; Hallam and May, Algoma, E.R., Ont.; Rosedale, Neepawa, Man., (2 routes); Artland, Battleford, Sask. (2 routes).

UNAUTHORIZED INSURANCE COMPANIES—SPECIAL TAX

Mr. RINFRET:

Has the Government any intention of levying a special tax on unauthorized insurance companies, which are known as mutual companies?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

No information in advance of Budget Speech or legislation, if any.

CAPTAIN SEFEROVITCH

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the Government aware of the conduct of Captain Seferovitch, Serbian Consul at Montreal in making publi: accusations against Canadian citizens by means of letters in the press?

2. If so, does it intend to take any action in the matter?

3. Have any representations been made to the Government with reference to the personal record of the said Captain Seferovitch?

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1 and 2. The attention of the Government has not been drawn to any letters in the press making accusations against Canadian citizens, and therefore the question of taking action as suggested has not been considered.

3. When the appointment of Captain Seferovitch as Consul of Serbia was proposed the usual inquiries were made as to his suitability for the position, and the fact that His Majesty's Exequatur was issued to enable him to take up his duties is evidence of the satisfactory outcome of such inquiries.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Has the Governor in Council prohibited the export of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars, from the Dominion of Canada, and if so, is such prohibition still in force, and under what authority, and how and when was such prohibition declared, made or published?

2. If the Governor in Council has prohibited the export of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada, was such prohibition absolute, or was such gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars, notwithstanding such prohibition as may have been made in respect thereof, still subject to export in certain cases, or by virtue of permits or licenses, secured for such purposes?

3. Has the Governor in Council, or the Government of the Dominion of Canada, or any minister or official or officer thereof, issued or granted permits or licenses permitting or authorizing the export of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada, by any person, bank, company or corporation since the 1st of January, 1918; and if so, to what persons or persons, bank or

banks, company or companies, corporation or corporations were such permits or licenses to export gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars granted or issued since the 1st of January, 1918, and what were the respective dates of such permits or licenses?

4. To what person, bank, company or corporation was each of such permits and licenses issued or granted, and when, and what amounts of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars were authorized to be exported by each of such permits and licenses; and what amount of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars has actually been exported under each of such permits and licenses?

5. Did such permits or licenses as may have been issued for the export of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars or the applications therefor specify to what country or countries the gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars, thereby authorized to be exported, were to be sent, and if so, what country or countries were so mentioned or specified in each of said permits or licenses, and in each application for such permits or licenses?

6. Has any charge or charges been made by the Governor in Council, by the Government of the Dominion of Canada or by any minister, official or officer thereof, for permits or licenses to export gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada, and if so, what charge or charges; and have the charge or charges so made depended to any extent, and if so, to what extent, upon the amount of gold coin, gold bullion or fine gold bars that the respective permits or licenses authorized to be exported?

Mr. GORDON:

1. What was the total number of enlistments in the Canadian Expeditionary Force (including men who enlisted under the Military Service Act) from the outbreak of the war to Armstice day?

2. What number of the said men served in (a) Canada; (b) England, and (c) France?

3. What was the total number of examinations of pensioners conducted by the Board of Pension Commissioners from June, 1920, to date?

4. What was the number of reductions in pensions made and the total amount thereof?

5. What has been the cost of the administration of the Board of Pension Commissioners for the whole period of the Board's existence?

6. What number of employees (a) male, and (b) female, were employed by the said Board, and how many of the male employees saw service in France?

7. What number of men employed in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment saw service in France, and what has been the total cost of administration of this department to date?

8. How many men are in the service of the Soldier's Settlement Board and the Vocational Training Board, and what number of them saw service in France?

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many bushels of Canadian grain have been carried from Winnipeg eastwards during 1919 and how many in 1920?

2. What quantity of Canadian grown grain exported abroad has been shipped through Canadian ports, from what ports and what quantity in each case, during 1919 and 1920?

[Mr. Devlin.]

3. What quantity of Canadian grown grain has been exported through American ports during 1919 and 1920, from what ports and what quantity through each port?

4. What quantity of Canadian grown grain has been carried from the West to the East during 1919 and 1920—(a) by the C.P.R., (b) by the G.T.R., (c) by the Government Railways?

5. What is the rate now prevailing on the transportation of grain in Canada (a) on the Government Railways, (b) on the various other railways?

Mr. McGIBBON (Argenteuil):

1. What was the total number of employees in the Civil Service in the year 1913?

2. What was the total number of employees in the Civil Service in the year 1920?

Mr. DUFF:

1. In what countries have commercial agencies been established by the Federal Government?

2. What are the names of said agents, their previous address, present address, previous business experience, date of appointment, and respective salaries?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. In regard to the Federal Civil Service what is understood to be comprised by the words (a) Inside Service; (b) Outside Service.

2. How many employees are there at present in the (a) Inside Service; (b) Outside Service?

Mr. STEELE:

1. What was the number of Civil Servants in the inside Service in each Department of the Government on December 31, 1920?

2. How many days absence, exclusive of regular holidays were recorded in each Department for the year 1920?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What was the cost of each of the by-elections held since last session in the Dominion of Canada for the House of Commons?

2. How many members of the Government have taken part in same and what are their names?

3. Where did they work or speak?

4. Was there any Government private car or motor used in connection with said by-elections by the members of the Government or their representatives?

5. If so, how many and for what special election?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. ROBB for Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a statement showing: (a) the total amount collected by the Government on packing houses and cold storage plants, (1) under the law of excess profits, (2) under the Order in Council of 9th of March, 1918, fixing the profits of such houses and cold storage plants; (b) the names of these firms who have paid; (c) the dates of said payments; (d) the amount of each payment respectively.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is adopted, I desire to point out that there is no objection whatever to complying with

the motion in so far as it ought to be complied with. There are, however, provisions in the different Acts which look towards keeping confidential information which is confidentially obtained. So far as I can see there is no reason why the return should not be made showing the total amount collected by the Government on packing houses and cold storage plants; showing also how much is collected under the law of excess profits; and showing also how much is collected under the Order in Council of March 9, 1918. The matter which is open to question and objection is the disclosing names of particular firms and the amounts of their particular business. I think the hon. member will probably agree with me.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERS AND DIRECTORSHIPS

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McMaster for the second reading of Bill No. 10, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect this debate would be resumed so early and I have not before me some of the memoranda that I had intended to use in dealing with the subject.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member might further adjourn the debate.

Mr. STEVENS: If it would be all right, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to move the adjournment of the debate again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The order will stand by consent.

FRENCH TREATY

Mr. ROBB for Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved:

For a copy of the new treaty of commerce between France and Canada.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I desire to inform the hon. member that the treaty has not yet been dealt with by the other parties to it sufficiently far to warrant us in publishing a copy. When the treaty is ready for publication we shall be glad to furnish my hon. friend with a copy.

Mr. ROBB: We might let the motion stand until the return of the hon. member. (Mr. Archambault.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stands.

INSPECTION OF GAS AND GAS METERS

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) Bill No. 13 to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Inpection of Gas and Gas Meters, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—definitions:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This Bill is both to amend and to consolidate different Acts. Perhaps my hon. friend would direct the attention of the Committee to any amending features when they are not apparent from the Bill itself.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will do that as we pass along. Some amendments are introduced, and consolidation has taken place. It was thought better to consolidate the old Acts and make the amendments at the same time so that it would be all under the one cover.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—regulations:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move that clause 3 be amended by adding thereto, as paragraph (g), the following words: "as to pressure under which gas is to be supplied." That is at present in the old Act, but it was omitted in the printing of the new.

Mr. BUREAU: In the old Act I find these words, immediately following those which my hon. friend has just moved to insert as paragraph (g):

In the case of inodorous gas, to require the addition of such substances as he deems necessary in order to communicate the odor.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the old Act there is such a clause as my hon. friend has mentioned; I do not know just why it has been left out of this Bill. My officer is on his way here; we will let the clause stand until we get an explanation from him.

Amendment agreed to.

Section stands.

On section 4—units of measure:

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): Does paragraph 2 have reference to natural gas as supplied to consumers in different parts in Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill deals with both natural and manufactured gas.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): What provision is made for the testing of natural gas?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall come to that a little later.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—certificate of registration:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a new clause so far as inspection of gas is concerned, but old as regards electricity. It is considered necessary to apply to the supplying of gas the inspection provision which has worked so well with regard to electrical supply. The certificates are furnished free of charge, and are for the period of a year. They have a statistical value as well, because you know then who are engaged in the work of supplying gas and are able to keep the business under supervision, which you could not do if you did not have the system of registration.

Mr. PARENT: Will this legislation be retroactive? Will it apply to companies already in existence?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has no retroactive effect.

Mr. BUREAU: But it must apply to companies already in existence, for it says:

No distribution system for supplying gas to any purchaser shall be operated until the contractor has obtained from the minister a certificate of registration for such system.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not retroactive; it does not operate until the Bill becomes law, but when the Bill does become law the certificate will be asked for from that date.

Mr. BUREAU: Take the case of Three Rivers, where the system of gas distribution has been in operation for some time and under very varying conditions. We have had natural gas and we have had artificial gas, and I do not think that anyone in the town could make any accurate report on the system, because it is not known where the pipes are. If the provision has reference to the manner in which the gas is manufactured, whether with coal or with sawdust, well and good.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All it requires is that the company or person operating the distribution system shall get a certificate of registration. You cannot carry on your inspection system unless you know what persons or companies are operating the different systems.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. BUREAU: That is, every gas company must register with the department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: For a couple of months last winter the gas supplied in Montreal was very bad and complaints poured into the City Hall every day. The company replied that the coal was inferior. Is there in this Bill anything to prevent a repetition of that state of affairs?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not quite know what brought about that state of affairs. The department has to do with the inspection of gas; I do not think it has anything to do with looking out for supplies of coal or the finances of a company or anything of that kind. This is merely to see that the gas which is distributed, is measured under proper regulations, so that the consumer shall get his benefit and the contractor or supplier shall be under the regulations and rules of the department.

Mr. MARCIL: Did the department receive any complaints from Montreal last winter in regard to the quality of the gas supplied and, if so, did the department take any action? The gas gave out a very bad smell; in fact, in some places we had to cease using the gas entirely on account of its inferior quality. Is any power taken in this Bill to prevent a repetition of that state of affairs?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The impurity of gases and the bad quality of gases come directly under the department and we have penalties and fines which may be imposed. The matter is now being attended to in the courts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East): We have a number of companies distributing natural gas in cities and towns in the western part of Ontario, and at times the gas that is supplied is mixed with a large quantity of air. While the gas meters are supplying the people who own the gas wells with the means of taxing the consumer, on the other hand, the consumer is compelled to pay for a very inferior quality of gas. I do not see in the Bill any provision whereby the consumer is sufficiently protected in that regard. The same thing would apply in connection with gas supplied to cities, as has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil).

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am informed that natural gas is not purified by any steps which are taken by the department and it is very difficult to do that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East): What protection is there in the Bill for the consumer of natural gas?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That seems to be a matter between the contractor and the purchaser. Natural gas is sold as it comes from the soil, and the question whether it is or is not good, and of a quality to fulfil the expectations of the purchaser must, to a large extent, be a matter of bargain between the purchaser and the supplier.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East): I am sorry indeed there is not in the Bill some provision whereby consumers of natural gas are protected against the men who supply the gas. While it is true that at certain periods of the year, the gas furnished to consumers in western Ontario in particular is of very good quality, yet when there is a shortage of that gas, the general impression is that a large proportion of the material that is furnished through the meters is air which is allowed to be pumped into the pipe lines. I should like to see some protection of the consumer of natural gas, if that is at all possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: What effect would the presence of air in the pipes have on gas? I do not know anything about natural gas, but I know something about coal gas.

Mr. ARMSTRONG, (Lambton East): It simply passes through the meter and is registered as gas, although it is merely air which, when it is placed under your furnace or in your stove, does not produce very much heat.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The former legislation which we are amending today made no provision for that, and it is not considered that it is really possible to do so under our Constitution.

Mr. CAHILL: What is required by the department from the contractor in order that he may receive a certificate?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He must give the information that he is a distributor of gas, the number of his meters, and a general idea as to his system of distribution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East): Will the minister be good enough to request his officials to investigate this matter in order to see if it is not possible to devise some legislation whereby consumers of natural gas will be sufficiently protected?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why is an annual certificate required? Business men, as a rule, like to have as little interference as possible, and if they receive a certificate when things are going along well, with no complaints from the inspector, why should they be kept under observation every year and compelled to take out a new certificate?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not much trouble in getting or in giving a certificate. The questions which have to be answered are very few and simple; but the department wants to know quite as much as those who go out of the business as the new ones who come into it. Therefore, if you have the expiry of the certificate at the end of each year, you know exactly how many have gone out of the business; and if you require a certificate from everyone doing business, you know all the new ones who come in. In that way your record is complete, and the interference with the business or the trouble given to the firm or association is practically nil.

Mr. PARENT: There seems to be no particular reason why this matter is not left in the hands of the provinces, because a province can grant a charter to a company to distribute gas or electricity. I should like to know if there is any special reason why the federal authorities are interfering in this matter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This has been the practice since Confederation, since the first establishment of these two branches I can see very evident advantages which would come from having a capable general supervisory power, and it would be fair to assume, I think, that you would get a better supervisory power from the federal department which devotes its time to the whole Dominion, and can bring about uniformity of work and uniform protection for the citizens.

Mr. PARENT: If this condition has existed since Confederation, I do not see why the section is marked "New."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Weights and Measures certainly come under the federal jurisdiction, and this is simply a device for measuring or weighing gas.

Mr. CAHILL: What would be the penalty for failing to apply for this certificate?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will come to that section later.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend in answer to a question put by my hon.

friend (Mr. Cahill) or my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) rather indicated that the obtaining of this certificate of registration was largely a matter of form. If that be the fact, I would point out that the language of the section itself indicates that it goes somewhat beyond that. It says:

No distribution system for supplying gas to any purchaser shall be operated until the contractor has obtained from the minister a certificate of registration for such system.

Assuming that an application was made and the certificate refused, obviously under this section no person could proceed to distribute under any particular system. That being obvious, what I would like to know is, what is the practical application of the section? Is it optional with the department to refuse such a certificate, or has the department some standard up to which all systems must measure or what regulations in the department have to be complied with before such certificate can be issued? Obviously, if this section were to be strictly interpreted, a person might be prohibited from doing business altogether.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is very true. It is really one of the objects of the Act, that inefficient systems which are not scientific in their nature, or not correct in their working, shall not be operated to the disadvantage of consumers, who have to pay according to the meter readings. It is for the purpose of protecting the consumers from inefficient or deficient methods of distribution. The department has to satisfy itself that the system is reasonably efficient for distribution, and that under that particular system the purchaser of gas will get the service that is reasonably due.

Mr. MURPHY: May I inquire if there are certain fixed standards or regulations in the department that are well known to people engaged in this business?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am informed by the officer that the purpose of this section is mainly statistical, so that the department shall know who are and who are not doing business. The certificates are generally granted as a matter of course when application is made, and the information obtained is filed.

Mr. MURPHY: Having regard to the explanation just given by my right hon. friend, does he not think that the language of this section is a little too rigid?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It merely asks that a certificate be granted.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. MURPHY: But it leaves it optional with the department to refuse to grant the certificate, and without the certificate a person cannot carry on business.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am told that exactly the same provision has been in the Electrical Inspection Act, and that no trouble has ever been found.

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest that if the object of this section is merely that the department shall know who are and who are not doing business in Canada, it ought to be changed, because at present it provides that no system shall be operated until the contractor has first obtained a certificate. That is too drastic, as my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) says. If the object of the section is mainly statistical, why not draft the clause to read that every contractor supplying gas shall obtain a certificate under a penalty; but do not stop the system just because he does not get a certificate. Under this section, as it stands, if a man in Three Rivers, or in Ottawa, or anywhere else, did not get a certificate. some over-zealous officer in the department could come down and close his plant. That is too drastic. If we are going to legislate as to the quality of gas and provide remedies where a bad quality of gas is being distributed, let us have another clause drafted. But this one exposes even the consumer to hardship.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not the intention of this clause to interfere with systems already existing and distributing gas, but that every new company shall get a certificate of registration, and that thereafter these certificates shall be supplied yearly in order that a complete statistical record may be kept of what companies are doing business.

Mr. BUREAU: If that is the object, we ought to say "No distribution system for supplying gas hereafter installed or established," and so on. As the section reads now, all existing distributing systems are included, and the supply of gas could be cut off if a certificate was not obtained.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This clause covers a question that has been a very troublesome one in some parts of the country during the past winter, where companies had threatened to shut off the gas supply to some of their patrons, who had objected to the very great increase in the price of gas charged by the company in violation of contracts made with certain towns. I was not

aware that it was necessary for the companies to receive a certificate of registration annually from the department, but that being the case, I can see the danger of having the supply entirely cut off in case the certificate is refused. A great many people in western Ontario use this natural gas for heating their houses, and if a license is not to be issued, then some means should be provided to see that the supply be maintained so that these people shall not suffer seriously as a result. Many people have no other heating facilities than natural gas. With regard to the question of the impurities of natural gas, the difficulty in certain towns in western Ontario during the past winter has been that companies have refused to purify the gas as they had contracted to do. As this Bill is endeavouring to regulate the gas companies, some provision should be embodied in it to ensure the purity of the gas, and also that, in the event of a certificate being refused a company, some means should be provided to see that the supply is maintained and that the consumer does not suffer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Possibly my hon. friend did not hear the slight conversation that passed between another hon. gentleman and myself with reference to natural gas, in the course of which I stated that none of our legislation preceding this had undertaken to look after the purification of natural gas. It is a very difficult thing to do, and I promised my hon. friend to have my officers look into the matter to see whether there was any possible method of doing it. The matter will have to rest there for the present. The difficulties which my hon. friend has stated I have seen discussed in the newspapers and in representations made from various quarters, as to the poor quality of natural gas. I must say that we have not yet legislated in that direction; heretofore the department has considered it so difficult that it has not undertaken to do that work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was particularly interested in the fact that these companies require an annual license, and I was anxious to know what would happen if that certificate were not granted and a company were unable to do business, especially in the middle of winter when their customers depend almost entirely on the supply of natural gas. If the company were refused this certificate, what machinery is there to insure the supply to those who depend upon this gas for their heating purposes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purpose of this clause is merely to get statistics into the hands of the department. It is not its purpose at all to refuse a certificate because of the quality of the gas, the defects of the system, or anything of that kind. The purpose of this clause, I repeat, is simply statistical.

Mr. MURPHY: In view of what my hon. friend says and obviously intends to do, would it not be better to amend the wording of the section so as to provide that every distribution system shall file with the department so and so, whatever the regulations are, upon which filing the certificates shall issue?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The objection to clause 5 as urged on this side of the House as well as on the other, seems to be the apprehension that it will stop the operation of gas companies altogether, with some embarrassment to those who are receiving gas. I would suggest that the minister change the clause so as to read:

> Every system supplying gas to any purchaser shall obtain from the minister a certificate of registration for such system, such certificate to expire on the 31st day of March each year.

That would compel them to get a certificate while it would not interfere with their operations. Section 13 says the contractor is penalized if he does not get the certificate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If he does not get his registered certificate.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under clause 5, which says that no distribution system for supplying gas "shall be operated until the contractor has obtained from the minister a certificate of registration," prevents him from operating if he fails to get the certificate. I do not think it is the intention of the minister to interfere with the operations of these gas concerns, but only to subject them to a penalty for failure to obtain the certificates. I think therefore that the clause is open to amendment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is right in the statement that it is not the intention to stop the operation of any gas system by reason of failure to obtain the certificate. The purpose of the clause is simply to compel the contractor to obtain his certificate, so that you may know that he is at work. The penalty in clause 13 is imposed for failure to get registration.

The certificate of registration is really given as a matter of course.

Mr. BUREAU: I think clause 5 ought to be amended in accordance with the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie).

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Section 5 is not intended to prevent operation at all; it merely requires registration.

Mr. BUREAU: If it has any object it must be to scare the contractor. As it stands, however, it seems to me that failure to get the certificate precludes operation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The registered certificate is required solely for statistical purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 13 states that failure to obtain the certificate is punishable by fine of $10 for each day during which such failure continues. That is quite plain. If it is not the intention to prevent operations on this account, then I say that section 5 must be amended; because as it stands it distinctly prevents any work being done: It says that no distribution system "shall" be operated until certificate is obtained.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps it might meet the difficulty and be perfectly clear if the section read:

> Every distribution system for supplying gas to any purchaser shall obtain from the minister a certificate of registration for such system.

Mr. PEDLOW: What is the particular reason for requiring an annual application for registration? Once a gas company has registered would that not be quite sufficient? These concerns are not like some small affair; the contractors cannot put them on their backs and walk off with them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would be rather difficult for them to put the gas system into their pockets and go away with them, but still a company might go out of business, and it is well to have the registration complete in the office. Besides, it entails no hardship.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause now reads:

> Every distribution system for supplying gas to any purchaser shall first obtain from the minister a certificate of registration for such system.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The word "first" should not be there.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. NESBITT: Supposing a contractor is supplying gas and at the end of the year he fails to obtain a certificate?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He gets his certificate as a matter of course, as long as he has a system in operation.

Section as amended agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bureau now moves that the committee refer to clause 3 of the Bill. Shall clause 3 as amended carry?

Mr. BUREAU: I renew my objections.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman's point is provided for in section 19 which we will come to later.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with this clause may I ask my right hon. friend if provision is made elsewhere in the Bill for the speedy publication of these Orders in Council that are passed? The Bill is of such general application and of such importance, that it seems to me necessary that the different Orders in Council which may be passed under this section should become speedily known.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Copies of the Orders in Council are distributed immediately to each company direct from the office.

Mr. MURPHY: May it not be a matter of general interest that the Orders in Council should be published in the Canada Gazette, for instance, within a certain time after the Orders are passed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Order in Council affects the contractor and he gets a copy of it. The departmental officer thinks that no good purpose would be gained by carrying out my friend's suggestion. It would only be another cause of expense and we are so economical these days.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think section 19, to which my right hon. friend referred, meets the case. It does not appear to me that the provisions are such as to give sufficient protection to the consumer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I understand the question has been raised as to whether the power to act in this matter belongs to the Dominion, or whether it is a question of provincial and municipal regulation.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see that there would be any danger to the public interest if we were to preserve the language of the

old Act. It has been in effect since 1910 and I do not think its authority has ever been disputed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am informed that on two or three occasions cases have been taken to Court and we have lost them.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like the right hon. gentleman to cite me one of those cases in respect to gas.

Section as amended agreed to.

On Section 6—right of access by contractor to premises where gas is used.

Mr. BUREAU: Paragraph (c) gives the contractor the power to enter the premises of a purchaser for the purpose of changing or removing any piping, et cetera. That seems to me to be a kind of arbitrary power to confer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But the contractor will be responsible for repairs.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all very well but some times a person would prefer not to be deprived of gas even if he obtained damages. It is provided that the contractor shall be responsible for any damage done, but he can take the piping away and leave the consumer without gas—in fact he may do it summarily. If it were provided that it might be done for certain reasons, or under certain conditions it would afford better protection for the consumer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The clause as introduced here is new only as relates to gas inspection. It has been in force for the last twenty years in the inspection of electricity and no difficulty has been experienced under it.

Mr. BUREAU: The two systems are not the same in character and therefore you cannot compare them. Although they give the same results, that is to say they yield power, heat and light, the two systems are absolutely different.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I know they are different, but in both cases contractor has to go inside the house to install the apparatus.

Mr. BUREAU: But I maintain that the two cases are not on all fours. There is nothing in the Act concerning electricity that gives a contractor power to go into another person's house and rip up floors in order to put in wiring. Unless it is a matter of contract as between the parties, the company, in the case of electricity stops at the outside wall and provides you with the current there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think my hon. friend's fears are justified as to what injury may be done.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not got any fears.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Experience is the best test in a matter of this kind.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not believe in waiting until the horse is stolen before locking the stable.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If a pipe gets out of order and the contractor is responsible he ought to have the right of entry and the right to make good the damage which exists inside and prevents the system from working.

Mr. BUREAU: To say that the contractor can enter a house and remove any piping is a little hard.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bureau moves: that clause 6 be amended by striking out the words "or removing" in the fortieth line. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. McDERMAND: Does the provision in clause (c) mean that the inspector may enter a gas field and remove any of the regulators and so stop the pressure of gas to the public?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the owner of the building or house comes to the conclusion that he will not take any more gas, the contractor will have the right to enter and remove his fixtures.

Mr. BUREAU: He has already at law full remedy to get back what belongs to him. I do not see why we should give him this drastic power of entering and ripping out pipes and meters.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is not an hon. member of this group entitled to have his question answered so that he can hear the answer?

Mr. McDERMAND: Will the inspector have the right to enter a private building and remove the piping or interfere with a line supplying a village with gas by removing a meter or cutting a pipe without consulting the consumer or consumers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the contractor.

Mr. McDERMAND: Would he have that right without giving notice to the public?

The reason I ask this question is because in my immediate vicinity last fall a whole village was cut off by a certain gas company removing the pressure meter, and the people were in darkness and suffered a good deal of inconvenience in consequence; in fact, the lighthouses along the lake were out.

Mr. McKENZIE: I submit that this right should be left entirely to the contract or agreement that the selling of gas makes with the purchaser. They have their private contract, and one of its terms should be that the contractor has the right to go in and remove his property from any building, or to go in and repair that property; but I think it is rather arbitrary for us to make a one-sided contract and give the contractor this unlimited power.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready for the question? Sir George Foster moves that clause 6 do carry. Mr. Bureau moves an amendment to strike out the words "or removing" in the fortieth line.

Mr. NESBITT: Before you put the motion, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but I must remind the hon. member that the motion was put for the second time. The Committee was asked if it was ready for the question, and no answer came. I am sure the hon. gentleman's remarks will be quite relevant after the motion is put.

Amendment (Mr. Bureau) negatived.

Mr. NESBITT: I was going to speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, but as it has been declared lost I have nothing more to say.

Mr. PEDLOW: Has the Minister considered—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow me? I think we had better be a little careful before we strike this out of the Bill as it has been very carefully prepared by officers who have had this matter under their charge for many years, and they have brought down to the House what they consider is necessary for the proper carrying out of the Act. I have been speaking with the inspector, and if the clause be considered somewhat drastic in its present form, as stated by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), it might be made perfectly reasonable by the addition of this phrase:

The contractor may at all reasonable hours and with the consent of the purchaser. . .

[Mr. McDermand.]

Mr. BUREAU: Since my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. McDermand) has taken the floor I think my case is far stronger. Supposing gas is being supplied to me and to another consumer through a common pipe, and the company wish to cut off his supply by tearing out a piece of pipe not only my house but the house of the man whom they wanted to deprive of gas will be shut off. Why should the contractor come on the premises and tear out the pipe? My hon. friend says that it is the contractor's property. But the contractor is entitled to replevy that property at any time. I think a county court judge is much better equipped to try each particular case than we are to lay down a general law empowering a contractor at any time to enter and remove piping. My right hon. friend may change the wording of the clause, but the removal of the piping is the objectionable feature.

Mr. McDERMAND: It was the question of removal that affected the village of which I spoke. The company removed the generator in that case and the whole village was in darkness and subject to the weather. I think the consumer should have certain notice given him before changes or removals are made.

Mr. MURPHY: Who did it in that case?

Mr. McDERMAND: The Dominion Gas Company.

Mr. NESBITT: The amendment was declared lost.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment to strike out the words "or removing" from clause (c) was lost, but any other amendment striking out the entire paragraph or amending it in any way except deleting the words "or removing" would be in order.

Mr. DOHERTY: It might be pointed out that this section, at all events as I understand it, does not confer on a man the right to remove piping; it is for the purpose of giving him a right to enter the premises.

Mr. BUREAU: For what purpose?

Mr. DOHERTY: Supposing that that man had a lawful right to remove piping. If you strike out the words "or removing", then he would not have the right to enter the premises. The purpose, as I understand it, is not to determine whether the contractor has the right to remove any piping, but when he has that right, to determine whether he shall have the right to enter at any reasonable hour for the purpose of exercising his right of removal. I would

suggest that instead of striking out the words "or removing" we insert after "removing" the words, "when lawfully entitled so to do". I should think there would be no objection to adding these words.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister will see the difficulty which is there introduced. Who is to decide what is a lawful right?

Mr. DOHERTY: My own interpretation of the section is that it confers a right to enter, not a right to remove; but where a man has a right to remove, this section gives him a right to enter. Nobody can decide then and there whether or not he has a right to remove; that necessarily would have to be fought out afterwards. Suppose a man had a judgment of the court determining that he had a right to remove, and the occupant barred the door.

Mr. BUREAU: He could go to the sheriff.

Mr. DOHERTY: He might have to go to the sheriff; but why, in cases where the right to remove is not disputed or disputable should there not be a right to enter?

Mr. McKENZIE: The purposes for which the contractor may enter are clearly defined in the section. It provides first that he may enter; then it sets forth what he may do after he gets in. Now, if it is objectionable that he should go in and do all these things, we should not allow him to go in. So far as I am familiar with the operations of electric concerns—and they are about the same thing; one supplies light and the other gas—the local Acts give them authority to put up poles, string their wires, and all that sort of thing, but the matter of what happens between the purchaser and the contractor as respects what the contractor shall do in the purchaser's house is the subject of private agreement between them. Perhaps we might well leave it to themselves to make such arrangements as might be thought proper in this regard, instead of making an unilateral contract—telling a contractor what he may do, and offering no protection to the purchaser, the man who owns the house. Then, I think the caption of this section is somewhat deceiving—"Inspection." If these things were done by a qualified inspector, I would have no objection, because he would be a good man, interested in both parties. But this is not an inspection; it is conferring power on the owner of the plant to do certain things. I do not quite understand why it comes under the head of "inspection."

Mr. MORPHY: I agree with the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie). I cannot help feeling, upon reading the whole section and the caption of it, that whoever drafted the clause intended to make sub-section (c) read this way:

> Changing or improving any piping, fittings, meters or other apparatus belonging to the contractor.

That, to my mind, is a reasonable view to take of the section; any other view is quite out of keeping with the rights of the public in dealing with large corporations supplying gas. If, on the other hand, it should be said that my view in this regard is not correct, I would simply fall in with the amendment of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) by adding to it these words: "after three days' notice to the occupant," so that paragraph (c) would read:

> changing or removing, when lawfully entitled so to do, after three days' notice to the occupant, any piping, fittings, meters or other apparatus belonging to the contractor.

So that if a person is aggrieved by arbitrary or captious pressure on the part of an incorporated company, amounting, in his opinion, to infringement upon his personal rights, he would have three days within which to apply to the court for an injunction to restrain the removal and thereby get redress before the damage is actually done.

Mr. NESBITT: I can hardly agree with my hon. friend. As to what the member for North Cape Breton says about the word "inspection," I may point out that the inspection is by the contractor's inspector, not by the provincial inspector or whoever the province employs. As to the words "removing any piping, fittings, meters" and so on, you have to give the contractor permission to remove piping because if the purchaser has not been paying his bills or for some other reason the contractor thinks it necessary to remove the meter, he could not do so without at the same time removing a certain amount of piping. I do not see how we can refuse to allow the contractor to do what is necessary to the carrying on of his business in a business-like way. He should not be asked to supply gas to people who do not pay for it. I think that the clause, taken with sub-section 2, which makes the company responsible for damage, is all right as it stands, because I do not believe any contractor or supplier of gas is going to remove piping or meters unless such ac-

tion is necessary, because he is not being paid for the gas, or has some other good reasons of that kind. These men are out to do business, just the same as anybody else, and unless they are selling at a loss —and that is not likely—the more gas they can sell the better for them.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should like the attention of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) to what I am about to suggest because I think we have been talking about this under a misapprehension; at least I know I have. This does not purport to give the right of forcible entry. It establishes the fact that a man has a right to go in to do all those things that are enumerated. If I am a tenant in possession and I do not think he has any right to do the things that he proposes to do when he enters my residence, I will simply barricade my door. He will not have any right of forcible entry; to enforce his right of entry, he will have to go to the court, and then we shall thresh out the question whether he has a right to do those things which he says he wants to enter to do. I do not think anybody is exposed to any forcible action, because the law simply says that the man has a right of entry for certain purposes, and I think we can take it for granted that his right of entry is only subject to his being in a position lawfully to do those things. I do not think anybody suffers any great danger under this clause.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) knows as well as I do that when a company is getting a charter to supply gas, it is careful to see that everything is put in that is necessary for the protection of its rights. By this clause we are giving a man, who is not under the control of the Federal Government, certain powers as regards his contract with another man who owns a house. If you were saying that the inspector should go in. I would say: "All right; this is one of your own officers, and it is up to you to legislate as to your officers". But you say, "The contractor." My right hon. friend says: "What we want by this clause is the right to enter the premises;" but where has the contractor a right to read the meter, except by this section? Where has he a right to take it away, except by this section? My objection is that we step in and say that the contractor shall do certain things. The contractor is not our officer. He may have his charter from the Dominion Government, as is the case with the Ottawa Gas company; he may get it from a provincial legislature, and in his charter all the powers of the contractor are well defined and enumerated and I think those who look after the contractor are careful, when they ask for a charter, to see that all necessary powers are granted. Why then should we give additional powrs to a contractor, such as the removal of pipes or entry at any time? Let the inspector go in and bring in the contractor if he pleases, but I object to the contractor or his servant being given the right to enter my house and to remove pipes or to do the other things that are enumerated.

As regards the clause relating to damages, I have only to mention the word "damages" to the Minister of Justice to make him smile. He knows as well as I do that very often when we go before the courts to get damages, the costs of the action exceed the compensation received. I might call that section a section of frivolity, because it does not amount to anything.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think we are going far beyond the purview of this legislation when we are dealing with property end civil rights. At an early stage of the discussion this afternoon the question was raised as to our right to go into the provinces at all to deal with matters of this kind. The minister quite properly answered that the question of weights and measures comes within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and consequently we had a right to deal with weights and measures. But clause 6 goes far beyond that; it tells a man who owns a house what shall happen; that a certain contractor may enter his house, and may do certain things. That is dealing with property and civil rights and has nothing to do with weights and measures. If we say that our inspector can go in and examine a house and do what ever is necessary for the purpose of the Bill, I will say that that is incidental to the jurisdiction of weights and measures; but I ask the Minister of Justice; By what authority can we deal in this Bill with property and civil rights? This is a question of property within a province, and we are telling a man he can go in and do practically what he pleases with that property. I do not think that comes within the scope of this legislation.

Mr. MURPHY: Listening to this debate, I felt that the matters covered by this clause are rather trifling and unimportant to be included in a Dominion Act, and I want to supplement what my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has said by suggesting to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the

Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that the matter might very well be left to contract between individuals. Would that not be covered in such cases by the ordinary arrangements that are made in regard to matters of this kind, making it unnecessary for us to incorporate it in an Act of Dominion application?

Mr. BUREAU: As regards the amendment moved by the Minister of Justice, is the contractor not lawfully entitled to enter when he is given the right of access?

Mr. DOHERTY: If anybody objects to my amendment I have no desire to press it. Personally, I do not think it is necessary. I think, that with the exception of the right to enter, this clause does not confer substantial rights on anybody who has not those rights already.

Mr. BUREAU: Strike it out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As regards the sub-amendment " after three days' notice to the occupants," that might act very badly; gas might be escaping, running all through a house, poisoning everybody, or it might catch fire and burn up the whole place.

Mr. MURPHY: I am sure, if gas were escaping, no objection would be raised to the contractor coming in and stopping the leak. What I wish to provide against is an arbitrary entry, when no gas was escaping, in order to take away pipes that are useful, not that are useless.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the real purpose of this clause in any event? In the first place, every gas company, before it can supply gas will have a franchise from a municipality, and under that franchise it will have rights that should be sufficient for it. Why should the Dominion Government be passing this legislation, and particularly this clause, when they have all these rights already under their franchise; and if not, why should we give them rights which the municipal franchise would not give.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should like to consult the officers of the Department before I make a decision, and I therefore move that further consideration of this section be postponed.

Motion agreed to. Section stands.

On section 7—pressure:

Mr. NESBITT: This clause provides that "The contractor shall from time to time report to the minister what the minimum service pressure is and shall provide, free of charge, etc., etc." We have had a great deal of trouble in Western Ontario over gas this last year. Some corporations have complained that there is not enough pressure, and others that the gas is poisonous and smells too much, and they have had the provincial Railway Board and a gas inspector up there investigating. There has been a lot of trouble between the municipalities and the gas companies, and my question is: where does the Dominion Government's authority come in, and where does the Provincial Government's authority come in? The same question applies to section 6, which has been allowed to stand. If the two authorities clash, I should like to know exactly where they do clash, because this is a very vexed question up in Western Ontario, and is causing constant rows between the municipalities and the gas companies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purpose of this clause is to put the department in possession of a fact, as to what the pressure really is. We have no power, and this does not give us power, to say what the pressure shall be.

Mr. NESBITT: If you have no authority to do anything, what is the good of having the knowledge?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The knowledge of what the pressure is, is necessary to us in testing the meters, and that is the whole purpose for which this clause exists. The pressure may be high or low, and in order to make an accurate test we have to know just what the pressure is.

Mr. NESBITT: Then we have no authority to control the gas companies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We cannot say what the pressure shall be.

Mr. NESBITT: Or what the supply shall be?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You have to go to your municipality for that.

Mr. CAHILL: This is a new clause. How have the companies and the authorities been getting along hitherto without it? The minister does not give any good reason why it should be inserted.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think the reason I have given is a good one. If we want a piece of information for the purpose of carrying out our work, we ought to be able to get that information.

We are not responsible for the fact of what the pressure is, but we are responsible for testing the meters, and we simply want to get the fact as to the pressure, in order that we may do our work in conformity with that fact.

Mr. CAHILL: Just what is the work of the department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The work of the department in so far as this is concerned, is to get information upon which to test the meters. The pressure may be high or it may be low. Now the meter has to be tested according to the pressure, and we simply want to know the fact of what the pressure is. This very same provision has been in force with respect to the inspection of electricity for the very same purpose.

Mr. McKENZIE: No doubt the minister has a perfect right to test the pressure, because that is incidental to the real purpose of the inspection, but I have very grave doubts whether he has power to compel the contractor to furnish the tools for doing that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not the tools.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is the apparatus, then. You are saying to the contractor: We want to make tests, and we are going to make you supply the necessary machinery to make our tests. Now I have very grave doubts whether you have any right to say that to any contractor. I have very grave doubts whether you can compel him to keep extra apparatus for that purpose.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has always been done in connection with the inspection. Do not put it into their heads that we have no right to do it.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Is this clause new? What has been the procedure in the past?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The meter has to be tested under the existing conditions, and one of those conditions is the amount of the pressure. We want to know just what that pressure is, for without that knowledge we cannot fairly test the meters.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): What has been the practice in the past?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The officer tells me they have simply had to take their chances in testing the meters, and that it has been very unsatisfactory.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. COPP: Has the minister received any information from the gas companies throughout the Dominion as to how this will affect their operations? We have natural gas in the city of Moncton. It is piped seven or eight miles into the city and then distributed. Sometimes the gas has been reported pretty low. Has the minister conferred with the companies who will be affected by this legislation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will see that this will not interfere with any company which is piping gas into a city. It merely asks that company: Please be kind enough to tell us what your pressure is, as we want the information in order to test the meters. That does not affect the company's operation.

Mr. COPP: Except that they have to supply the pipe and facilities for the test.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is only a neighbourly thing for them to do.

Mr. COPP: How will these tests be made, and to what expenses will the companies be put in supplying these facilities? I should like some information on these points.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This really means a saving to the companies because, instead of asking them to bring their meters to be inspected at the office of the inspector, our meters are taken to the premises and all the company is asked to do is to connect up a pipe to help the inspector in making the test.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Director.

Mr. ROSS: This seems to be a radical departure from the Acts of 1906 and 1910. We seem to be appointing a new director and new officers, and you are taking great powers to yourselves. You are appointing numerous inspectors and assistants. What is the reason for this change, and what will the additional cost be?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am glad to be able to tell my hon. friend that this does not contemplate, nor does it provide for, the appointment of a single additional officer. It merely gives the names and the powers of officers already at work.

Mr. MORPHY: It seems to me that the caption of the clause is rather misleading when read in connection with section 6. Section 6 is headed "Inspection." To my mind it should be headed "Directors' rights

and privileges." Section 8 is headed "Officers" and deals with inspection. The caption should indicate the purport of the clause. Then they would not be misleading the people who wished to understand the law.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This deals with the appointment of officers.

Mr. MORPHY: For inspection purposes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: And the one that deals with directors' right is headed "Inspection". It seems so abnormally out of place that I thought I would mention it.

Mr. STEVENS: I would draw attention to sub-clause 4. Does not the Civil Service Act as it now stands provide for this qualifying examination? Why insist on introducing it into this legislation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think the provisions of the Civil Service Act cover this case, but perhaps it might be just as well to let it stand.

Mr. STEVENS: As I understand the Civil Service Act, all these positions in all departments are filled by examination, and I think it unwise to introduce into this Act or any other Act a special clause with reference to examination.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it not a fact that by Order in Council the Government can at any time over-ride this provision with regard to examination, as they have done in connection with the census Enumerators and the Purchasing Board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move to strike out sub-section 4.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the subsection?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It provides what is already provided under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have the greatest objection to striking out anything that has any tendency to remind the Government that there is such a thing as the Civil Service Act, because it should be kept before them continually. They should be reminded of it at every turn of the road. It is bad enough as it is, but if nothing is said in the House or in bills about the Civil Service Act the Governement will forget all about it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is quite wrong.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) has just brought to the attention of the Government the fact that officials under the census regulations have been appointed regardless of the Civil Service Act. I do not quite understand why that should be so. Surely this is a matter that ought to come within the operations of the Act. These officers do Government work of a very important character, and why should not the Government ask the Civil Service Commission to submit to them a list of men in the different counties of Canada capable of doing this work? Other matters of less importance are submitted to the Civil Service Commission, but here was a very large slice of patronage and the Civil Service Commission was put aside. The old Tory machine is renovated and put into running order, and the appointees are absolutely and entirely of the old school. I have had the opportunity of looking at the Halifax papers this morning in which the officers in my own county and others in the province are given, and I can assure my right hon. friend that they will pass the acid test of Toryism of the finest order. In mentioning this I am not finding fault, because if I had power and the Civil Service Act were out of the way I would do exactly the same thing. But I do object to the camouflage of affirming that there is a Civil Service Act in this country under which we are supposed to select officers through a commission appointed for the purpose, while at the same time we find the Government over-riding that Act. I think the minister at this very stage should define as clearly as he can where the Civil Service Act is in this legislation, so that henceforth we shall know when there is a transgression of that Act. I should like to have some explanation from the minister. Perhaps it does not come within the scope of this discussion as to why he as one of the ministers of the Crown has ignored—if such is the case—the Civil Service Act in connection with the census. Why should the appointments be made regardless of the provisions of that Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall have ample time no doubt on a more fitting occasion to take up that particular question and discuss it. It really has nothing to do with the use of gas or the work of testing meters or anything of that nature. There will be an answer for my hon. friend at the proper time and I hope he will restrain his impatience until then.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I do not think this clause should be struck out. If we leave

the matter entirely in the hands of the Civil Service Commission they may determine that an examination is not necessary, and may dispense with it in making these appointments. Now, where we are dealing with gas, something which is very essential and at the same time very dangerous, I think there should be the statutory requirement that no persons should be appointed to these positions until they have passed a technical examination. This clause simply makes it obligatory that there shall be a technical examination under the direction of the Civil Service Commission. I do not think it would be wise to leave it in the hands of the Commission to say whether or not there should be a technical examination, or any examination at all, and give the Commission power to make the appointment without deciding whether the applicants for these positions are techncially qualified to fill them.

Mr. CALDER: I am inclined to think there is a point in the argument of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie). As I understand the Civil Service law, appointments to the Civil Service are certified by the Civil Service Commission either with or without examination, the matter being left to their judgment as to whether an examination is necessary or not. It seems to me that in cases of officials of this character there should be an examination.

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization this fact: This clause gives the Civil Service Commission absolute power to prescribe the nature of the examination, but it does not state that it shall be of a certain type. It says "such examination to be held under the direction of the Civil Service Commission." I submit the whole thing is covered by the Civil Service Act, and this is a perfectly useless clause.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are two sides to that question and I am not sure but that the suggestion of my hon. friend back of me (Mr. Tweedie) should be taken into consideration. It is just possible—I think it may be more than that—the Civil Service Commission under the powers given to them by the Act may appoint these officers without examination. Now, the purpose of inserting this clause is that in reference to these officers there shall be an examination provided for by the Civil Service Commission, and that they shall be appointed by the Commission only after a technical examination. If that me so, if it is absolutely essential that technical acquirements shall be the basis for the appointment of officers to these positions, and that seems to be the case, the clause should remain. Under the circumstances I will ask that further discussion of the matter be postponed, and the section be held for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the minister have the right to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. McKENZIE: I certainly think that subsection 4 of section 8 is important and should remain. We know that the Civil Service Commission now appoint parties to the public service from year to year without an examination at all, and call such appointments temporary. If it it imperative that no person should be appointed to a position such as is provided for here without passing a technical examination then the section should remain.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is withdrawn, shall the clause carry?

Mr. CAHILL: The minister stated that there were to be no new appointments, and yet the very first clause of the Bill provides for the appointment of a director.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is, an officer who is already existent and performing the duties shall be made director, that is all. The statement I made is correct.

Mr. CAHILL: And there is to be no change in the salary?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No change in the salary and no change in the number of officers.

Mr. PARENT: Am I right in understanding from the minister that the appointment of a director and inspectors will be made by the Civil Service Commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The existing Civil Service Act brings the appointment of these officers under the Civil Service Commission. The only point which has been raised is this: the Civil Service Commission may appoint to an office either with or without an examination. The department takes the view that with reference to these officers there must always be a technical examination. That is the reason we

have put this clause in the Act, to make sure that the Civil Service Commission in appointing shall only appoint after an examination of the technical qualifications of the applicants.

Mr. PARENT: That may be the minister's view but if the section is taken as it is, it will be found to be possible for the Civil Service Commisson to have ten or fifteen men pass an examination and be pronounced qualified for these positions. Section 4 does not say that appointments will be made by the Civil Service Commission.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Civil Service Act does that.

Mr. PARENT: But this section may supersede the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The object of this section is simply to make sure that there shall be a technical examination, which I think is perfectly right.

Mr. CAHILL: Does that mean that the present officers shall have to take an examination, or is the examination only to apply to new officers that may be appointed from time to time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I presume it applies to new officers only. The present officers are qualified.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would ask the minister if he considers the wording of subsection 3 of section 8 sufficiently definite. We are now framing this Bill, and I think we should make it a little more specific in certain details. The provision to which I have particular reference declares that an officer may at all reasonable hours enter any premises. Now we should define what we consider "reasonable hours" to be and not leave the matter open. The same, or similar, phraseology occurs in section 6. I think we should define what we mean by "reasonable hours," and I would suggest that we say between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There might be something occurring at the other hours to prevent the officer from carrying out the duty. I think my hon. friend will find it very difficult to go further in the matter of definition than is set out in the Bill. Circumstances must determine the hour.

Mr. PEDLOW: But there may be two opinions as to what constitutes "reasonable hours." A moment ago in the discussion of this Bill we had a difference of opinion upon certain matters, and it is equally possible that there will be a difference of opinion in regard to the present point. I certainly think we should settle details of this kind when we are framing the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think we could make the provision more specific than it is.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—meters, etc:

Mr. PARENT: Will not the provisions of this clause interfere with the ordinary employees of a gas company? By this clause it would seem to me that no inspector outside of the one nominated by the Government, or the Civil Service Commission, would have the right to enter houses and verify the meters, although at the present time the gas companies' employees perform this work.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We do not interfere with the employees of the company which is furnishing the gas.

Mr. MORPHY: Subsection 9 reads:

> Within six years from each verification and sealing every meter shall be presented by the owner for re-verification and re-sealing, or for the cancellation of the seal by the inspector.

There is no definition under this Act of what constitutes an owner, but there is a definition of what constitutes a contractor—the person who supplies the gas. Invariably the contractors supply the meters, and in my experience they rent those meters and will not sell them. Now, it seems to me from the point of view of public right that the duty under sub-section 5 should be cast upon the contractor, the man who supplies the gas, to provide at his own expense for the re-verification of the meters at that period of time when they should be verified. The word "owner" in used in the subsection. There may be a way of getting around that by the contractor saying he leased the meter, or in some other way he may say that he is not the owner; I cannot say what might happen under the interpretation that might be given to the clause; but I think the word "contractor" should be put into that section specifically and that the duty should be cast upon him of arranging and paying for the re-verification of the meters periodically.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are cases in which the contractor or the company does not own the meters, they are owned by the consumers themselves; and this subsection makes it necessary for either owner,

whether it be the consumer or the company, to have the re-verification carried out.

Mr. MORPHY: If that is certain, I am satisfied.

Mr. ROSS: Under this clause there does not seem to be any protection thrown around the public in regard to when the meter should be verified. In the old Act of 1906 by section 19 it is provided:

> No meter shall be stamped which is found by the inspector to register, or capable of being made to register, quantities varying from the true standard measure of gas, more than three per centum in favour of the seller, or four per centum in favour of the consumer.

But there seems to be nothing in this Bill protecting the consumer in that regard. Why was this protection left out?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am told that the inspector of the department has the power to order the re-verification of a meter at any time if it is found to be defective, but that all meters under this general clause must be re-verified every six years.

Mr. ROSS: The minister does not quite get my point. Under the Act of 1906, and also under the later Act of 1910, there are standards set up to protect the public; but under this Bill there is no provision at all in that regard.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a provision in this Bill by which the standard shall be set by Order in Council, and the officer works under that Order in Council.

Mr. ROSS: Why should it be done by Order in Council now when it has never been done heretofore in that way; why not by statute?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reason is that if it is in the Act, every time you changed the standard you would have to enact fresh legislation. These changes of standard take place from time to time, and it is conducive to the best operation that they shall be adopted without loss of time. The same amount of protection is afforded under this Bill, but added protection is given as according to experience we change the fineness of the standard.

Mr. ROSS: I do not quite follow the minister's explanation. I cannot conceive that the fineness of standard would vary so rapidly that we could not establish a basis in the statute to protect the consumer. From the fact that the standard established in 1906 was not changed in the Act of 1910, I would assume that the standards do not vary very rapidly, and even if we had to pass legislation I think the public would be much more satisfied to depend on a statutory provision rather than on an Order in Council which might or might not be passed.

Mr. CHISHOLM: These gentlemen have a habit of passing Orders in Council.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The officers of the department think it would be better to have the section remain in its present form.

On section 10—tests in the case of disputed accuracy of meter:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is just the same as the old Act, except that it is a little more definitely stated.

Mr. ROSS: There were many rules in the old Act with respect to testing which I do not find in this Bill. Why were they left out?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They will be provided for, as I said before, in regulations passed by Order in Council, and for the same reason.

Section agreed to.

On Section 16—for not keeping records or permitting inspection of them:

Mr. McKENZIE: I move that the words "not exceeding" be inserted after the word "of" in the fourth line.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All right—the penalty not to be less than five dollars.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McKenzie moves to amend clause 16 by adding after the word "of" in the fourth line thereof, the following words: "of not less than five and not more than,"

so that the clause will read:

> shall be liable to a penalty of not less than five and not more than fifty dollars.

Mr. PARENT: What is to get the benefit of the penalty, the Crown, or the man who prosecutes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Crown.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 19—for supplying injurious gas:

Mr. McCOIG: In the old Act there is a section which has a very important effect on the part of the country from which I come. It provides that:

> The supply of gas shall be regular and sufficient.

The old Act distinctly provides that a company shall give a sufficient supply of gas, when they have the gas to give to the consumer. This is omitted from the present Bill, and I think it would be a great mistake to eliminate it from this legislation, because it is telling a company which enjoys all the privileges that many gas companies enjoy, that they shall supply the consumer with a sufficient supply of gas, especially in the cold season of the year when gas is very much required. I do not think the minister should ask us to eliminate such an important section when it means so much to the people of Ontario who are being supplied with natural gas at the present time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am informed that that has been left out of the present Bill because the opinion has been given that we have not the power to enforce it. We might, however, go through with the remaining clauses of the Bill, and then I will leave the Bill in committee and we can take it up again and consider it a little further.

Mr. ROSS: Clause 19 is not closed so far as the committee is concerned?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was not clause 19 that was particularly referred to. Another point was raised there which my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) contended was of vital importance, that it was in the old Act and that it was not brought into this. I suggested that, as we had an opinion from the Minister of Justice that we had not powers with reference to that, we could not do that under our powers, that we might pass these other sections, and I would allow the Bill to remain in committee until I had an opportunity of consulting the Minister of Justice with reference to the matter. Then it could be brought up again. I will not ask that the Bill be passed until I have an opportunity of doing that.

Mr. ROSS: The Bill will be brought up in committee again.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 20—for offence specific penalty for which is not provided:

Mr. PARENT: How does this read with the amendment passed a few minutes ago reducing the minimum penalty to $5?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This would be a blanket for all the rest. That was a special penalty for a special case. This will provide for other cases which are not provided for specially.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 19, to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that copies of this Bill have been distributed as yet.

Mr. DOHERTY: They have been distributed, I understand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my right hon. friend that this Bill does not appear to be on the official fyle. Copies of the Bill may be lying on the table, but I do not think hon. members have had an opportunity of perusing the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, I have no desire to proceed with the Bill if any hon. gentleman thinks he has not had proper opportunity of perusing it, but as I explained the other day, it is a very simple Bill, very easy of apprehension, and I would not anticipate there would be serious objection to it. There are two clauses. Their purpose is to provide that on appeals from the decisions of the Commissioner of Patents, which appeals under the existing law lie to the Exchequer Court, and are brought at the instance of the party interested, the Commissioner of Patents, as representing the Crown and the public interest, shall as matter of right be entitled to be heard before the Exchequer Court, and shall, in the event of the decision of the Exchequer Court reversing the decision of the Commissioner have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I may say that until 1913 the only appeal from the decision of the Commissioner of Patents was to the Governor General in Council. At the time that was not considered a suitable means of rectifying any error that the Commissioner might fall into, and in consequence, by an Act passed in that year, the appeal was made to the Exchequer Court instead of to the Governor in Council. That appeal, of course,

was at the instance of the party interested. Though there was no provision in that law for the Commissioner of Patents being represented before the Exchequer Court, as a matter of practice he always has been so represented. My information is that the judge of the Exchequer Court thought it desirable that the other side of the case should be put, and at his suggestion the Commissioner of Patents appeared and defended his view.

That practice has gone on without question until a recent case. In that recent case the decision of the Exchequer Court was favourable to the private party and adverse to the decision of the Commissioner of Patents. The latter, assuming, apparently, from the well-established practice, that he was a proper party in the case made an application for leave to appeal to one of the judges of the Supreme Court. That application was necessary because upon the question arising there was no amount involved, and therefore no sum of $500. The commissioner made his application to the judge for leave to appeal, and the judge presiding declined to grant leave to appeal, taking the position that the Commissioner of Patents was not a party to the case and, therefore, in effect had no standing even before the Exchequer Court, and, of course, no right of appeal to the Supreme Court. Now the purpose of this Bill is simply to convert into a legal right what by practice was recognized as the privilege of the commissioner, to appear before the Exchequer Court to defend his decision. Of course, it was not at all in the interests of the commissioner himself that that right should be recognized, but it was felt that there should be somebody to represent the public interest, to put before the court that public interest and the reasons why in that public interest the decision of the commissioner should be maintained. This present Bill provides simply for that right to the commissioner to appear before the Exchequer Court and uphold the public interest in the matter, and, in the event of the Exchequer Court deciding adversely, to carry the case to appeal, just as the private party has the right to carry the case to appeal. The object, in a word, is to put the public on a footing of equality with the private interest, and I would think there would be general consent that there should be such a provision.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not find any fault with the purpose of this Bill, to give the commissioner the right of appeal which the private party enjoys, but what I would suggest is this: here is a matter that refers exclusively to the Patent Act, just as Chapter 17 of the Statutes of 1913 which transferred all appeals from the Governor in Council, and even all pending cases, if I remember rightly, to the Exchequer Court, refers exclusively to the Patent Act.

Mr. DOHERTY: The object of this Bill is to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I know, and that is where confusion may arise. The fact of amending the Exchequer Court Act in order to give a certain person mentioned only in the Patent Act, and whose duties are defined by the Patent Act, the right of appeal might embarrass anyone looking up the legislation on the matter. There are always in the Patent Act certain provisions whereby an appeal lies from the decision of the commissioner. Now, why not include the provisions of the present Bill in the Patent Act, so that anyone looking up the legislation would not have to turn up the Exchequer Court Act to find out whether the commissioner had the right of appeal? If we are to give the commissioner the right of appeal by amending the Exchequer Court Act, one could not tell by looking up the Patent Act that he had that right Under the consolidation he would find that the appeal lies with the Exchequer Court, but he would have to look under the head of "Exchequer Court" to find a matter which is exclusively and entirely within the purview of the Patent Act. The Bill is all right. I do not want my hon. friend to think that I am criticising its principle; my only objection is in regard to the place which the title occupies in the statute. My object is to make the work easier for lawyers looking up the Patent Act to ascertain what the powers and the rights of appeal are, instead of having to look up the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rather fear the House is getting into matters of detail which can properly be discussed only in committee. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) states that he has no fault to find with the principle of the Bill, with which he is satisfied. The only question involved in his objection is one which it would be well to discuss in committee.

Mr. BUREAU: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that changing the title of the Bill would be changing the whole Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not involve the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

On Section 1—Commissioner of Patents may appear by Counsel.

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite realize there is a good deal of force, from the point of view of convenience, in that suggestion that the hon. member for Three Rivers makes. But unfortunately the practice has been to cover the entire jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court by the provisions in the Exchequer Court Act, and this particular provision does not differ from others, if I am correctly informed. You look to the Exchequer Court Act for the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, and there you find also a great variety of matters referred to. But it is there you go to ascertain the jurisdiction of that Court. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman, if it were to be useful, would involve the repealing of the Act of 1913 to which I think people have become thoroughly accustomed, and re-enacting it as an amendment to the Patent Act. While that might perhaps be advisable from the point of view of convenience, and while it might be well to put a clause into the Patent Act to say that there is an appeal to the Exchequer Court, I still think that the Exchequer Court Act is the proper place to regulate the jurisdiction of that Court, as likewise the right of appeal from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court. We might consider the desirability of putting a clause into the Patent Act, if it is not there, to indicate that there is an appeal to the Exchequer Court, but in the meantime it would be well to let this bill pass. We are not here conferring jurisdiction on the Exchequer Court; that is already conferred by the existing Act. We are only making provision as to who shall be entitled to be heard before the Exchequer Court, and providing a right of appeal for both parties. As the law stands at present, the Exchequer Court has jurisdiction, and the appeal exists. The only difficulty is that it is now interpreted to mean that only one party can be heard before the Exchequer Court and only one party can appeal. We are not creating the appeal; we are simply providing that both parties may be heard on an appeal which already is provided for in the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. BUREAU: The statement of the minister gives more force to my suggestion. We are not conferring jurisdiction on the Exchequer Court; it already has jurisdiction. The only question is that an officer who comes within the scope of a specific Act, namely, the Commissioner of Patents, shall have the right to appeal to that court. The gist of the thing is not the right of appeal or the question of jurisdiction, but the right of the commissioner; and if you were looking for his powers, if you wanted to find out whether he had a right of appeal, you would naturally look to the Patent Act under the duties and powers of the commissioner. I do not object to this Bill being passed, but it creates confusion. My hon. friend knows better than any one else that if you have to go through five or six statutes having reference to different matters in order to find out what particular officer has to do, you are put to considerable labour and sometimes confusion is created. My object is to put under one heading and in one Act all the powers and privileges conferred upon this particular officer.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill does not create the appeal. It does not give the right of appeal even to the Commissioner of Patents. It only provides that on an appeal from the decision of the Commissioner of Patents, which appeal can only be by the other parties and which already exists and is provided for in the Exchequer Court Act, the Commissioner of Patents shall be entitled to be heard. Then having once given him that right to be heard, we give him the same right to appeal from that decision that already exists in favour of the other party. So that we are in reality only regulating the procedure. There is convenience in confining the entire jurisdiction and procedure before the Exchequer Court in the Exchequer Court Act, and this is a matter of procedure. Before the section passes I desire to amend it to some extent. I do not know that it is necessary, but perhaps it is as well to put in the amendment which I shall propose. It has reference to the way in which the Commissioner of Patents is entitled to appeal. I would also move to insert, after the word "patents" in the eleventh line, the words "acting in the said capacity."

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) means, by the terms of his amendment, that the Commissioner of Patents shall have the right to appear for the Crown and as representing the inter-

ests of the public. If he adds "representing the interests of the public," and should the Supreme Court find against the opinion of the commissioner, should we infer that the finding is contrary to the interests of the public?

The Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) There are two interests to be represented: on the one side the interest of the party applying for the patent; then, against that, is the interest of the public, which may require that the patent be withheld; and there is the interest of the Crown. The commissioner will represent the public at large interested in its withholdment. It may not be absolutely necessary to say that he has the right to appear as representing the Crown and also as representing the interests of the public, but I do not see what objection there could be to it. There are cases where the Crown may appear by reason of having a special interest in the matter. There are others, as in the present case, in which the Crown is interested in appearing not in order to protect a special interest of the Crown, but in the interests of the public at large. Such seems to be the case on hand.

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) I understand the explanation given by the right hon. Minister of Justice, but I believe that we may take as a principle in law that in a case where the Government is represented, the Government, through its representative, appears for the Crown. Now, under our constitution, the Crown represents the public in a general way, and if in a clause of our law we say that any one represents the Crown, I take it that we infer thereby that this person appears for the public in a general way. By adding that this person appears not only for the Crown but also in the interest of the public, we either make a distinction which should not be found in our laws, or it constitutes a tautology, which is not necessary. I believe that by saying, "The Commissioner of Patents, in the name of the Crown, shall have the right to appear . . ." the phraseology would be better and the idea more constitutional.

The Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: (Translation.) I should congratulate myself over the fact that the hon. member so completely admits that the Government represents the interests of the whole public—

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) As a legal fiction.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) But I might perhaps acknowledge the tautology, for I confess that the phrase is not absolutely necessary. However, notwithstanding the respect I have for the opinion of the hon. member, I conceive that there are cases where the Crown, that is to say, the Government, acts as being itself interested, that is to say, by reason of the organized government as such having an interest therein; and there are other cases—such as this one—where the Government as such is in no way interested in a patent being granted or denied to the applicant. In this case the interested party is the public in general. Though I admit that there would be no necessity of saying so expressly, it appears nevertheless desirable to indicate clearly in what capacity our commissioners are to be recognized and it can do no harm to state that they not only represent the Crown but have the special object of protecting an interest which is not so much that of the Crown as of the public in general. I concede that the Crown has the right to protect the interests of the public in general but if one refers simply to the general law, it is the Attorney General who should intervene to represent these interests. I wish to make it clear that the commissioner can, as representative of the public interests, lodge this appeal, as well as the Attorney General.

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am astonished to hear the hon. Minister of Justice advance this argument. We are in a British country. We live under British institutions, and in framing our legislation, we should, as far as possible, follow the principle of the British Constitution. I do not believe that in our public law, any more than in our private legislation, there could be a distinction between the Crown, as representative of the executive power of the judicial power, and of the people. It is very different in the United States. In that country I understand that one can say "The people *vs.* so and so," "The State *vs.* so and so;" but in a British country there can be no question of the people against an individual or of the State against an individual it is always the Crown. I am even more astonished to hear the right hon. Minister of Justice suggest a case where the interests of the Crown, in the acceptatioon of the word I have just indicated, might conflict with the interests of the people in a general way. How could it happen in a case before the Supreme Court that there might be con-

flict between the interest of the Government—the word Government, according to what the hon. Minister of Justice has just said, would then mean the Crown—and the interest of the general public? Who then would represent the general public? Who would have a mandate to represent the general public, according to the principles of our Constitution? Who could present himself before the Supreme Court—not only before the Supreme Court but before any court of our country—and say, "I represent the interests of the general public?" And how again could the commissioner or his representative claim to have the mandate to represent before the Supreme Court the interests of the general public, if these conflicted with those of the Crown? Who would represent the Crown? Could the Commissioner of Patents, as an officer of the Government, as one of the Crown's representatives, claim that he represented the interests of the general public as opposed to those of the Crown? I believe that as a legal proposition, it would hardlly be defensible. Certainly my experience is much more limited than that of the minister, but I cannot conceive of cases where the Government could be represented by a lawyer who would go before the Supreme Court and claim that he represented the interests of the general public and that these interests were opposed to those of the Crown. A lawyer who would appear and uphold interests opposed to those of the Crown could not be the representative of the Government according to the principles which govern our Coustitution.

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, we might no doubt prolong this very interesting discussion in dwelling upon the part taken in it by the hon. member for Dorchester, but it would not lead to very important practical results. I will only say that I was misunderstood if it was believed that I had suggested that there could be interests of the Crown opposed to those of the general public. My proposition was, that, among the interests that the Crown is called upon to defend and protect, one might make a distinction between those of the Crown proper, so called, and those of the public, which the Crown, as its representative, is charged with protecting. Now these two interests usually are protected through the intermediary of the Attorney General. In this case under consideration, we make an exception as to the official who would appear to protect these interests, and we designate this official to represent the interests that are as a rule represented by the Attorney General. It seems to me that in any case there is no harm in stating it. I admit the thing would go without saying, and as is often repeated—the remark was first made by a great man—things that go without saying are still better when said.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) Would the object of the amendment then be that of removing all responsibility from the commissioner showing that he is acting as a representative of the Crown?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) In that case, why not insert the phrase "ès-qualité"? It is short, it is understood by every one, and it would show exactly in what capacity he comes before the Court.

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) These words would be better understood in our province than in any other part of the country. I do not know that these words have the same meaning in the English provinces as they have in our laws. Besides, even in saying "ès-qualité," we do not specify in what capacity. There are several capacities. We say "ès-qualité" when one appears as a tutor or as a curator. Could it be wrong to embody in the law not only that he appears ès-qualité, but also state in which capacity?

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) Would not the English words "Acting in his official capacity" translate the words "ès-qualité"?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) I do not think they would, not in the present instance; because if we say "In his official capacity," this would not mean in the capacity of Commissioner of Patents. We are simply granting him a new power. I do not know that I would have moved this amendment had I known that it would be objected to.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) I am not objecting, I am merely asking for information.

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) I believe the best reason is that one which I gave in reply to the hon. member for Dorchester. I do not think it wrong to say things sometimes which are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the clause such as it reads before the hon. minister moved the amend-

ment was the following: "The Commissioner of Patents has the right to appear and be heard through his lawyer, on the hearing of the appeal." The hon. minister now suggests that we add: "The Commissioner of Patents, on behalf of the Crown and as representing the interests of the public, shall have the right to appear and be heard through his lawyer, on the hearing of the appeal." Who shall decide if the commissioner appears for the Crown or if he does so in the interests of the public?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) There shall be no necessity of a decision, for he shall have to do both. The amendment reads "On behalf of the Crown and as representing the interests of the public." If there are two distinct interests, he must represent both.

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) As I said, before, there can be no distinction from the legal and the constitutional point of view, between the interests of the Crown and the interests of the public. Therefore, as the hon. minister has just said, if there is no distinction, there is no reason to add "the interests of the public" after saying "on behalf of the Crown" this being sufficient. The right hon. minister told us just a while ago, that there were cases where a distinction might exist. Now, he tells us that such a distinction does not exist. If it does not exist, then it amounts to what I said: It is a case of redundancy, and it would be better to eliminate the last part of the amendment, in due regard for the principles of the constitution as well as for the improvement of our legal phraseology.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) Will the right hon. minister allow me to remark that there is a clause, in the patents law, which might properly apply to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Dorchester, namely, when an employee in the civil service asks for a patent. This employee has no right to obtain it for himself, unless he ask the government; there is a provision to the effect that the government is to be served first. The commissioner is the one who shall decide on what terms the patent may be granted. In a case like this, the interests of the public may differ from those of the Crown; and then, the commissioner cannot represent both interests at the same time, because in his official capacity, he will have to represent the Crown and refuse to grant the patent to the employee, or else make such terms as would not be in the interests of the public generally. The words "or" instead of "and" should therefore be inserted, so that when a conflict should arise, he could choose between the two.

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) How then conciliate the opinion of my hon. friend from Dorchester with that of my hon. friend from Three Rivers? I am indeed on the horns of a dilemma.

It is obvious that I could not please both the hon. members at the same time, because my hon. friend from Three Rivers gives us to understand that in some cases the fact that the commissioner would be serving the interest of the Crown would preclude the idea that he was acting in the interest of the whole people.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) Not necessarily.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: (Translation.) No, but I think the hon. member from Three Rivers came to my rescue during the discussion in which I was engaged with my hon. friend from Dorchester.

The hon. gentleman is supposing a case in which the commissioner, when claiming on behalf of the Crown a royalty from the man who is trying to use his patent, would be there to uphold the rights of the Crown as to the collection of a certain sum. Now, I do not deny that the people are indirectly concerned in that matter. All that is added to the public revenue benefits the people. However, such is not the case when it is a matter of safeguarding a right which each individual is directly entitled to. In fact, when it is a question whether a man is entitled to a patent or not, if he obtains it to whose detriment is it? To the detriment of the public who, by the fact this patent is granted, is debarred from using such an article. True, it is in a sense that the public is interested, even when the question is what amount should a man pay as a royalty for the privilege of availing himself of a patent. As I said a few minutes ago, although the Crown is primarily interested as collector of the revenue the people who are benefited by it are also interested.

Mr. BUREAU: (Translation.) The commissioner has the right to prevent the use of that patent, and it might be in the public interest that such a patent should be used.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: (Translation.) In that sense, yes.

Mr. BUREAU: That is provided for in the same section.

(Section as amended agreed to.)

Bill, as amended, reported.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the order "Notices of Motions" was called, forty-six were read through and no hon. member was ready to proceed. Believing that some hon. members are prepared to go on now, I would move, with the consent of the House, this being private member's day, that the House do now return to the order, "Notices of Motions."

Motion agreed to.

PENSION DEDUCTIONS FOR RETURNED SOLDIERS INSURANCE

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient, in order that a greater number of disabled soldiers and dependents be enabled to enjoy the benefits of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, that arrangements be made to, at the request of the Pensioner, deduct from Pension payments such sums as the said Pensioner shall indicate and apply same to the payment of insurance premiums under the said Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution is a very simple one. Under authority of an Act passed last session, the Government has entered into a plan of insurance for returned soldiers and their dependents. Although the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act has not been in force very long, it seems to have been productive of good results. I am informed that a large number of returned soldiers have taken advantage of it, and it is in order to allow a still larger number to be insured that I propose this resolution.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, a number of soldiers receive pensions, rather small in amount, varying from $2.50 to $10, $15 and more a month. The money derived from these small pensions is not, as a rule, put to the very best use. The amount is too small to be saved; it is more in the nature of pin money or spending money, so that the soldier derives no real benefit from it. Should the resolution which I propose carry, the soldier will be permitted, on making application to the Board of Pension Commissioners, to have his pension, or such part of it as may be necessary, apply toward the payment of premiums on insurance under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act. The premiums are fairly small; the rates are somewhat better than those given by the line companies, and if the soldier is permitted to request that deductions be made from his monthly pension cheque, to be applied upon premiums, he will be in a position to leave his dependents in a much better position should he unfortunately be carried off. I understand that there is no very great objection to the proposal on the part of the Government, except that its adoption might cause some trouble to the Board of Pension Commissioners; they might have to do a little extra work, and there may be some difficulty in connection with changes of pensions. For instance, having passed a new medical examination, a pensioner might be found quite fit, his pension would be cut off—I understand that this is the objection of the Board of Pension Commissioners—the insurance might be dropped. The answer to that is quite plain. In any case the man would be no worse off than he is at present; he would simply have to continue the payments out of his own resources. I do not think I need add anything further by way of explanation. I think the resolution ought to carry.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this resolution refers to a matter of some importance, but none the less a matter of administrative detail. It calls for the granting of the privilege to the pensioner of assigning all or part of his pension, thus making it applicable to the support of an insurance policy under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act. As hon. members know, particularly those who have been members of the Government, all departments of the Government are opposed to accepting assignments of pay; it is not the practice in any department that any payee from that department shall be permitted to make an assignment to a private citizen, to a company, even to another department, of his or her salary. No doubt, the objection on general grounds is on account of the greater administrative difficulty of being sure of the correct payment. I do not think any matter of mere difficulty or delay should stand in the way of an improvement, particularly if it is to advance or help the position of a returned soldier. I am not sure whether this would help him very much or not. Of course, any soldier now can turn his cheque back just as soon as he receives it.

Mr. McMASTER: It will be easier if he never gets it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he never gets it, he does not bother with it at all; but even if

he does get it, if he gives an assignment of the whole or part of it on his insurance, he can withdraw that assignment at any time he has a mind to. I suppose there would be less possibility—just slightly less —of a withdrawal or a lapse of the insurance if the privilege of assignment were given. I know the Pension Commissioners, doubtless more than any other branch of Government, have difficulty in being certain of the promptness and correctness of their payments. I do not know what the number is, but many cheques are returned every month, not finding their proper destination, and undoubtedly those difficulties would be enhanced if the assignment privileges were given. There is no doubt in the world that errors would creep in.

I think I am justified in saying, at this stage, that I purpose submitting to the House very shortly a resolution calling for the reappointment this session of a joint committee on re-establishment, along the lines of the re-establishment resolution of last session and the session before, though, perhaps, not just in the same wording. That being the case it occurs to me that, this would be a proper subject to submit to that committee. I think, therefore, it would be well, before giving the consent of the House to this resolution, that one or two members or officials of the Pension Board should be heard, so that the House might be advised by the committee who make detailed inquiry, whether it is worth while adopting this plan or not. I, therefore, suggest to the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) that he allow the resolution to be withdrawn, on the understanding that the subject matter of the resolution will be submitted to the joint committee for report this session.

Mr. POWER: Only a word in answer to the Prime Minister. I understand that no other member wishes to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought, perhaps, the hon. member was about to withdraw his resolution. Of course, if any other hon. member desires to speak, he should do so now.

Mr. POWER: With reference to the remark of the Prime Minister that it has not been the policy of the Government to permit assignments of any moneys due by governments, I will point out to him that, all during the war, assignments of soldiers' pay were not only permitted but, in fact, enforced. Soldiers were forced to assign their pay, for their own good, it was said, so that, on a matter of principle such as that, the objection would fall to the ground, whereas, in this case the assignment would be simply a voluntary one in what the soldier would consider to be his own interest.

With reference to cheques being returned, it seems to me that the objection of the Prime Minister would disappear. If the cheques were simply transferred from one department to another, we would have less difficulty in reference to returned cheques; there would be less difficulty with reference to wrong addresses of the pensioners, as the cheques would simply be sent from the Board of Pension Commissioners direct to the Department of Returned Soldiers' Insurance. The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act is a new one, and very few of us are familiar with the details of it. The proposition which I make, although I have already made it to the Pension Commissioners, is perhaps new to a large number of the members of this House, so that, in order to give them occasion to study it, I will cheerfully accede to the request of the Prime Minister, on the understanding that the subject matter of the resolution is to receive further consideration during the session.

9 p.m.

Resolution withdrawn.

PENSIONS TO WIDOWED MOTHERS OF RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the Act to provide pensions to or in respect of members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces, 1919, so as to provide that the pension of a widowed mother of a member of the forces who has died on active service shall not be reduced on account of her income; and further that pension shall be granted her of right whether or not there are other living children.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members who have been interested in pensions are doubtless aware, this is by no means a new matter. Since I have been a member of this House, on every occasion on which an opportunity has presented itself, I have brought this subject to the attention of the House of Commons; I have advocated it in committee and on the floor of the House. We have the Pension Act which provides for pensions for disabled ex-soldiers, their dependents, the widows of soldiers, and, to a certain extent, the dependents parents of soldiers. This provision for dependent parents of soldiers is limited in many re-

spects, and, to my mind, it is and has been altogether too limited.

In this resolution I intend to discuss only that phase of the situation which has regard to the widowed mother of a soldier who has been killed overseas. It is my intention that this widowed mother should receive, at the hands of the state, absolutely the same treatment as the actual widow of a soldier killed at the front. There are and have been certain restrictions and limitations to the pensions allotted to the widowed mother. Some of those restrictions I am glad to say, owing to the efforts of those members in the House who have been interested in that class of pensioners, have disappeared. Formerly the widowed mother who earned any money was not allowed to benefit by the Pension Act. We had the sad spectacle of the mother who had given her only son to the cause being obliged, though her age hardly permitted her to work, to engage as scrub woman. This, I am glad to say, has disappeared since the Pension Committee has made the recommendation, which the House has accepted, to the effect that the actual earnings of the widowed mother shall not be taken into account in calculating her pension. But the widowed mother's enjoyment of a pension is limited by statute. By the Pension Act of 1920, it is provided that:

> The pension to any parent or person in the place of a parent shall be subject to review from time to time and shall be continued, increased, decreased or discontinued in accordance with the amount deemed necessary by the Commission to provide a maintenance for such parent or person but in no case shall such pension exceed the amount of pension prescribed for parents in schedule B of this Act.

One great complaint we have had hitherto is that the widowed mother, being limited and restricted with reference to her pension, has had to have this pension revised at different times, and the pension itself has always been subject to review. The result has been that in order to keep these pensions straight, a whole horde of inspectors and visitors comes down on the unfortunate woman who receives a pension. We have had cases of these visitors coming in and questioning the poor widow whether or not she was satisfied with the pension she obtained, and by a series of adroit questions finding out that perhaps the poor woman obtained certain sums from insurance on her late husband or that she owned a little piece of property in some other part of the country, or had a few dollars in the bank. All these things were duly reported to headquarters by the visitor, and headquarters in a large number of cases, I am sorry to say, cut off the pension. There have been numerous complaints as to pensions being cut off in this way; and it is to obviate that difficulty that I am proposing that this pension should not be subject to any review whatsoever, but that once granted it should be granted for good and all. Section 23 of the Pensions Act provides:

> When a parent or person in the place of a parent has unmarried sons residing with him or her who should, in the opinion of the Commission, be earning an amount sufficient to permit them to contribute to the support of such parent or person, each such unmarried son shall be deemed to be contributing not less than ten dollars a month towards such support.

You will note that the statute makes reference only to unmarried sons. Now it was well understood, and I think every member of last year's Pensions Committee will bear me out in this, that in no case was the Act to be interpreted in such a fashion as to allow any deductions to be made from a widow's pension on account of the earnings of any married male member of the family or of any female members of the family. If I remember rightly, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), or the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), last year instanced a case where an amount was deducted from a pension because one of the girl members of the family had earned a certain amount of money by working as a stenographer, and at the time the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), indignantly denied that anything was to be deducted from the widow's pension on account of the earnings of any of the female members of the family. If I have given the wrong names or ascribed to any hon. member things he did not say, I hope he will call my attention to it. Now, how does this work out in practice? I had a case to submit during the course of the summer, one among very many, to the Board of Pension Commissioners. I may state in passing that it is not my intention to attack in any way the Board of Pension Commissioners. I consider they have a very difficult duty to ferform, and that on the whole they have performed it well, but I contend that no such discretion should be given to the Board or to any other Government officials as is given under this Act. It has been the experience, I think, with those who have had to do with Government departments that when we give

too much discretion to Government officials, they are apt to become very officious, and we are apt to find that their discretion is usually not in the best interests of those whose affiairs they are supposed to administer. However, to return to the point I was discussing. of unmarried sons geing presumed to contribute $10 per month, in this particular case I was informed by the Board as follows:

> According to your letter W is earning $1,200 per annum. J. is undergoing treatment for T. B. C. in the S. C. R.

I might say that in this case three sons were at the war; one is now earning a certain amount of money, another owing to war service is now totally disabled and is undergoing treatment in the S. C. R., and it was suggested by the Board of Pension Commissioners that this gentleman undergoing treatment in the S. C. R. for T. B. C. should support on the allowance he gets from the S.C. R. his widowed mother. I will leave that suggestion with those who took part in the deliberations of the Pensions Committee last year. The Board goes on to state:

> Further, that the income of the home is $1,500 per annum on account of the earnings of the two daughters.

Because the daughters between them were earning $1,500 this widowed mother was not granted the pension to which she would have been entitled under the Act. Now I submit that under the Act mention is made only of deductions on account of the earnings of an unmarried son residing with the parent, and not in the case of those residing elsewhere, and most certainly not from the earnings of daughters who are obliged owing to the family circumstances to earn their living in the world. Further, paragraph (7) provides, and I think the members of the Pensions' Committee will remember that there was considerable discussion of this point last year:

> The pension to a widowed mother shall not be reduced on account of her earnnigs from personal employment or on account of her having free lodgings or so long as she resides in Canada on account of her having an income from other sources which does not exceed two hundred and forty dollars per annum.

The first point is this: If the widowed mother's income exceeds $240 per annum, that is, if she has more than $20 per month. they will have nothing to do with her, they will give her no pension. The widowed mother, in many cases too old to work and utterly incapable of earning her living, is supposed to be able to get along on a measly $20 per month. I submit that in the judgment of this House we should not force these women, who in many cases have lost their only support, to be obliged to live in such fashion.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The hon. gentleman is wrong there. I think he must have got a wrong impression from reading the Act. That is not the law at all.

Mr. NESBITT: Quite the contrary.

Mr. POWER: I am very glad if it is not but I am under the impression that it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the $20 is unearned income, that is, if it comes from some source other than her own earnings, it is deducted from the maximum she is entitled to, which is $60, and I understand this is the only country in the world where she gets such a maximum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have understated it. She may get the $60 in addition to the $20. Up to $20 there is no deduction, but beyond that, if her income is unearned, it may be deducted from the $60. That is the law.

Mr. POWER: As a matter of fact that should be the interpretation of the law. But in the correspondence which I have had with the Board of Pension Commissioners that is not the interpretation which has been given it, and that is why I wish to make the matter perfectly clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member read the letter?

Mr. POWER: I have four or five letters, but I should not like to go into the details or to give names.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well.

Mr. POWER: I may say, however, that there has been considerable discussion about the matter and I am quite willing to communicate to the Prime Minister the purport of this correspondence. In any case we will suppose that the Prime Minister is right and that the Board of Pension Commissioners do interpret the law in the way they should. I will call the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that section 7 provides that the pension shall not be reduced by reason of earnings so long as the recipient resides in Canada. This would have the effect of precluding all those widowed mothers who reside, let us say, in the United States, in Scotland, or in England. On this point I would remind

the Prime Minister that last year during the discussion of the Pensions Bill certain hon. members, for instance, the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), pressed this point to such an extent that the then Prime Minister, the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden), asked that the section be suspended for some time. After this suspension the Prime Minister returned to the House, whilst the discussion of the Bill was still in progress and stated:

> I shall certainly take into consideration what has been said on this subject by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I see some force in the observation as to the feeling of irritation which might be created by too close or too frequent inquiries into the private affairs of persons who have lost near relatives in the war.

This refers to the first point.

> But my hon. friends will observe that it will be impossible to change this provision without bringing down another resolution. I hope, therefore, they will be willing to accept my assurance that what they have said in the matter will not be overlooked.

I think that if I had time I could show to the present Prime Minister that the postponement of further consideration of the clause was due, in great part at any rate, to the objections of hon. members on this side as well as across the floor in regard to widowed mothers resident in the United States. Subsection 8 section 23 of the Act says that the pension of a parent or person in place of a parent shall not be reduced on account of the payment of such person of municipal insurance on the life of a deceased member of the forces. I contend that the pension should not be reduced by reason of the payment of any insurance. My contention is that if the deceased young man made his insurance payable to his mother, as in a great many cases good boys do, and paid for it, she should get it and should not have her pension deducted in consequence. As my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) reminds me, such payment would not be deducted in the case of a claim for damages. And though this is not a case of a claim for damages against the country, it is a case in which the country has a solemn obligation to fulfil towards these soldiers and their dependents. When the soldiers went to the war it was definitely promised that their people would be no worse off financially, should they be so unfortunate as to lose their lives in the cause for which the country was fighting, than when they went away, I submit—and this is the whole tenor of my resolution—that the widowed mother should be placed on exactly the same basis as the widow. The widowed mother who lost her son at the front is as a rule well up in years and is unable to earn her living in any way or to increase her income; and it should be the peculiar and special care of the state to look after her. I say that we have possibly a greater obligation towards the widowed mother than towards the widow herself, and it is our duty to see to it that we are not told that the aged mothers of Canadian soldiers are in want or are apt to be in want owing to discriminatory legislation of this Parliament.

I do not think there is very much more that I need say on this subject. I think, however, that it might perhaps have been better to have discussed it on a day when there was a larger attendance of members. But I see a number of those who in the past have supported the object of this resolution, and I hope that this, the fifth session during which I have brought this matter to the attention of the House, will be the last in which I shall have been obliged to argue in favour of this class of dependents who deserve so much from the country.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Power) will admit that he and I have fought together on this question through several of the pension committees sitting in former years, and sometimes we were practically alone in our fight in that respect. Now I certainly do not want to say anything to-night that would prejudice or pre-judge the position of the widowed mother. No one could have greater sympathy with her than I have. I cannot forget the remark of one of the Chairmen of patriotic funds who, during the course of the war—said he had yet to find a mother who was not broken-hearted because her son went overseas. But throughout not only our pension legislation but that of every other country has run the difference between a pension to a widow and a pension to dependent parents. The widow as the hon. member has said, gets her pension as of right absolutely independently of what her station in life may be; but the parents of the man who has died have always been called upon to prove, first; that they were supported, or might be supported, by the son who had died, and, second; that their financial position was such that they were

really in a dependent position. Once their financial independence was shown their right to a pension ceased. Well, we have improved the position to a certain extent. In the early years of the war the widowed mother only got $22 a month. She gets now, with the bonus awarded during this year, $60 a month. Then she had deducted from her pension her personal earnings. Well, that was corrected. She was, I think, two years ago allowed her personal earnings without any deduction for her pension. Any independent or unearned income which she might receive was deducted from the pension awarded to her; and the Pension Board, as perhaps was their duty, went to some lengths in construing what was an independent income. They held, for instance, that the ownership of a house was equivalent to a certain amout of rental per annum, and while they fixed that rental at a reasonable figure, some $10 or $15 a month, the mother's ownership of that house did result in a reduction in her pension. They also held that if she had sons capable of maintaining her living with her and earning a sufficient income, the duty of maintaining the mother rested on those living sons and that no pension was due. Well, as I say, we corrected some of those things. A widow may now live in her own house and yet we make no reduction from her pension; and as the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) says, if she is in receipt of an independent income up to $20 a month, no deduction is made on account of that income. That is to say she will get $60 a month by way of pension even if she is in receipt of $20 a month of independent income, or $80 a month altogether. If she gets $25 a month independent income, $5 comes off her pension. If she gets $80 a month independent income she gets no pension at all and, to that extent, she is in an absolutely different position from the widow of a soldier. Then we have also provided under the last Act, as has already been explained, that if the mother had sons living with her who, in the opinion of the Pension Board, were capable of supporting her, those sons should be held to be contributing $10 a month toward the support of their mother. If she only had two such sons, and had no independent income, that would be considered to be equivalent to $20 of unearned income and no deduction would be made from her pension; but if she had more than two sons, or if she had an independent income and two sons living with her, then there might be a deduction of income.

[Mr. Cronyn.]

I confess that I am surprised to learn that the Act has been so construed that the earnings of a daughter are deducted or are taken into account. It was certainly not according to my recollection. I have not had the opportunity of looking at the Act recently, but my memory is very clear that so far as the Pension Committee is concerned we only considered and were only considering sons, and the question of daughters or the earnings of daughters never arose.

While one hesitates to mention the question of cost in a matter of this kind I think I should point out to the House that the estimate of the cost of the proposed changes which we made last year—those changes which I have tried to outline—represented an increase of nearly two and a half millions in the annual pension bill of the country. It struck me that that was a very high estimate at the time, but it was the one furnished us by responsible officials and we had to adopt it. I have not yet had any intimation as to how the changes have worked out in actual practise. I believe that we are the only country that has, up to date, made the allowances on behalf of a mother that have been made. As I understand it the greatest amount allowed by any other country to a dependent mother is $48 a month, and all unearned income is deducted from that pension. Perhaps we have not gone far enough yet. I think it is a matter that might very well be again considered if a committee is appointed this session.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): This is a question which I, with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), have fought for a good many years. I am not considering either what the cost to Canada is, or what any other country does; it is a question of whether Canada has done justice to these women or whether she has not. I agree with the hon. member for Quebec South that there has been a great deal of irritation, too much irritation, by having inspectors unnecessarily visit these women. They go around more or less in disguise, they do not know what they are after, and the first thing the recipients know these widows' pensions are cut off, or reduced, and we do not get any reason for such action until we come down here to the Pension Board at Ottawa. I do not think that is fair. Neither do I think it is fair that there should be any discrimination between widows and widowed mothers. While I do not wish to raise the question of discrimination here,

I would certainly say that if any discrimination were to be made it should be made in favour of the mothers. We all know that these women are older as a class than the wives, and their earning power and capacity in life is diminished, compared with the younger set of women who happen to be left widows. In estimating their dependent condition I think the figures have been set altogether too low. For instance you say that a woman is not entitled to a pension unless she is in a dependent condition, and I admit there is a great deal to be said for that.

But then you come down to set a figure, and you set $240 as the limit. That is to say, I think no deduction should be made —and I moved this in committee once or twice last year—where a woman is in receipt of less than $700 or $800 a year. Considering the cost of living to-day, I do think a woman is dependent if she has not that amount of income, and I think a great deal of this trouble might be eliminated if that standard was raised. I realize, of course, that it would not do to put women enjoying an income of $4,000 or $5,000 on a footing of equality with women who have a very small income, but I think it is altogether too low to set the limit at $240.

I agree with the hon. member for Quebec South that we have to make the administration more a matter of routine, and not leave so much to the discretion of the Board of Pension Commissioners. I have nothing but the highest praised for those commissioners. I have found them at all times considerate and more or less generous, but they do have a faculty of interpreting the regulations in a manner which does not always meet with my approval. As I said before, I think we must eliminate all these irritating conditions. I do not think it is fair to deduct from a married woman's pension $10 a month if she has a boy who is not working or whom she is not able to make work. It is pretty hard for a mother to say to her boy, "You have got to work or get out." Sometimes he is not able to work, and sometimes she is absolutely unable to force him, and in a great many cases she has not the heart to do it. In my opinion these pensions should be made a matter of absolute right. I do not think you can put them on any other ground and do justice to the widows and mothers of the soldiers who died in France. I cannot see why any distinction should be made between a boy's mother and a boy's widow when they were both dependent upon him for a living. I also agree with the hon. member for Quebec South that any insurance they might have coming to them through the generosity of municipalities or firms or societies should not be deducted from their pensions. Surely Canada is big enough and generous enough to pay her own debts to these widows and widowed mothers without taking into consideration such insurance. I hope that this matter will be settled once for all. I think the Pension Committee in the past has succeeded in eliminating nearly all the defects of the Pension Act. Up to a couple of years ago it had many defects, but during the last year I think the committee has worked admirably, and as far as I have been able to find there are to-day very few complaints indeed. Most of them, I am sorry to say, are associated nearly altogether with the medical men. Consciously or unconsciously, they seem to have got into their system some kind of microbe which impels them to screw pensioners down very often to the lowest possible figure. I do not believe that that is in the best interests of Canada, and I do not believe that such action expresses the will of this House, the will of this Government, or the will of the people.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with many of the suggestions thrown out by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). My sympathy goes out very largely to the widowed mother. I do not think that we should boast of what Canada has done or is doing for her soldiers. I believe it is the desire of this Government and the wish of the people that none of her soldiers' dependents should suffer one iota. When I was Minister of Militia I suggested in this House that the Government should grant to the mothers who had lost their boys in the war a small silver cross, which I designated The Mother's Cross of Sacrifice. To my mind the greatest sacrifice in this war was made by the mothers who reared their boys and sent them to the battlefront. I know of many instances where a widowed mother has suffered more than any one realizes, and is in fact suffering to-day, and will continue to suffer for the rest of her life. While this country has been generous, and while I for one realize that the Board of Pension Commissioners have done herculean work and that complaints have been few and far between, yet I think the commissioners are forgetting one essential fact in the administration of the Act, namely, that they are dealing with human beings.

I think there should be a little more human kindness in the administration. I have every confidence in the Prime Minister's assurance that he proposes to move for the appointment of another committee to go into these various matters this session. The committee appointed last year did magnificent work, of which the soldiers and the country heartily approved, as did also this House. If that committee is reappointed I am confident that what has been brought forward by the hon. member for South Quebec, with a portion of which I entirely agree, will have the most careful and sympathetic consideration and that something will be worked out to meet this situation.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Pension Committee ever since there was a pension committee of this House, I must confess that I think we considered this question at all our meetings. Somebody has said that the widowed mother is always old. I know a great many widowed mothers that are not any older than the widows of our boys, so that that description is not always appropriate.

As to the limit of $240, the Ontario Government recently passed an Act whereby the widow without children gets $30 a month; the widow with one child, $35 a month; the widow with two children, $40 a month; the mother with three children, $45 a month, and the widow with four children, $50 a month. Our pension to the widowed mother was $60 a month with no deduction for her own earnings, but a deduction for unearned income over $240, leaving $80 a month as explained by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn).

I see no reason why, sons, who are unmarried and living at home, should not assist in supporting their mother or their father, for it encourages thrift on the part of the boys, and, after all, it is their duty. If a mother wants to board her son without charging him anything, why that is her or the family's lookout, but the country should not be called upon to be philanthropic to the extent of making good her indulgence or his default. That sort of philanthropy breeds a type of people who are not of much use in this country. Nobody respects the mother more than I do, whether she be a widow or not a widow, and whether she be in this country or in any other country. But we have gone pretty far in the granting of pensions, and if people are economical and try to get on they will find the pensions ample to maintain their families in all decency. Somebody said that the boy who was in a sanitarium was expected to pay something toward the upkeep of his mother, as well as the boy who has been living at home. As I understand it, the boy in the sanitarium is allowed $17 a month for incidental expenses—cigarettes, laundry, and that sort of thing, and the dependent receives $75 a month. No man who is in a sanitarium, no matter where it is located, requires that $75 a month, for he is supplied with everything—nursing, food, and so on.

Mr. POWER: Does my hon. friend think that this $75 a month, granted of right to the soldier who has been disabled by war service, should be applied to the unkeep of his dependent mother?

Mr. NESBITT: I do not see why part of it should not be so applied. If the man is disabled he will be pensioned; if he is in the sanitarium only temporarily and subsequently recovers fully, he will not receive a pension when he comes out; he is expected to earn his living in civil life. I have the greatest sympathy for both the widow and the widowed mother, but there is no use in running away with sentiment; it does not assist either the widow or the widowed mother to become independent, to become a good citizen. I repeat that the boy who leaves home and who will not help to support his mother or his father will never become a good citizen. I see no reason why the Government or the Board of Pension Commissioners should make that deduction of $10 a month. It is a very small amount. After all, the pensions throughout are generous. However, this is a question which should be brought before the Pension Committee, if it is going to be appointed, and thrashed out by them; then if the House does not agree with the report of that Committee, the matter can be further discussed here.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). I could never see any justification for a distinction between the pension payable to the widow and wife of the soldier and that payable to the widowed mother. It seems to me that the test is whether the pension is payable as a matter of right or as a matter of dependency. We must adopt either of these two principles as applicable to both class of cases. We have adopted the principle that the widow or wife of the soldier is entitled to

pension as a matter of right, and we endeavour to ascertain what amount will be sufficient to enable her to live comfortably and decently during the time she is in receipt of that pension. We should apply the same principle to the widowed mother and grant her the pension as a matter if right, as in the case of the widow.

The member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) contends that if we pay these sums to widowed mothers as a matter of right, there will be a tendency to breed in this country a class of people entirely dependent upon the Government for support. But if he stands by that argument he must also apply it to the widow or wife of the soldier who was killed at the front, because many a man who was killed at the front left behind him sons who are just as capable of supporting his widow—their mother—as the brothers of a man killed overseas are capable of supporting their widowed mother. I think it is simply a matter of right that the widowed mother should be classed with the widow of the soldier, and that pensions should be paid to her without any deductions on account of insurance or other income from independent sources. When the Committee are considering this question they can bear in mind the opinions which have been expressed in the House tonight in connection with the matter, and if they do I should think that they they would bring in a report along the lines I have suggested. Should they fail to do so the House will be at liberty to deal with the matter on a subsequent occasion. I have much pleasure in supporting the arguments which have been submitted to the House by the hon. member for Quebec South.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the views of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). This is a question which has been before the Pension Committee for some time. I believe that in every case the widowed mother should be treated in just the same way as the dependent widow. There is another question in connection with this matter which has come to my mind during the progress of the debate, and that is the position of the woman who marries the returned soldier who dies subsequent to his injury from any cause. As the member for Muskoka rightly said, our medical men are apt to interpret the law very closely, and in many cases the widow of a returned soldier is left without any assistance from the Government simply because she married a soldier after his return to Canada. We find that men who returned to Canada 90 or 75 or 60 per cent. disabled receive for themselves, their wives and children, an amount of pension proportionate to their disability, while the wife of the soldier, whom she married after his return to Canada and who subsequently died, receives nothing. These aspects of the question should be taken into consideration by the Committee and reported upon favourably.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I do not like to let this opportunity pass without again expressing my sympathy with the object of the resolution moved by the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). I have, on two or three previous occasions, spoken very strongly in favour of the utmost liberality as regards the treatment of the widowed mother of a soldier. While her pension has been improved in many respects, I feel it is hardly yet as liberal as I should like to see it. I admire the spirit that actuates the hon. member for Oxford North (Mr. Nesbitt) in keeping down the expenses of the country as far as possible—and, perhaps, there are too few of us who take that course—but I feel that in the present case the committee have not yet been over liberal. I know of a few cases in which hardship has resulted. I have always taken the ground—and I do not see any reason for changing it—that when men have died, as these men have, in the interest of this country and the Empire, we owe them a different debt from that which we may owe to any other class of citizens. The hon. member for Oxford North has related what has been done in Ontario with regard to pensions for widows, but it ought to be remembered that the widows who are provided for by the Ontario Act have become widows by an act of Providence.

Mr. NESBITT: What about the others? Was that not an act of Providence?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Just a moment. The one has become a widow by an act of Providence, and in the other case the soldier has died in the service of his country. I consider that there is a greater responsibility upon the country when a man dies in its service than there is in the case of a man who has died without giving any particular service to his country. I hope, of course, all citizens do some service to their country, and I do not say they do not; but this country owes a certain debt to the

man who has died at the front or on account of illness that he has contracted at the front, by reason of the sacrifice that has been made, and if we cannot pay that debt to the man, we can pay it to the widow. There is quite a strong difference, and deductions should not be made by reason of the earnings of the widowed mother.

Mr. NESBITT: They are not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, they are. I remember a case that I have brought up two or three times before the Pension Board and it is not yet settled. Because the widow has up to the present been able to earn a fairly good living, she is denied a pension. The late member for York-Sunbury (Mr. McLeod) also brought up the same matter and, so far as I know, it has never been settled because the widow is able to earn a certain amount in a banking institution, and if the amount is above the specific amount that has been named, nothing is done. They tell her that if she finally becomes incapacitated so that she cannot work, her case will be taken into consideration, but not as long as she can earn what is possibly a fairly good living for a widow. She is, however, working beyond her years, and the day will soon be at hand when she cannot continue to work. The country owes a debt to that widow whether she is willing and able to go out and earn her daily bread or not; she may wish to lay up something for a rainy day, and the country should not be so severe in making deductions from the pension of a widow simply because she is able to earn a certain amount for her sustenance. I speak very strongly in this connection. I know the hon. member for Oxford North does not agree with me—and I am sorry for that because I esteem his judgment as very valuable—but at the same time I believe, if he opens up his heart-strings a little more, the country will not find fault with him in that respect. I believe in being absolutely generous to the widows and widowed mothers of returned soldiers. If we do anything to lighten the burden and to make them forget some of the sad loss that they have sustained as a result of this war, we are doing what is simply our duty and the most liberal treatment we can give is not too much in connection with the resolution that my hon. friend (Mr. Power) has put on the Order Paper. I am pleased to add a word on behalf of this matter and I trust, if a committee is appointed, this matter will be further considered and I am sure it will meet the views of a large number of the members of this House if even more generous treatment is given to the widows and widowed mothers of returned soldiers.

10 p.m.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) is to be congratulated on having presented this matter to the House in such a form as to win, as it has, a large measure of sympathy from hon. members. I have such a high appreciation of the work done by the committee that sat during the last two years under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), that I would be reluctant to see any change made in the matter of pensions without having the matter first submitted to the committee. I hope from the expressions of opinion given by hon. members this evening that the committee will be able to concur in the case presented by the hon. member, but, at all events, an opportunity will be given for considering it. I know the object of these deductions, and it is a good one. The idea is that you do not want to pay pensions to people who do not need them. That is a very commendable object; but if we have regard to the number of pensions generally, are there enough cases of that kind to make it worth while to make that regulation? In making these deductions with the resultant worry and interference, is the game worth the candle? The number of wealthy people in Canada is not very great; in this country wealth is fairly equally and comfortably distributed—and that is better than a few people having the wealth as is the case in some countries—so that if you had no deductions at all, the number of widows who would get a pension and who did not need it, would not be very large, and if they got a little more, no great harm would be done. The suggestion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. P. McGibbon) is that, unless it can be shown that the widow is in receipt of a very substantial sum from other quarters, the wise policy would be to have no deductions at all. I would suggest to the hon. member for Quebec South that, having made the progress he has in the good work, he consent to let the matter go to the committee and bring it up at a later date, if that be necessary.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it affords me a

great deal of pleasure to join with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in congratulating the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Powers) upon the manner in which he has brought his motion forward, and upon the reception with which his presentation of it has been met. There is no doubt that the case of the widowed mother is one that appeals most strongly to the sympathies of all of us. I am sure that we would all desire that every means should be taken to prevent its happening that any mother who has lost her son in the service of this country should be left in any condition approaching even to want. Of course, when you come to carry out your desires, there are some considerations that have to be borne in mind, because, after all, you have to arrive at some definite sum. Some consideration ought to be given to equality. While you may avoid laying down an absolute rule as to what particular amount of income, independent of other sources than the pension, should lead to deductions being made from a pension, still, it does rather appeal to one that a good deal is to be said against granting pensions to people with regard to whom it is absolutely impossible to suggest that there can be any need. It has occurred to me, listening to the discussion, that one way of meeting the situation, and perhaps a fairer way—I am not expressing any conclusion; this is only what occurred to me—might lie in the direction of increasing the maximum amount of sixty dollars that is to be given as a pension, rather than in directing one's attention solely to the question of what deductions, if any, ought to be made.

However, I do not desire to express any final opinion on the subject this evening. I think the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) can rest assured that the matter will engage the serious, and I do not think I would be going too far in saying, the sympathetic attention of the committee. I would join with my hon. friend from Shelburn and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in asking the hon. member for South Quebec, if with the assurance that the matter will be brought to the attention of the committee, and seriously, and carefully, and I think I may say, sympathetically looked into by them, he might not think it proper at the present time to withdraw his motion.

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.): As a member of last year's Pension Committee it would probably not be amiss for me to say a word in this discussion. I supported the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) when he moved this resolution before the Pension Committee last year. When the resolution was defeated in the committee it was only by a very small majority, and I felt at the time, and still feel, that if the whole committee had been present when the vote was taken it would have carried.

There is one other case I wish to bring to the notice of the House and of the committee, and it is that of the widow of the soldier who was wounded or disabled overseas and who marries after his return to Canada. His widow is absolutely denied a pension under the present Act. I would like to see this injustice to the large number of widows of returned soldiers who have married subsequent to their disability remedied this session. I also agree with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) that the sum of $240 per annum is too small an amount of income to allow before deductions are made from the pension. I fully agree with my hon. friend from Muskoka that no deduction should be made from the widow's pension on an unearned income of less than $700 or $800 a year. In view of the fact that a pension committee is to be appointed this year, I think it would be the part of wisdom for my hon. friend from South Quebec to let this matter go before that committee, and I think there is very little question that these matters will be remedied in accordance with his resolution.

Mr. DANIEL D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): There is just one phase of this subject that I should like to bring to the notice of the House, and particularly of the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), who was chairman of the Pension Committee last year and who in the natural course of events will be chairman this year if another committee is appointed. I appreciate very much the forceful and very proper way in which the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) has placed the subject before the House, and I am sure the discussion that has taken place, and the experiences that several members have given, will be of assistance to the committee when they come to consider these questions.

There is one point I would like to impress upon the House, and that is in connection with the deductions that are made from the pension in cases where there happen to be two or more sons. I know that in the part of the country from which I come there are many cases where there are perhaps

one or two sons who should support their mother, but who will not, and what is the good of throwing the impossible burden on the widow of compelling these boys to support her? There are lots of boys who will not do so, and unless they are supporting their mother voluntarily and freely, it is not right to say that the mother shall suffer because they are not doing their duty. In cases of that kind, where the widowed mother cannot increase her income except by what her boys might give, I would certainly say to the House and to the committee, whoever they may be, that they might very well leave out of consideration making any deduction from the pension of the widow.

Mr. NESBITT: May I ask whether these boys live at home with the mother?

Mr. McKENZIE: In some cases they do and perhaps in a niggardly way pay their board. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) knows that boys sometimes take advantage of their mother when they are boarding and rooming with her that they would not take of other people, and will not pay as much for their board as they would have to pay elsewhere. I know cases of that kind, where the mother has to do the washing, for instance, and give the board cheaper than the boys could get it elsewhere. The boys will pay just the amount they were paying before prices went up, and the mother is the loser. That is all the profit she gets from boarding her boys. I do not wish to give a bad name to the people in my part of the country, but there are cases of that kind, and I think I am more than justified in bringing them to the attention of the committee. I repeat that the committee should leave out their consideration making deductions from the pension of a widow who has sons who might support her, but who are not doing so.

I wish particularly to bring to the notice of the House the case of some widows who are not receiving a pension at all, and so far as I know, have not received any consideration from the Government so far. It is within the knowledge of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), the exminister (Mr. Mewburn), and other members of this House that at certain stages of the war, in 1915, 1916, and perhaps later, this Government engaged some steamers to carry supplies to the old country, iron and steel, for instance, from Sydney, for the purposes of the war on the other side of the water. These steamers were engaged for that war service, and I have one particularly in mind at the present moment, the "Sharon," owned, I think, in Quebec. She was chartered by the Department of Railways and Canals, loaded with steel at Sydney, and started for the other side of the water, but she never got across. The belief is that she was torpedoed. At all events, she never reached the other side, and all on board were lost. Sixteen or seventeen, perhaps twenty, widows were left in my town by reason of the loss of the "Sharon." Now if the steamer was torpedoed, and there being no evidence to the contrary it is not a great stretch of the imagination to believe she was, while engaged by the Government of this country for the purposes of the war, these men lost their lives by reason of the war, and it does not take very close reasoning to show that their widows are entitled to some consideration at the hands of the people of this country, and of this Parliament. I would like to have cases of this kind kept in mind by the committee when they come to consider the other features that have been brought to their notice. These steamers that were chartered were not war vessels, but they were used for the purpose of carrying supplies to be used for war purposes, and while the "Sharon" was so engaged these men lost their lives by reason of the unsafe condition of navigation. I would urge that as just as good a case for consideration by the committee as if the men had been killed at the front.

Mr. POWER: It has been alleged during the course of this discussion, or at least it has been suggested, that in some cases the widowed mother obtained more than the widow herself and that she should be very well off with the sum of, say, $80 per month. Now, I am not asking for $80, I simply ask that she be given $60 per month in exactly the same way as the widow obtains it, and without there being any deduction whatsoever. I ask that she be given it of right, that there be no question as to whether she has a house, as to whether she lives in the house which she owns, whether she is keeping a boarding-house or has turned it into an apartment house, deriving an income therefrom, whether she has a few dollars in the bank, or whether a few dollars were left to her from insurance, or any other consideration of that kind. The point I wish to make quite clear to the House is that to my mind, the widowed mother of the soldier is entitled to be placed by this country in exactly the same position as the widow

of the soldier. I have been told also that we should encourage the widowed mother to become independent. It seems to me that the mother of a boy who has been killed at the front has usually reached an age when it is no business of the country to try to encourage her to become independent; it is rather its duty to see that she is independent. We are not going to set up a school to teach the elderly women who have sacrificed their all in the great war how to become independent in this country. There is no question to my mind of the opinion of the House on this matter, I think that every hon. member will agree with me that this is no time to bring this question before the House. What the province of Ontario does with regard to mothers' pensions is one matter. I do not care what it does. But what the Dominion of Canada does with regard to the mothers of the sons whom she sent to the front is a matter with which we are all concerned. We have our pledged word to these boys; we have our pledged word in the face of the whole Dominion of Canada; and it seems to me that the least a House of Commons such as this, elected during the war and in the war spirit, can do is to keep its war pledges.

Now, I have been asked to allow this matter to be referred to committee. As I said before, for four years I have been fighting the case of the widowed mothers, and have spoken in furtherance of it in committee; and on each occasion, I am sorry to say, the committee refused to bring in a favourable report. Last year, I submitted this identical resolution, which a number of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House and to my left supported. It was referred to the Pension Committee, amidst, I may say, the acclamation of the entire House of Commons. But when the Pension Committee reported they were too busy reporting on other things to have anything to say in favour of the widowed mother, except for a very small amendment to the law as it stood. And when, not being satisfied with the decision of the Pension Committee, either last year or the year before, I carried the matter to the floor of the House, where it was discussed, I was told first that if this point were to be insisted upon, The whole matter would have to be referred back to the committee and in that event it would be held up because the committee would not have time to report before the end of the session. This has been the case for two or three years in succession. Whenever the report of the Pension Committee came in, we who wished to critise or amend it or to refer it back to the committee were told: Well, we are very willing to help you, and you are possibly right in what you say, but if you oppose this committee's report, no report at all will be brought in and the pensioners will not have the benefit of these provisions. Last session, in spite of this objection made by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), I insisted on pushing the matter and I desired to bring it to the vote. On asking the Chair to put the question to the vote, however, I was ruled out of order because, had the law been amended in the direction I proposed, it would have been necessary first to obtain a resolution of the House, as there was involved the question of voting larger sums from the exchequer. This has happened in two years. Now, I have no guarantee that it will not happen again. There is no guarantee that the Pension Committee's report will not be brought down in the dying days of the session and that the Government will not say again: Unless you accept this report and swallow it holus-bolus the pensioners will be deprived of the benefit thereof. And there is equally no guarantee that if I insist on bringing this amendment before the House it will not again be ruled out of order. As a matter of fact, it should be ruled out of order if the chairman of the committee did his duty properly, so that I should be absolutely without recourse. We have a proposition which has been received by the House with enthusiasm for two, three and four years, and every time we came to what I might call a show-down the matter was thrown out.

Mr. ARTHURS: Did the hon. member ever bring that proposition to a vote in this House?

Mr. POWER: In order to explain more fully to the hon. gentleman, who has evidently not understood what I have been talking about for the last five minutes, I will tell him that last year I endeavored to bring the matter to a vote but that it was thrown out by the chairman on the ground that I was not in order in proposing that further moneys be voted from the Crown at the request of a private member without a resolution of the House.

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. member was a member of the committee whose actions he is complaining of, but he did not bring in a minority report.

Mr. POWER: I will answer that question too. For the last three years, on every occasion when the committee brought in a report, I have objected to the omission of any provision for the widowed mother. On every occasion when the matter has been brought before this House I have insisted on these provisions such as I have advocated to-night being placed in the bill. And if the hon. gentleman had the interest of the pensioners and their dependents so much at heart, as I am sure he should have—and as I am sure he would have but for the fact that probably he is under—

Mr. ARTHURS: You are not answering the question.

Mr. POWER: What is your question?

Mr. ARTHURS: Have you brought in any minority report?

Mr. POWER: I did on one occasion bring in a minority report, but I was all alone on this question, and not having had any satisfaction in introducing such a report, I proposed, with the consent and, I think, with the knowledge of all members of the committee to debate this matter on the floor of the House. And as a matter of fact I did debate it on the floor of the House. It is no new question and the hon. gentleman ought to know that. Speaking frankly, I am somewhat reluctant to agree to the request made by the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Another reason is that personally I am under the impression that the returned soldiers have no longer very much faith in this Pension Committee. I rather think that in the past few years they have been looking at the Pension Committee and the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment as a means of thwarting what they consider to be their legitimate desires. Last year we had somewhat of a tempest in a teapot but we saw at that time what the true feelings of the soldiers were with reference to the Pension Committee. I am willing to do my best for the returned soldiers at any time, but I will certainly not sit on the committee another year. I know that on several occasions during the proceedings of the committee last year, the soldier vote was defeated by an almost entirely civilian vote; and if that is to happen again—and it might very well happen on this very question—I do not see any necessity or any reason why the committee should sit another year. I have on every possible occasion placed my views on this important matter before the committee and before the House, and I do not think I could serve any useful purpose by sitting on the committee another year. Nevertheless, I have to bear in mind that if this question were not referred to a committee at the present time my proposition might be defeated, and in all likelihood would result in a worse condition for the poor people whom I am endeavouring to benefit. I am strongly desirous of furthering the cause of the widowed mothers, and if it were left to my own feelings in the matter I would say, "Let us come to a show-down and see whether those who have been telling us so much about their interest in the returned soldiers and their dependents will prove their interest by their votes on the question when put to them in a fair and straightforward manner." However it seems to be the opinion of those who are better versed in parliamentary matters than I am, that more good may perhaps be obtained by referring this question again to a committee; that there may be a better chance of the committee this year seeing things in their true light than has been the case in the past three or four years. Therefore, at the request of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, for whose opinion I maintain the highest respect, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw the motion?

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Tuesday, March 8, 1921.

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Volumes 1 and 2 of the Auditor General's report.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Copies of General Orders and appointments, promotions and retirements, Canadian Militia, promulgated between February 2nd, 1920, and February 1st, 1921, and copies of Routine Orders, Canadian Expeditionary Force, promulgated between February 23rd, 1920, and September 30th, 1920, when publications ceased.—Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

Orders in Council relating to Royal Canadian Navy.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

VACANCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received communications from several members notifying me that the following vacancies have occured in the representation, namely:

Of Joseph Ernest Oscar Gladu, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of Yamaska, by decease.

Of Harry Fulton McLeod, Esquire, member for the Electoral Dictrict of York-Sunbury, by decease.

Of Thomas George Wallace, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of York, West Riding, by decease.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts, respectively.

GERMAN REPARATION—CANADA'S CLAIM—THE EXISTING SITUATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PAMPHILE REAL DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to know, in view of the situation in Europe at the present time between the Allies and Germany, whether the Government intends to take proper steps to ensure the indemnity which Canada was supposed to be entitled to, or which, at any rate, we hoped to receive from Germany.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): There is no statement I can make just now having particular reference to reparations, other than such as applies to the general question of reparations, which of course is in the hands of the Supreme Allied Council. This matter was referred to yesterday in more general terms by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) when enquiry was made whether a statement could not be given to the House as to the condition of affairs consequent upon the demand for distinct reparation proposals from Germany by that Supreme Council, and the unsatisfactory response thereto. As I said yesterday, continual communication passes between the British Government and ourselves as to the principal occurrences of the Supreme Allied Council. Those communications are marked "Secret", but I see no objection to stating in the House such of them as in certain form have already reached the press. The only result will be of course to give something in the nature of official confirmation to these facts. It will be remembered that the Supreme Allied Council met, in January last, in Paris, in order to formulate proposals for submission to Germany on the question of reparations. An adjournment was made to London, and the meeting there took place last week. The proposals which Germany was asked to make were not at all as to the amount of reparations but rather as to the methods by which she should undertake to make good the call for reparations. At such meeting in London Germany undertook to lay a statement of her methods before the Supreme Allied Council, but she added thereto, or made a part thereof, proposals as to the amount of reparations as well, which, in the judgment of the Council, were not only wholly inadequate but constituted a challenge to the foundation of the Treaty itself; in a word, an intimation that it was not the intention of Germany to abide by the terms of the Treaty. That being the case, Germany was informed through the British Prime Minister that there was nothing in her proposals that could form even a basis for discussion and that she would be advised as to what steps would be taken in order to enforce the provisions of the Treaty itself. Consequently, Germany was advised, in brief, as follows: First, that a small area on the right bank of the Rhine would be occupied; second, that it was intended to deduct from moneys owing Germany from outside countries for German goods a certain proportion applicable to the Reparations Account; and third, that control would be taken of the customs in all occupied territory. These intentions were submitted to the German representatives and, failing any adequate proposals on their part up to noon of yesterday, the Allied proposals became operative at that hour. It will be observed that there is nothing in the programme which involves an increase of the forces now occupying German territory for its enforcement and, as well, that no Canadian troops are engaged. I do not feel that there is anything more than I can say at the present time, except that no specific proposal as to co-operation is before us.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST TYPHUS, ETC.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): In view of the very widespread prevalence of typhus fever in Eastern Europe, and in view also of the fact that within the last day or two cases of the disease have been

found among immigrants arriving at the ports of Boston and New York, I would ask the Minister of Immigration and Colonization to state to the House what precautions are being taken to prevent the introduction of this disease into Canada.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I am not aware of all the details of the situation, but I can assure the House that every precaution is being taken at the present time to prevent the introduction into Canada not only of typhus but of one or two other epidemic diseases that are very prevalent in certain parts of Europe at the present time. As a matter of fact the countries of Western Europe are all keenly alive to the situation—that is to say, Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain and other nations—and they are taking every precaution to prevent the spreading of these diseases from Eastern to Western Europe. As far as my information goes there are but few cases of typhus at present at the quarantine stations at Boston and New York—very few cases. Only one case—which is located at Massena, in New York State—has broken loose. That case is under strict observation, and every precaution is being adopted to prevent the disease from spreading further. I may also state that we have stationed three of our officers at New York to study the conditions there and make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the steps being taken by the American authorities to prevent the spread of these diseases in the United States. In addition to that our own officers are very keenly alive to the situation and very strict instructions have been issued to the officers in our own ports to exercise every vigilance. At the present time not a single case of this disease has landed at any port in Canada and, as I have already said, very few in the United States. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the House that the officers of the Health Department are thoroughly alive to the importance of taking every means to prevent these diseases from entering Canada, and are co-operating to that end with the American authorities and our Provincial Health Officers.

PRIVILEGE—MR. DESAULNIERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ARTHUR L. DESAULNIERS (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the Montreal Gazette of to-day I am reported as having placed on the Order Paper a resolution seeking to suspend immigration into this country. I wish to state that I am not the author of the resolution to which the Montreal Gazette refers, and that if this resolution is brought up for discussion in this House I will oppose it.

ESTIMATES FOR 1921-1922

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the year ending March, 31st, 1922 was presented by Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

REINSTATEMENT OF MR. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I would like to ask the Government whether the statement appearing in the newspapers that Mr. Alexander Johnston has returned to the public service is correct, and if so, what his status will be in the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): In answer to the hon. member I desire to state that Mr. Alexander Johnston has been reinstated in his former position as Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

EXCHEQUER COURT AMENDMENT ACT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill No. 19, to amend the Exchequer Court Act be read the third time.

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

CANADIAN NATIONALS DEFINITION ACT

Resuming debate on the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty for the second reading of Bill No. 17, to define Canadian Nationals, adjourned from March 4.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): As I explained to the House when this matter was up last it is my intention, when we get into committee, to propose amendments to the definition of a Canadian National as set forth in the Bill. As that definition constitutes practically the entire Bill, I quite recognize the importance of the changes which I have in contemplation. I have asked to have the Bill as proposed to be amended printed and

circulated, and I believe that has been carried out. I was informed this morning that it had been printed, and last evening I handed to the leader of the Opposition a number of copies of the Bill as proposed to be amended. I trust that under those circumstances there has been opportunity for hon. gentlemen to take communication of the amendments. Upon what may be called the principle of the Bill, it seems to me that very little is called for beyond the explanation which was given at the first reading. What needs to be clearly understood at the outset—I think it is perhaps scarcely necessary for me to mention this, but it is well to avoid any misapprehension—is that the Bill does not contemplate to in any way affect the status or position of any Canadian as a British subject. Notwithstanding its enactment we shall all remain, of course, British subjects; and under the definition as proposed nobody will be a Canadian national who is not a British subject. But the purpose of the Bill is to define a particular class of British subjects who, in addition to having all the rights and all the obligations of British subjects, have particular rights because of the fact that they are Canadians. I think we have always understood that without a specific statutory definition there has for a long time been such a person as a Canadian, and some outstanding indications which justify a man in claiming to be a Canadian. But we have reached a stage now where there are certain specific rights created in favour of Canadians, or, to use the expression in the Bill, of Canadian nationals, as such, and should the legislation which this House last year asked to have passed by the British Parliament clearing up any doubt as to the extra-territorial effect of our legislation be enacted, as I have every reason to believe it will be, it will then be important to have a clear-cut definition of who are the people who may be affected by that legislation.

I might give an outstanding instance of where we have rights created in favour of Canadian nationals the provisions of the Convention establishing the permanent Court of International Justice. Under those provisions—which I have no doubt will meet with the approval of this House when the Convention is brought down—the judges of that court are to be elected by the representatives of the different members of the League. To secure election, it is essential that a candidate or aspirant should have a majority of the votes both of the Council and of the Assembly. Each country, member of the League, has a right, —a right not to be exercised directly by its government, but in the manner which I will point out in a moment—to nominate candidates. Each country proceeding in the manner to which I have referred is entitled to nominate four candidates; not more than two, however, of those candidates can be Nationals of the nominating country. So there we have a case where we need to distinguish between a National and a non-National of the nominating country.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister allow me a question? He states that a distinction has to be made between a Canadian national and a Canadian citizen. Is it on account of the League of Nations that the word "national" is used?

Mr. DOHERTY: We have already a definition of a Canadian citizen in the Immigration Act, but that definition is expressly limited to the Act itself, and we have no definition of a Canadian citizen which can be of general application.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not exactly what I had in my mind.

Mr. DOHERTY: I know, but I wanted to make that clear. There is a reason for using the word "national" rather than the word "citizen." It is to be found in this, that in the particular convention to which I referred and in the general proceedings of the League the word "national" is used as designating a person, whether subject or citizen, who forms part of the people of a particular member of the League. I am not certain that "national" is perhaps the most desirable word for England, but the word used in the French version of those proceedings by which the word "national" in our Bill should be translated is the word "ressortissant." I think the idea of using that word was to avoid the necessity of making distinctions between people who are subjects or citizens of a country and to get one word that, whatever the national designation, would cover the class of people who constitute the people of that country.

M. BUREAU: Le mot "ressortissant," est-il celui employé dans les procédures officielles de la Société des nations?

Mr. DOHERTY: Oui, le mot est celui employé. But perhaps I had better proceed in English. In the official documents this word "ressortissant" is used. You may have to talk of the "subject" of one country

and of the "citizen" of another country, but in "ressortissant" you get one word for them all. We passed considerable time with some very distinguished French gentlemen and some equally distinguished English gentlemen trying to find an English word that would be an exact translation of "ressortissant."

Mr. BUREAU: Do they use the word "national" in the English translation?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, the word "national" is taken as the translation of the word "ressortissant." It seems further desirable that in making the definition we should use the term which is employed in these documents, because, after all, what we want to do, so far as that is a particular reason for this measure, is to have a clear-cut definition of who is the person who, as being a national of Canada, is entitled to these rights.

There is to be found in the convention a further reason for having this clear-cut definition. There is a provision in the convention that if two or more candidates, nationals of the same member of the League, should be elected judges, the question of which of these should be the judge is to be determined—and it is perhaps consoling to those of us who are not as young as we at one time were—in favour of the gentleman who counts the largest number of years to his credit. But it is obviously important that we should be able to establish just who is a Canadian national, so that it may not be suggested that, if another British subject is elected and one of our men is elected, that would be a case of the election of two men who are nationals of the same member of the League. I may say that the convention as originally drafted might have been open to that suggestion, but at the instance of the representatives of Canada, among others, the wording was modified so as to make it quite clear that this question of one giving way to the other would not arise when there were elected not merely two nationals of the British Empire, but two nationals of the same member of the League. That is another instance in which we have the creation of a right in favour of the Canadian national. The recognition that each member of the League has nationals of its own being once made so clear, it seems to me only a natural thing, even if there were no other reason for it, that this country should take the responsibility of defining who its nationals are, and that is what this Bill proposes to do. As I said at the outset, there is no question of modifying in any way the position and status of us all as British subjects. The purpose of the Bill is only to define a particular class of British subjects—a class who have the peculiar quality of being that kind of British subjects who are nationals of Canada. As to the details, I assume we would deal with them better in committee. But speaking in a general way, if hon. gentlemen will look at the Bill they will see that the provisions defining "Canadian national", in the first place make such a Canadian national every British subject who come swithin the definition of a Canadian citizen under the Immigration Act. In addition, a provision is made with regard to certain classes of persons which follows the principles upon which the question of the quality of British subject is determined by the British Nationality Act, which we also have enacted. The definition of "Canadian citizen" in the Immigration Act limits the quality, so far as that quality results from birth, to the person born in Canada. In addition to the person born in Canada this Bill proposes to enact that the son of a Canadian national born while his father is a Canadian national, even though he be born outside of Canada, shall be a Canadian national. All hon. gentlemen will agree that if any one of us found himself in the unfortunate position of being absent from Canada temporarily with his family at a time when a child was born to him, he would want that child to be as full-fledged a Canadian as he is himself.

There is also a provision that the wife of a Canadian national shall be a Canadian national. With regard to persons such as the child in question, whose quality of Canadian national results from the fact of his paternity, though he was born elsewhere, there is a provision analogous to that which is found in the British Nationality Act, conferring upon such a child, if he should be entitled to nationality in any other British dominion, the privilege of renouncing his Canadian nationality. There is no need of providing for what will happen if he is entitled to become and desires to become the subject of some other country, because that is already covered in the British Nationality and Naturalization Act. Of course, if a man ceases to be a British subject he necessarily ceases to be a Canadian national.

Mr. EULER: In the case of men who were naturalized while they were minors, because of the fact that their fathers were naturalized, but who under the present Franchise Act have no vote unless they obtain a voting certificate—are they considered Canadian nationals under this Bill, even if they have not that certificate?

Mr. DOHERTY: Anybody who is a British subject and who was born in this country or who has domicile in this country as described in the Immigration Act, is a Canadian national. This proposed legislation, of course, has nothing to do with the franchise. I do not know what action may be taken in the future; the franchise may or may not be granted to all Canadian nationals, that depends upon the legislation of this Parliament on the question of the franchise. The Bill does not deal with any particular rights that are to belong to Canadian nationals; it is concerned simply with the making of a definition. The question as to what rights should belong to them or whether there should be differences between different classes, either as to the franchise or as to any other matter, is a thing that would have to be dealt with in separate legislation.

There is also provision for the case where a child is by reason of his birth a Canadian national, but by reason of his parentage or for some other reason, may at the time of his birth or later become entitled to recognition as a national of some other part of the Empire; the same privilege is given to him to make the declaration whereby he would cease to be a Canadian national. Both these classes follow absolutely the principle laid down with regard to the quality of British subject in the Act dealing with British nationality.

Mr. EULER: I would like to ask the minister another question.

Mr. DOHERTY: Might I suggest that questions will come more regularly and could be better dealt with when we go into committee on the Bill? Of course, I am precluded now from saying anything more on this reading save by way of reply to close the debate.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I regret that, from my point of view, with which all may not agree, this is another step in the wrong direction. When a false step is taken, it leads to another false step, and the first one having been taken, the second, perhaps, becomes unavoidable, and that is possibly the situation to-day. The word "National", as a noun, would be properly and fairly interpreted in the language of international affairs as a citizen of a sovereign State. Hitherto, we have all been glad to be British nationals. Canada is not a sovereign State; I do not want it to become a sovereign State, and I claim the expression "Canadian national" is rather difficult to be understood. This is, however, a step in the wrong direction; I do not expect to correct it, and I am satisfied simply to express my opinion.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): Mr. Speaker, if I understand aright the explanation of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), this legislation has become necessary in order to define membership in the League of Nations. The word "ressortissant", which has been translated by "national", must mean that a man, although not, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has stated, a member of an independent nation or of a sovereign State, has a voice in the League of Nations and must be more particularly identified. That is the reason why the expression "Canadian national" is used to translate the word "ressortissant", to show that the man belongs to one of the Dominions, that is, Canada. This Act on the statute books comes, comme un cheveu sur la soupe, an Act to define Canadian nationals. Might I suggest that, in order to facilitate the understanding of this legislation in the future, we put a preamble to it, stating in as few words as possible the explanation which has just been given by the Minister of Justice? I might suggest these words: That whereas it has become necessary, for the purpose of the better working of the League of Nations where Canada has a voice as a separate entity to define the status of the members who appear in the League of Nations as representing Canada, this legislation should be enacted defining these representatives as Canadian nationals —comme ressortissant de la nation canadienne, comme bon semblera. In that way, it will be seen in years to come why this legislation was enacted. In a few years the world will, perhaps, become normal again, and the next generation or the generation succeeding that will possibly be at a loss to know how this legislation came on the statute book unless some explanation is given by the preamble.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): (Translation). Mr. Speaker, in the French version of the Bill, these words "Nationaux Canadiens" are incorrectly given as a translation for the English "Canadian Nationals." The definition given of these people in paragraph "B" is as follows:

(b) British subjects who ordinarily reside in Canada although not domiciled there.

I should like to know from the right hon. minister whether British subjects residing in India, in South Africa and even in China may be termed "Canadian Nationals."

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member will allow me, I am afraid he is reading from the Bill as it was originally introduced.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I explained the matter and I am responsible for the confusion. I am surprised we have not the Bill before us as reprinted, because I gave most special instructions and it was reported to me early this forenoon—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: (Translation.) I am surprised myself but can we continue the discussion if we have not the Bill before us?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (Translation.) I said, at the outset of my remarks, that in case some hon. members would deem it advisable, I would not insist on proceeding with the Bill, but how could I possibly make such a suggestion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am out of order, I am afraid, but I only want to make the suggestion that questions of this kind seem to be questions that should properly be dealt with in committee. The difficulty is that I am being asked questions and I am not entitled to answer. If, when we go into committee on the Bill, any hon. gentleman feels that he is under a disadvantage by reason of this unfortunate accident, I certainly shall not insist on pressing the Bill through.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I submit we should not discuss a Bill that we do not have before us.

Mr. DOHERTY: All right.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising now is not to take exception to the principle of the Bill, but rather to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) to the form in which the Government is introducing its legislation. This is the second important Bill to which, after its introduction, the Government has presented an amendment much more substantial in its nature than the provisions of the Bill itself, with the result that we on this side of the House are expected to discuss a measure, the provisions of which we have not seen and with which we are not familiar. It is quite true the Minister of Justice last night presented me with a copy of the amendment he purposes moving to the Bill, but the amendment is a more substantial measure than the Bill itself. While I have been favoured with a number of copies, there has been no opportunity for members on this side to consider the matter, and, what I think is equally important, there has been no opportunity for the country to become familiar with the measure which my right hon. friend has introduced. We should have some idea of the measures that are to be discussed in this chamber, and some opportunity should be given for public opinion to express itself before measures are finally passed through this House. My right hon. friend would be taking a course that would be in the public interest if he would have his Bill presented in the form in which he hopes it to pass this House. The Government might consider that suggestion as applicable equally to all future legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY: If I may be permitted, I thought I had said, we shall say, at least half a dozen times, that I did not expect hon. members to discuss the Bill unless they felt ready to do so. I made the most frank, candid and open confession that there had happened this error; that I acknowledged my responsibility and asked nobody to suffer in the slightest degree, and in the face of that complaint is made that hon. members are expected to do this, that and the other thing, whereas hon. members had been assured that they were not expected to do anything of the kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the practice to which we are objecting.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let us get the whole mystery and see what the awful crime of this Government was. The imputation is that this matter was not given consideration. The trouble came, perhaps, because it got too careful consideration. Two drafts were made of this Bill,

and the unpardonable offence that occurred was that, when I was handed the draft for introduction, I was handed the first draft instead of the second. My offence goes to that extent and no further. I have acknowledged that members should have this Bill before them and that they should not be expected to discuss the matter without it. As to presentation, if the hon. gentleman thinks something is to be gained by that, I have no particular objection to take this Bill back and re-introduce it. But as a matter of fact, the Bill as proposed to be amended is printed in full, and if it is not actually in the hands of members, the responsibility is on whoever has charge of the distribution of those papers. Let me make this suggestion: Let the Bill go into committee, as I said a few moments ago, and if then it is not thought there has been opportunity for its consideration, I shall certainly not press that it be proceeded with.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask a queston?

Mr. SPEAKER: We must come to some semblance of order in this debate. We are debating the principle of the Bill on its second reading, where hon. members are restricted by the rules to only one speech. Now we have had two or three speeches, and all sorts of questions. I submit that the debate ought to be adjourned, or else brought to a conclusion, one or the other. If it goes on, we must adhere to the rules.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet intervened in this debate, and therefore I am in order in speaking now. I think we should not be called upon to discuss even the principle of this Bill, without having had it before us. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), with his usual courtesy, has said that he is prepared to do everything to meet our reasonable requirements, which is only what we would expect of him. We accept the evidence of this spirit of justice, and I would now move that the debate be adjourned and that we proceed to some other business. If I want to speak again, I shall have another opportunity.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

COPYRIGHT ACT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 12, to amend and consolidate the law relating to copyright.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would the minister give us an explanation of the Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: The measure has been re-introduced this session after having been, I think, twice before this House. This measure went through the Senate, substantially in its present form, in the session of 1919, I think. It came to this House, but unfortunately, for one reason or another, did not get through. The Bill was re-introduced in this House last year and, equally unfortunately, it did not reach its culmination; it was not adopted.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There is nothing on the Order Paper to indicate that the Bill has been printed in French. I have not on file a copy of the Bill in French.

Mr. DOHERTY: This is another case where I was assured the Bill had been printed and distributed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not on the file.

Mr. DOHERTY: If that is the fact, that the Bill is not in the hands of hon. members, I am where I was in the other matter. The hon. gentleman asked for an explanation of the Bill, and I was proceeding to give it. I have no desire unduly to press the matter. I have sent to inquire what is the explanation for the Bills not being here, because I gave the most positive orders that the Bill, which had been delayed in the course of printing, should be completed and distributed, and I was assured that that had been done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Bill has certainly not been distributed.

Mr. BELAND: Too many officials were dismissed from the Printing Bureau.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Probably Griffenhagen has the Bills.

Mr. VIEN: It is apparent from the Order Paper that the Bill has not been printed in French, because the letter "F" does not appear after it, in accordance with the note at the top.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it printed in English?

Mr. DOHERTY: I was assured this morning that the Bill had been printed and distributed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister a copy?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have one at the office, but, unfortunately, I did not bring it with me, as I expected there would be plenty here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Either we must proceed with the reading of this Bill, or the Order must stand.

Order stands.

MINISTERS AND DIRECTORSHIPS

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McMaster for the second reading of Bill No. 10, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, when this order was called on a previous occasion I was making a few observations in connection with it. I have given the Bill considerable thought, and it appears to me there are certain objections to it.

In the first place, I contend that there is no demand for this type of legislation. I have carefully inquired, and I am not able to find any record showing that ministers of the Crown in the past have in any sense violated the ethics or the privileges of their office in the way sought to be remedied by this Bill. From that standpoint, I contend there is no need of the Bill. In the next place, it is unwise for this House to persist in introducing legislation where legislation is not required. Our statute books are perhaps filled now with numerous measures about which the public know nothing, which are neither observed nor enforced and which serve no really good purpose.

Another point I would suggest is this, that you are not going to make men honourable or good by statute. My hon. friend in this Bill purposes to surround the morals and the ethics of a minister of the Crown with certain regulations. Now I think it is a sound argument to advance, certainly it is a sound reason in law, that when you set forth in a law a certain restriction, it carries with it the suggestion that as long as you keep within the exact bounds of that particular stated law, you are at liberty perhaps to indulge in practices that otherwise would not be indulged in. You may prevent a man who holds a directorship in a company from being a minister of the Crown or compel him to resign his directorship, but you do not change his position as an individual, as a citizen, as a member of the company, towards the Government in the slightest degree, because it stands to reason, that it certainly would obtain, that while a man might conform with the technical demands of the law, he would not necessarily conform with its spirit. He may resign his directorship but retain his shares and be in exactly the same position as he was before.

The ordinary ethics obtaining in this House in connection with the position of members of Parliament, and more particularly in connection with those who in years gone by have held the high office of minister of the Crown, are such that I think the public has been amply protected in the past, and I believe it would be wise for this House to recognize that fact and rather to rest its case upon a personal sense of honour than upon conformity with some rule laid down such as this. My hon. friend in this Bill is seeking to prevent any minister of the Crown from holding the position of director in corporations. It is desirable, I think, that we should have in this House representative citizens from every walk in life. We often hear the statement made that we ought to have more business men holding public office, civic, provincial and Dominion; that it would be a good thing for the country if the capable, efficient business men of the country took a greater interest in public affairs; and that we might in that event run the affairs of the country more on a business basis. I am not advancing this as my own view; I am merely stating what is currently expressed by a large number of persons. Now, my hon. friend is going to circumscribe the entry of business men into the affairs of the country, and I want him and other hon. members of this House to consider this question: Why should we prevent a man holding a directorship in a company from holding a position in the Government, and yet allow the chief counsel, the chief legal adviser, of corporations to fill such a position? Certainly if there is a danger—mark you, I am not endorsing this argument; I am merely stating it as inferred by my hon. friend the mover of the Bill—in a man holding a position as minister of the Crown who happens to be a director of a company, I submit that there is still greater danger in having in that position a legal adviser or what is known as a corporation lawyer, a man who is engaged particularly in that class of legal practice. I would say that if the Bill were to be seriously considered by the House, it should be amended to include legal advisers of corporations. Now, that is only one argument. I go a step further and submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if that argument is sound—and I notice my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) nods his head as

if he accepts it as sound—then the auditors of companies, that is, expert accountants who are closely identified with large corporations should also be precluded. Let us take, for example, the auditor of a large bank, or of a large commercial or industrial corporation doing business with the Government. That official would be just as likely to be influenced by the interest of the corporation as would an individual who was a director. Perhaps he might not be influenced to the same extent, but almost so. Then we might carry the argument still further; and as I explore this field of argument I find its ramifications stretch in all directions. Take a large corporation like the Toronto Street Railway, the Montreal Street Railway, or an important steel corporation—any of these large institutions that have a great amount of insurance, we will say. They frequently do business with one firm. They contract with an insurance firm to cover all their insurance, running into millions of dollars. Now, does any hon. gentleman mean to say that there is not just as much danger of undue influence in this case as there would be in the case of a director of a company? What I am driving at in this argument is simply this: first, that there is no demand for this Bill, so far as I can judge; and secondly, that it is trying to state in a meagre statute what ethics shall control the actions of a man who happens to be a member of the ministry. That is bad, in my estimation. It is inherently bad, and there is no sound argument, nor is there any demand for such legislation so far as I can see.

These are some of the arguments that occurred to me in glancing over the Bill. I confess I have not had time nor opportunity to delve very deeply into the constitutional history of the British form of government having regard to this particular measure. But I do not recall any statute of this character, or any stated rule of this kind, set forth in any of the great authorities, Bourinot, May or any other, as a desirable thing even. Consequently I submit to the House that it would be very unwise for us to encumber the statutes of this country with an unnecessary Act which, so far as I can judge, can do no good and in all probability would simply serve to dull the sharp edge of honour and ethics as they now obtain in connection with public office. It may have been well for the hon. member to bring the Bill to the attention of the House so that this particular branch of parliamentary ethics might come prominently before hon. members and thus serve to remind them of their high responsibility. In that respect it has done no harm; but I submit that it would be unwise for this House to adopt the Bill as presented by the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. McMASTER: I presume, before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of replying to the arguments that have been advanced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is my duty to inform hon. members that the hon. member for Brome is about to exercise his right of closing the debate. Any other hon. members who desire to speak may do so now.

Mr. EDWARD WALTER NESBITT (North Oxford): My experience is that a great many men who are directors of corporations—I think the resolution refers to them particularly—hold very little interest in those corporations, being frequently appointed directors by reason of their general knowledge of business and their ability to serve the corporations of which they are appointed directors. The shareholders may consider them so qualified from their business experience and their integrity that they make them directors without their having any particular financial interest in the company. I have known many instances where directors held not more than two or three shares—enough to qualify them. So that the mere fact of a man's being a director of a corporation does not necessarily prove that he has any real interest in the business. The man who is really interested is the man that holds the shares or certificates, the stock of the corporation. I do not understand by the resolution of the hon. member for Brome that it is intended to shut out the man who owns stock in the corporation, but simply the man who is a director. I think that the great majority of men who have become ministers, so far as my knowledge goes, have resigned as directors of corporations. Then again, there is nothing in the proposed legislation to stop a member of a partnership from being a minister; and a member of a partnership, whether it be two or four, is just as much interested in the business as though he were one of five or seven directors of a corporation. Therefore, the proposal, in my judgment, attempts to single out the director unnecessarily, and will

accomplish absolutely no good, because, after all, a man is interested largely according to the extent that his pocket is affected. Further, as I understand it, the independence of Parliament Act prohibits a man, no matter whether he be a minister or an ordinary member of Parliament, from being directly or indirectly interested —I think that is the wording—in any undertaking that has a business connection with the Government. In that way I think the public are amply protected if we regard people as honourable. If they are not honourable, you cannot possibly do anything by the wording of an Act of Parliament or resolution, to make them honourable—at least that is my opinion. The mere fact of this House passing a resolution or declaring by statute, that a director shall not be a member of a government will not—let me repeat—by any manner of means cover the desired ground if such person continues to be a shareholder, because, there is where his vital interest lies. I do not know why my hon. friend wants to introduce this legislation, because I believe that the present law protects the country amply, protects it just as well as it would be protected were we to pass the present Bill.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (minister of Marine and Fisheries): No doubt the hon. member for Brome had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries clearly in mind when he was drafting this legislation.

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very glad to know that such was not the case. I have no hesitation in stating that I am a director of many large industrial companies throughout Canada. I am also a director of banks and trust companies. I ask how could it be otherwise? A man who enters business early in life, achieves a success, and becomes associated not only with a large industrial concern—of which he may happen to be the president, vice-president or managing director—but with other commercial undertakings in the city or town in which he resides, and who amasses wealth, will find himself invited to become a director of other large corporations, banks or trust companies. If a man is not successful in business, and if he is not possessed of good judgment he will not find himself on any of these various directorates. Now, suppose a business man is called to serve his country? It is a well-known fact that business men who have no desire to become members of parliament, great as the honour is, or to become members of a government although they appreciate to the full what that honour means. Judging from the political history of Canada and other countries it is a rare thing to find a business man, who has succeeded in commerce or in finance, either a member of the popular Chamber or a member of any particular cabinet. But, Sir, if the State does call that man, there is only one thing for him to do. He must place the duties of his public office, the duty of serving his country, before his business interests, and henceforward devote all his time and all his attention to the administration of those public affairs to which he has been called. If I may be permitted to make a personal reference for a moment my position as a member of the Government and as a member of the House is no different from the position which would be taken by any other business man. I had, of course, to drop all my business connections as far as my giving them any personal attention was concerned; I have not been able to attend to the duties of the various boards to which I belong. But, Mr. Speaker, is it fair for the hon.member (Mr. McMaster) to expect a business man identified with large interests in this country to at once resign from those boards upon his entering the Government? And after all, as my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has said, that really does not reach the kernel of what the hon. member for Brome is striving to accomplish as long as a member of the Government, or a member of the House, is a large stockholder in various large industries, banks, and other business institutions. Therefore it comes down to this: If one were to do what the hon. member for Brome desires he would have to throw all his stock holdings in various companies, on to the market and take whatever he could get for them, resign from all these boards, and then appear before this House and in the words of the well-known hymn it would be a case of "Take me as I am". Surely no person who considers the subject seriously would for one moment expect a man who had been in business all his life to sell his holdings in these companies and to retire from these different boards. Because, secure as this Government is at the present time, as well as the party that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, governments come and

governments go. Therefore a business man would be most unwise to dispose of all his holdings and resign from all the boards on which he sat as a director in order to accept a passing honour in any particular government that might last for only a few years.

But, Sir, the vital point is the one I referred to a moment ago. Any Canadian citizen who has been in business in a large way and is a director of various companies, must put those interests to one side, and the honesty and uprightness of that man must be depended upon to serve the State rightly and to ensure that he give his full time and attention to the country's affairs. What difference would the fact make that a man had resigned from the boards on which he sat? As the hon. member for North Oxford has so well pointed out, as long as a man's interest remains in these various companies he would have the same interest in them whether he was a director of a board or whether he was not. Therefore I do not see the need or the usefulness of such a proposition as the hon. member for Brome has made to the House.

Let me say one thing more before I resume my seat. I do not claim to have any particular qualifications over and above those possessed by the ordinary business man for the position I occupy at the present time, but after acting for over three years as a minister of the Crown, and after an experience of twenty years as general manager of one of the largest corporations in this country, and having some knowledge of business, I have no hesitation in saying to hon. members that to be the minister of, we will say, any of the five or six large departments of government requires more business skill and more executive ability than to be the general manager of any of the largest corporations. I find no fault with so many gentlemen of the legal profession being in this House or in the Government; we need all classes of men here; but, Sir, if you are to have business men of large affairs in this House or in the Cabinet, then such small legislation as this, if I may be permitted to so term it, is only going to have the effect of still further discouraging business men from entering Parliament or the Government.

Therefore I have no hesitation in saying that I entirely disagree with my hon friend from Brome, and I am quite satisfied that when any man has the responsibilities of a minister of the Crown placed upon his shoulders he will see to it that he serves the interests of the state first and his private interests afterwards.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), I have only these few brief remarks to offer. First, I think the minister, judging by what he has just said, is likely to be far more successful if he confines himself to building sailing boats than he will ever be by continuing to build a mercantile marine. The hon. gentleman has told us the number of companies in which he holds directorships, also the numerous companies of which he was or is general manager. This debate, Mr. Speaker, I do not think ought to be narrowed down to the personality of any member of the Cabinet, and I do not think it was the intention of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) to introduce a Bill which might be construed as being aimed at any individual member of the Government. The Bill brings before the House a matter of much higher importance, notwithstanding the importance that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine may have in the Cabinet. I do not claim that the Minister of Marine, because he is a director of many companies, is not a competent minister; and on the other hand I do not claim that he is a competent minister because he is a director of those numerous companies. Should a minister of the Crown have interests other than the interests of the state? That is the whole question. Several hon. members have addressed the House from the other side and they have told us that public life in Canada has shown numerous examples of ministers who had very large commercial interests and nevertheless served the state to the best of their ability. Such is the case, and I do not deny it. But, on the other hand, can you say, without danger of being contradicted, that our ministers have always acted in that way?

The hon. Minister of Marine has said that since he became a minister it has been impossible for him to give proper attention to his business interests. Therefore, I infer that as a director of the companies which he has mentioned he has not been of much usefulness to them. If he has not given any attention to those companies, why should he remain a director, why should he draw his fees? Why should he have any objection to resign his directorships if he has not time to attend to their business? On the other hand, if another member of the Cabinet is in the same posi-

tion as the hon. Minister of Marine, but, instead of giving no attention to the business of his companies, has done so since he became a member of the Cabinet, every hour and every day which he has given to the business of his companies is an hour and a day taken away from the state, and that attention and work devoted to his companies is attention and work that he should have given to the public business of this country.

The hon. minister asks: Is it fair to expect a public man when he enters the Government of Canada to resign his business interests when he may hold his portfolio for only a very short period? That argument is commonly called the "Safety first" argument. I admit its strength, I admit that a minister when he enters a government, and especially a government like the present one, is not very sure of what may happen the day following his entry. But to keep in touch with his corporations and with his business associates as the hon. minister has to remain friendly with them, and should the interests of those associates diverge from the interests of the state, what is his position? The hon. minister has not explained that to the House. For instance, should the tariff policy be discussed around the Council table if the Minister of Marine is a director of several companies, and if those companies are interested in the drafting of the tariff schedules, will the minister think of the interests of Canada first, or will he think of the interests of his business associates? That is the question that the House is supposed to discuss. It is not a question of individuality or personality, although the hon. gentleman is very important in this Government; the question is away beyond his importance and reaches greater heights. The question is: Are we to have in this Government ministers who will be free from business interests so as always to make decisions in the best interests of the country at large?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Am I to infer from his remarks that he would want any member of the Government to sell all his interest in various companies in order that he might be completely disinterested?

Mr. CANNON: No, Mr. Speaker, because, as the hon. minister has said, when a man has wealth and ability, he is sought by everybody in Canada so that that ability and wealth may be used. But I say that a gentleman who enters the Cabinet should make his investments in such a way, and should have business associates of such a nature, that neither his investments nor his business associations will interfere with his conduct of public business. That is my contention. I say further that a minister who is a director of a dozen companies and large corporations such as those mentioned by my hon. friend places himself in such a position that if he remains human, runs the risk of being incompetent, and if he wishes to be an angel he runs the risk of being misunderstood.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (Perth North): Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat to be regretted that the debate has taken a line totally different from that in which it proceeded in its earlier stages. It does seem to me that this matter should be discussed entirely free from personalities; that we should deal with the principle of the Bill and that alone. To my mind no real reason has been put forward in support of the Bill by its sponsor or by those who have spoken in favour of it. To me as a Canadian the public life of Canada has been, within my recollection at least, upon a very high plane; Canadian public men have held high and honourable positions, much to the credit of Canadian public life. But this Bill leaves the inference that a totally different condition prevails among our public men and in the public life of Canada, and it seeks to prevent something that has not at all become an abuse. In other words, its object is to prevent Cabinet Ministers who are directors of companies from working selfishly in the interests of the companies they serve as against the public welfare. In that respect I think the Bill is a reactionary measure; it is putting something forward to induce and perpetuate an atmosphere derogatory to the best interests of our national life. The promoter of the Bill has shown no reason why business men of wide experience should be debarred from the councils of Canada. There never was a time in the history of Canada when men of great force, men of wide business experience, men of fine parts, men of honour and integrity, were more needed in the councils of a nation than they are to-day in this period of readjustment. What is the objection to such men acting in that capacity? Is it any crime to be a man of business ability, of wide business experience? Should such men be debarred from the highest positions in the public life of Canada? I say, no; a thousand times, no. Not all members of the Cabinet need be men of these large parts,

but certainly the fact that they are men of that quality and of that class is no argument against their holding such positions.

It is contended that a man honourable in every way, without a stain upon his business, personal or public character, should not be eligible to hold office in the ministry if he be a director of a company. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) says it would be that man's duty, where he a minister of the Crown, to get all the business he could for the firm of which he was a director. But is it so, Mr. Speaker? Has the public life of Canada degenerated to such a point that the statement of the member for Guysborough is applicable to it? No. I rather take the view that a minister who is a director of one company or of two or three companies, if ordinarily inclined to be venal or corrupt, is much less inclined to be so in connection with his public office, if he holds a directorate, because he is under a fierce light; the finger of suspicion may be pointed at him because he is a director. His directorate is a deterrent force; it keeps him free from corruption and graft; free from any unfair activities on behalf of his firm. Let him cease to be a director, and what is the result? He has put on a cloak that shelters him, because he can say: I am no longer a director of any company, but I hold my stock; my influence is just as great in the councils of a nation as it ever was; I can get things done, and they cannot say that I did it because I was a director of a company. In other words, this Bill opens the door to the very thing that the promoter of it desires to prevent; it enables those who may be venally inclined to do the very thing my hon. friend does not want them to do by virtue of their directorship.

The Bill is filled with subject matters that might be carried a good deal further. Is the hon. member going to say also that if the member of Parliament happens to be a shareholder in a company he must be debarred from being a member of the government? It is as natural to say that as it is to say the other; in fact, if you follow through all the avenues that lead to interest it would not be long before you would have no Parliament at all.

My chief objection, then, to the Bill is that it reflects upon what I conceive to be a pure Canadian public life, and that it is put forward without any evidence being offered of its necessity. Surely, at a time when we in Canada are on the threshold of the readjustment period, with a debt of $2,400,000,000 staring us in the face, we should call to the councils of the nation the best men we have from the point of view of business, from the point of view of the rebuilding of Canada, from the point of view of reducing the almost insufferable burden under which the country groans by way of debt. Public men honourable in character should be free from even the suspicion of attack that this Bill conveys. Let us get down to business; let us call to the councils of our country the best men we can obtain, and then let us treat them fairly and honourably, and be thankful that we get their services—services rendered, in many cases, at the expense of large personal business interests.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I want to detain the House only for a moment or two in discussing this matter. Let me say, at the outset, that I am in grave doubt as to the wisdom of passing this somewhat drastic legislation. I am in that doubt because I would prefer to see a matter of this kind settled by what I venture to call the good sense, discretion and high-mindedness of men in public life, rather than by the strong arm of the law. There was a great deal in the argument of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) when he said that, as a pure matter of using properly the energies of a minister, it was necessary that this legislation should be enacted. We are all familiar with the old saying that "no man can serve two masters," and that is particularly true if each master wants all of a man's time. Clearly, a Cabinet minister's time is so much occupied that he probably has not time to devote to other businesses. One of my greatest friends in the press gallery when I first came to Ottawa said to me: "There is only one thing worse than being a member of Parliament, and that is being a minister," and I think, from the point of view of hard work, that statement was probably strictly true. Never having been a minister, nor having any particular expectation or ambitions in that way, I am personally unconcerned; but from all that I see of Cabinet ministers, their job is sufficient to use all their activities, so that the hon. member for Brome reasoned well when he said that if a minister's work is sufficient for him, if he accepts directorships of companies, he must either rob his country or rob his companies in the matter of time.

Then there is the further consideration that Caesar's wife should be above sus-

picion. Men in the service of the state should not occupy, in regard to companies, a position which could be considered even doubtful. I am not aware of what the law is in the Old Country, but I know what is the very general practice there. There is probably no man of greater high-mindedness in the world to-day than the former Foreign Secretary of England, Lord Grey; and when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman made Lord Grey his Foreign Secretary, the latter did not need any law; he did not need any instructions from his chief; he was at the time chairman of the directors of the Northeastern Railway Company, which position carried with it a salary of £5,000 a year and he at once, of his own initiative, gave up the chairmanship of the directors of the railway company and became Foreign Secretary, with the best results, I think, to the Empire.

I am quite willing to admit that there are differences between Canada and the Old Country in this respect. The Old Country is an old country; it has for generations and centuries had large numbers of leisured people, with abundant private income, who devote themselves very largely to public affairs. We are a younger country, and we have not that leisured class up to the present moment in our national history. At the same time, the sooner we follow the example of the Old Country in that respect, the better. One of the grounds on which I would have extended my remarks in that connection the other day is that I should have congratulated the House and the country on our new Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) on being a House of Commons man. He learned his politics; he learned what he knows—and it is a good deal—of the science of government, in this House; and it will be well for this country when, for the purpose of having trained statesmen and politicians—I pay no attention to the sneer at professional politicians in this connection—something is done to appoint from the membership of this House, young men as secretaries (without salaries) to ministers, as they have them in the Old Country with salaries, to learn the intricacies of statesmanship. Pending such a time, we have many men who make sacrifices to serve their country, and even though there were more sacrifice required than there would be on the part of many of our public men to give up business directorships, I feel it would be a desirable state of affairs to bring that about.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

I want to repeat that I have doubts about the wisdom of passing drastic legislation upon the subject at the present period of our national history. It might be an unwise step to go too far in that direction. I am not one of those who believe in the omniscience of governments or even of parliaments, and I have a very great suspicion of governments interfering in human affairs beyond the point that is wise. There are certain proper limitations of state control beyond which governments should not go. And in this connection, while I have the utmost sympathy with the view of my hon. friend, I doubt if he could carry his measure anyhow. If he takes it to a vote, I am very much afraid that at the present stage of my thinking, I could not vote for the enactment of quite so drastic a measure as this; but I want to repeat that the condition of thought in our public men and in our citizens ought speedily to be brought to the point at which for generations the highest-minded public men have arrived in the Old Country. I have given an illustration, which must appeal to every section of this House, in the action of Lord Grey when he took office under Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Châteauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent to you and the hon. members of the House that the measure before us is not a party measure. It is in no way the policy of the Liberal party to attempt to do anything that will keep business men from taking their fair share in the work of carrying on the business of Canada. Every hon. member knows that John Smith, as John Smith, if he is a member of Parliament, cannot do business with the Government of Canada; but John Smith and Co., Ltd., incorporated, can go on and do all the business he likes. So I imagine what the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) had in mind was to create such conditions as would put incorporated companies on about the same basis as a man doing business under his own name or under the name of a partnership. But I submit in all sincerity to the hon. member for Brome that he cannot attain that object by the Bill now before the House, because there is nothing in the world to prevent a man, if he so desires, from withdrawing from a directorship if he becomes a minister and putting in as director his chief clerk or some other man in whom he has confidence, and doing business, and more business under that cloak which does not expose him to any legal attack. I submit that that man is

a greater menace to the state than the man doing business openly as a director, because in the latter case you know whom you are dealing with. Therefore, I am not at all in favour of the proposed measure. If my hon. friend were to introduce legislation that would prevent incorporated companies that had on their directorate a Minister of the Crown from doing business with the Government, I submit that he would be upon sound ground, but I fear the measure now before the House will be misunderstood, will do no good, and will not attain the object which my hon. friend desires. I am sure he had nothing personal in his mind when he introduced this measure. I am not going to offer him advice, because he is better posted upon these questions than I am, but it does seem to me that if he wishes to create such conditions as will prevent incorporated companies from abusing their privileges he might very well introduce such a measure as will put an incorporated company, with a director in the ministry, upon the same basis as a private man doing business.

That is all I have to say in regard to this Bill. Looking at it purely from a business point of view, looking back over my experience in Parliament of now over twelve years, I am bound to say that the greatest menace to good legislation in this Parliament has not been the business men. There have been some other men who have been able to come to the members of this Parliament and go before committees, and it does seem to me that my hon. friend might exercise his energies in correcting some of these abuses before he attempts to interfere with business men taking their proper place in the national councils in this Parliament.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): My mind on the matter is governed very much by considerations such as those put forward by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), the only difference between myself and him being, I think, that I have advanced, or retrogressed, if that is a better word, to more definite conclusions than he.

The subject matter of the measure has no interest for me at all, personally. I am not now, and have not been for many years, a director of any company. I believe the Parliamentary handbook discloses my name as connected with two little companies in Western Canada, but I have to confess that they both went into liquidation about twelve years ago, and I have not taken the precaution to have the Parliamentary handbook brought up to date. Possibly the House now has the explanation why these companies went into liquidation. Since that time I have not afflicted any company with the acceptance of a directorship. But my position with regard to this Bill would be just the same were I in a more favoured place as regards the business community.

I am not able to follow the arguments presented on behalf of the Bill at all. In the first place, this fact must impress itself upon the House: there is no other country that I know of, certainly none has been named to Parliament and the authority adduced, where legislation of this kind is in effect. I do not believe it is in effect in England. The practice may be in effect there of resigning directorships upon accession to Cabinet position more than it is in Canada, but I think I am safe in saying that that practice is by no means universal in England right up to the present time. In no other country is it in effect. It is not in effect in the provinces of Canada, nor has it been the practice in this Dominion to any great extent in all the years that have gone. Governments now existing and governments that have existed, both in federal and in provincial affairs, have retained within their number men who still were directors of companies. Now that is a fact that, while it is not conclusive, must impress the House with much force. At all events, in the presence of that fact a considerable weight of argument would be necessary to convince us that we should mark out a new trail and impose new restrictions upon the accession to Cabinet position of men of business in Canada. We are called upon to do so by the mover (Mr. McMaster), and in very specific language by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), because of a principle which they claim to have discovered which compels us so to act. Now what is the principle? It is defined in different ways by hon. members who support the Bill, but in very broad language this definition is common to all: they say that a minister of the Crown requires all his energies and all his talents for his office; his master is the state; therefore, he should give all his time and all his energies to the fulfilment of his duties as a minister, and he should have no other interests of a fiduciary character or otherwise which conflict with the performance of his primary task. Well,

that is either a principle which we should follow or it is not. In the first place it is a principle that it is impossible to follow. It could not be lived up to as expressed; it could not be lived up to no matter how you express it. The hon. member for Dorchester says that a minister of the Crown should have no other interests at all to occupy his time. If that is correct, he should not even have a family.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that is an extreme interpretation of what he said, but it comes within the principle that the hon. gentleman argued for. What he asks for is that a minister's whole time should be given to the state, that the state should be his only interest. Certainly it follows that he should have no other interests of any kind, whether as director or otherwise. If it is true that where your treasure is there will your heart be also, then if his principle must prevail, one cannot have a treasure, one cannot have anything.

I was most impressed by the illustration that was given by the hon. member for East Toronto (Sir Edward Kemp). A gentleman comes into Parliament and is called to be a member of the Government. He is the owner or very largely the owner of a business. We will say it is unincorporated. Let us illustrate by figures, and say that this man is eighty per cent owner of that business. Now undoubtedly he is a trustee in so far as the other twenty per cent is concerned, in the management of that business, and consequently, he not only has his treasure there, but in a sense he is a trustee for others who have a treasure in the same business. Now we will assmue that he is called to public office as a member of the Government. He is permitted, if the Bill passes, to occupy just the same position in that business that he did before, and if he puts it into the form of a joint stock company, which would be a wise thing to do under those circumstances, he is not allowed access to the "treasure" that he has gained in all his years of hard work, to enable him to see that it is being managed at least fairly in his interests. He is not allowed that access that comes from the occupation of the post of director. He is compelled, merely because he has put that business into the form of a stock company, to abandon the earnings of his lifetime and to take no further interest in it than to commit it to others. He is not to be allowed to gain at least that access to, and that knowledge of, its supervision which he might have if he were permitted to retain the post of director.

Now, it is quite true that he cannot occupy any substantial time in the supervision of such shares as he may hold in a company by reason of his occupying the post of director. That is quite true. The fact that he is a director, however, keeps him in touch at least with his own investment; it keeps him in touch with the management of it to a certain extent; and without occupying any substantial portion of his time it there stands in a safer position, more satisfactory to himself, than it would be in if he were compelled to abandon it altogether and leave it to the management of others. Now, I am thoroughly in agreement with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that there may come a time when the occupation of high government office becomes inconsistent with the retention of directorships or with fiduciary relations to others; that time may come, but I do not think that its advent can be settled by legislation or that the severance can be enforced by statute. Indeed, that time has come in Canada. I well recall that the right hon. gentleman who occupied the position of Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) prior to the present minister (Sir Henry Drayton)—and so far as I know this is true of the present minister—resigned his directorships in all the companies he was in. He did that, I have no doubt, because of the belief that in the actual administration of his public office he came into too direct contact with the interests in respect of which he was responsible as a director. There was such direct and intimate contact and relationship between his position under the Crown and his directorships that he felt it to be inconsistent with the proper discharge of his ministerial duties. It is to his credit that he took that position. There was a degree of intimacy and closeness of relation that does not at all exist ordinarily between directorships and the duties of a minister of the Crown. There was a directness of intimacy and a closeness of relationship which he felt made it impossible for him to hold both positions, and, as I have said, it is to his credit that he took that position, although I must say that I have not observed up to this hour that he was accorded any great degree of credit in this House or out of it because he took that stand. I did not observe that the hand of attack was

stayed or that the voice of calumny was stilled at all, because it was always asserted, with a random abandon that did not seem to me to be creditable, that he still was merely the mouthpiece of the business interests from which he came. However, he took that stand. And there have been cases in British public life where the same has been done; and I believe that in our own country public men of both parties on attaining office can be depended upon to see to it that if the retention of directorships in companies or even of stock in companies—because there is no great difference, if there is any material or imaginable difference between the relationship of a directorship to a minister of the Crown, and the relationship of a stockholder to a minister of the Crown—they can be depended upon that, if the relationship is so close that the administration of their office might be open to influence, they will drop the private interest in deference to the imperative demands of public welfare.

Now, I do not know how that may be defined by legislation. I do not know how it can be definitely stated when the time comes that the relationship is so close that the one position must be dropped. There is always a relationship. I do not know where one is to put his money if it is in a Canadian company—yea, or even if it is in an American company—so that it will be in such a position as not to be affected by any act of the Government of Canada or of Parliament. There is no place in which to put it so that it may be absolutely and entirely outside of the scope of the actions of Parliament. It is said that he should invest it in such a way that there may be no danger of his being influenced by it in the slightest degree in the discharge of his public duties. Well, I should like to have a suggestion as to how he could so invest it; personally I do not know how he could. It is a matter of degree. If one invests in any company or in any business in this country, whether he be a minister of the Crown or a member of Parliament, the destiny, the safety, the success of that investment is undoubtedly influenceable by legislation of this House and the administration of the Government. That you cannot get away from.

There is no fine and clear principle that you can state and enforce by the passing of this legislation. It becomes wholly a matter of degree, a matter of the good judgment of the man who is called to public office. On that account it seems to me that this legislation would be futile. If you carried the attempt made by this legislation to the extent of the whole principle involved, you would be compelled to enact not only that a minister should not hold any directorships in this country, or exercise the slightest supervision over the earnings of his life up to the time he became a minister, and over the property that alone will be the support of his family when he leaves his public office, but that he must sell the stock he holds in companies that come into contact with the Government and with the administration of his department. And you would have to go further and enact that members of Parliament should do the same, because in the end it is Parliament that determines the legislation and not the government at all; and if it is feared that members of the Government will be unduly influenced by their holdings in various concerns, there is just the same reason to assume that members of Parliament will be similarly influenced.

It seems to me therefore that the House would be wise to follow the practice that has obtained in Britain, and in Canada as well, federally and provincially, and in every other country, so far as I know, and leave it to the sense of honour of public men and to the sense of accountability to the great public of the country; because in all things they do they are accountable not only to Parliament but to the entire country. Leave it to their own sense of honour and responsibility and we shall get better results in the end than by trying to enforce impossible enactments such as that put forward in the Bill.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member is about to close the debate.

Mr. DANIEL D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I want to say just a word or two. The speech made by the Prime Minister is, in its conclusion, in direct contradiction to the speeches made by many of his supporters on the other side of the House. For instance, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) made a speech which was highly condemnatory of this Bill and of the principle which it espouses, and characterized the sponsor of it as a man who was usurping the rights and powers of Parliament and doing something that was entirely wrong.

That is not the way in which this Bill should be approached. Every member of the House, the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) included, must agree that the ideal condition is that a minister of the Crown should not be a director. That is the ideal. If one minister of this Government can be a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is there any reason why every other minister should not be a director of that concern? And is it a desirable condition, when the business of the country comes into conflict with the business of a private corporation of the magnitude and the far-reaching effects in operation such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, that every member of the Government should be a director of that company? When the question of rates came up, or legislation affecting the operations of that company in its relations with the people of Canada, would not the public be shocked to find that when the board sat as a board every member of the Government of this country was on it and that there was no one to represent the country at all? That is a condition that is quite possible according to the gospel preached by my good friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who launched into the hymn "Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow" and expressed other lofty ideas as if he wished to also have them set to music in this House.

Now I am not saying that this is a practicable Bill. I am not saying that it can be carried out; but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Brome should not be brought before the bar of the House and chastised and indeed brought to task severely, because he dared to introduce the measure. Its introduction has worked a lot of good. It has been shown that it was desirable, whenever it could be brought about, that members of a government should not be directors; that although we have fifteen or sixteen, perhaps twenty, heads of departments here, it does not follow that even although every one of them retired from being director of companies, anything would happen the country. In the event of their retirement the companies will go along just as they did before. The interests of the individual who happens to be a minister would, if he were not on a directorate, be in the hands of other directors, just as the business of other men formerly were in his hands, and things would go along first rate. Perhaps it is not practicable to carry out this proposition; but let me say to the Prime Minister as well as to the House, that the ideal condition is that men who are ministers should have nothing to do with such companies in particular as are concerned in a large way with the Government.

The hon. member for East Toronto (Sir Edward Kemp) spoke about a private man acting in a private capacity, and that such a man can do business with the Government and be a minister; but the moment his business becomes incorporated he is debarred from serving in the Government or being a director of his own business. Well, those are small matters in a way. About a man who is conducting a private business as a manufacturer, or some other line, I do not concern myself at all; it is his private affair, and even if he incorporates the business the fact is still true to a great extent; but the cases I have particularly in my mind are those of any members of the Government who are acting in the dual capacity of directors of concerns that have to do with the public and at the same time are occupying positions as heads of departments that deal with these concerns. I think such a position is an anomalous one, and the exercise by ministers of such dual capacities should be avoided as much as possible.

Mr. WILLIAM FOSTER COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Before the hon. member for Brome closes the debate, I want to say a word or two on this question. It appears to me that the idea that the Bill may be passed in accordance with high moral ethics is not a businesslike proposition. The fact has already been referred to that the business interests of Canada—and when I speak of "the business interests" I mean everybody who is engaged in any trade or commerce of any kind, which would embrace a very large proportion of our population—is now and always has been under-represented in almost every government that has been formed in Canada since I can recollect. That applies to the provinces as well as to the Dominion. Now this Bill which the hon. member has introduced would further circumscribe the bringing into office of any business man in Canada. It is well known that no man gets on very far in these days who does not become a director of some kind of a company. He might be a very poor director and it might be a very poor company, but he is a director of some kind of a company if he has got on at all in the business world. Yet this Bill would preclude him from taking his seat in the present or any other government. We now have in

Toronto a government that has not a single business man in it, and I am sorry for the province that it is so. If there were business men in that government I think some of the loans that have recently been floated at very high rates would not have been floated; they would have been placed on the market at rates that would have yielded a much better return for the money of the province than we are now getting. I say the same with regard to this Government. From time to time, I believe, the legal element has predominated and legislation—often not very useful legislation—has emanated from legal men like my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) who would like to pass his name down to posterity as the father of some great Act in operation in the country. For my part I would like my name celebrated—and I have been here quite a number of years—as a man who has prevented unnecessary legislation from going on the statute books, rather than as a man who had been a party to passing doubtful measures of any kind. There is far too much legislation passed in this country, and in my judgment it begets a contempt of law; in fact the people become so befogged that they do not know where they are half the time in regard to obeying the laws that this country has enacted. Many of such laws have gone through this House since I have been here. We let some through last session that members now are sorry for and they woke up to the fact afterwards. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that far too much legislation goes through and in its passage it is hurried to too great an extent. My hon. friend from Brome has submitted a Bill that may be deemed perhaps to be receiving undue consideration, but it is a far reaching measure and it is quite opposed to the practice that has been in vogue in this country for many years. I believe if this legislation were to pass my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) would not have to resign from any directorates. I may be wrong but I judge that he would not have to resign from any directorates in order to qualify if this legislation were to pass, and that also may properly be said with respect to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). Holding the particular views that my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) does I do not think he would be a valuable asset to any ordinary manufacturing or commercial company, and therefore perhaps he is not so very much sought after. My hon. friend in bringing in this legislation is, I think, entirely in the wrong.

Let me say that I have known the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) for a great many years, long before he entered this Government. I have known him for at least twenty-five years and have done business with him, and I recognize him as one of the first business men of Canada. Now, to say that he should divest himself of directorates in companies because he is here to-day and—as my hon. friend would have told him last week—he is going to be gone to-morrow; he then called upon the whole Cabinet to resign immediately and get out, he declared—they have no place here—is unreasonable. The hon. member would compel a minister to divest himself of all his business interests, and in the second clause he calls upon him to do so within fifteen days after he is sworn in. Now a minister upon accepting office might go to his constituency and not be elected. He might have resigned all his business interests and thrown them to the winds, and still his constituents might not endorse him. Perhaps they would rather refuse to endorse him because of the fact that he had thrown away his business interests, and would no longer have that position of influence in the community that he would enjoy did he continue to retain his business interests,—because in every community the man who employs a large number of his fellows or makes a success of business is rightly looked up to. Are you going to put into office the man who fails, the man that cannot qualify, or are you going to choose the man whose business career has justified him in being selected among his fellows for a position of this kind?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend has gone too far afield in this measure and that there is no call for such legislation in the Dominion of Canada at the present time. I do not remember the existing situation ever having infringed upon the rights of the people to any extent. I trust that no one in particular has been especially aimed at in this legislation. I do not believe the hon. member for Brome would do such a thing. I have a higher opinion of him than that, and I do not think he has any particular person in mind in the matter. But I would like to point out to him that his Bill would limit a class of men who may be selected for Governments, and it would cut out those who, perhaps by their training and by the success they have made in business career, are the best fitted for that particular calling.

I am not sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) who leads the third party was not

included in this measure. I rather fear he would be. While he has no doubt got his eye upon this proffered legislation and is able to look after himself, it seems to me that possibly the United Grain Growers and the Elevator Companies may be directly concerned. No one would say, no matter what opinion they had of the Grain Growers party, that the leader of the party was the man to be dropped, when it is doubtless understood that he is by far the most capable man for the position for which he has been selected by the Council of Agriculture, and by those who follow him.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when the House looks at this in a sober, clear way it will see that the interests of the country have not suffered, nor are they likely to suffer, because the moment any minister of the Crown showed that he was allowing his private interests to dictate his public policy, he would be a marked man in the House and in the country and the Government could not get rid of him too quickly. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his measure, because I think it is pretty sure to be defeated.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the reference to myself made by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) induces me to participate in this debate very briefly. If I might be permitted a personal allusion, when the Union Government was formed in October, 1917, I held a directorship in the company with which I had been associated for many years, and I was also a director in one of the smaller Canadian banks. I am divulging no confidence, I think, when I say that before accepting office I discussed the matter with the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who was then Prime Minister, and as far as my own business relations were concerned, it was clearly understood that my time was to be entirely free from them. As far as my position with the bank was concerned, I considered it then my duty to resign my directorship, and I did so.

I am in cordial agreement with what my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said, and also with what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) has said, that the best approach to a solution of this question comes through a high-minded sense of public duty. I am at a little difference of opinion with my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). I cannot see that his position is entirely consistent or logical. He proposes that any one who is a director of a corporation doing business in Canada shall sever his business connection on being elevated to the high honour of a minister of the Crown. If my hon. friend is consistent I think he must pursue that principle still further. Take the case, for instance, of a gentleman who may be elected to this House, and is the head, or a member, of an important legal firm. Should he accept a Cabinet position, would it not naturally follow, for the reasons stated by the hon. member for Brome, that he should sever his connection with his legal firm? We might carry the principle further. My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) is, I believe, a general merchant in that town. If a new Government should be formed and my hon. friend should be asked to become a member of it, should he thereupon be compelled to dispose of all his business interests in Renfrew? I might pursue that line of reasoning still further, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) is a farmer. Were he to be elevated to Cabinet rank, would it follow that he should dispose of his farm holdings in order that there might be no division of interests in the prosecution and fulfilment of his duty as a minister of the Crown? I think that principle could be carried to very extreme lengths.

I do hold very strongly, however, that business of the Government should be entirely dissociated from the business of corporations of which members of the Government may be directors. I think that is in the public interest. After all, I believe the best solution of this question may be found in the development of the high sense of public duty that was manifested by Lord Grey in the instance given by my hon. friend from Red Deer. But the discussion has done good, and I am sorry that I was not in the House when my hon. friend from Brome, for whom I have a very high respect, introduced this measure, as I have no knowledge of what he stated on that occasion. But viewing the whole question on general principles, although I think it is very highly desirable that the conduct of our public men should be put beyond any possibility of reproach, yet it seems to me that the position taken by my hon. friend from Brome is perhaps a little too far in advance at the present time.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, in the observations which I made when introducing this Bill last Friday, I was very careful to endeavour to dissociate

any expression of personality in my discussion of its subject matter. I am glad to say that, with one exception, that attitude of mind on my part has been followed by hon. members who have spoken in this debate, and I thank them for it.

I am quite aware that there are arguments against my Bill. There is the weighty argument which has been discussed by the hon. member for East Toronto (Sir Edward Kemp) and by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Their point was that in the case of a man who has built up a personal business of his own under the law and the practice as at present there is nothing to prevent him accepting the office of a minister of the Crown and retaining his interest in his personal business—remaining its manager, so to speak. But the member for East Toronto said: If this Bill goes into effect, then such a man if he changed his business into an incorporated form would be precluded from being a minister of the Crown. Now, I had thought of that case before it was brought up and—I do not know whether I am exactly in order in making this statement, Mr. Speaker—in the hope that the principle of the Bill may be accepted, I thought of meeting such a case in this way: By defining what I would call a personally owned and controlled company. Let us define such a company as one in which 85 per cent of the capital stock is owned by the minister and his relations within the degree of first cousins, and the board of which is composed of a majority of the minister's relations within the same degree. Then I would make an exception of such a company and would allow the minister to retain his directorship; but if he did so I would preclude his company from doing any business with any department of the Government or with any national system of railways or of ships. I would be prepared to do that to meet the objection made by the hon. member for East Toronto and by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, in which I think there is a great deal of force.

My hon. friend from East Toronto also said: Trust the ministers. That has been the motive, so to speak, of a great many of the speeches made against my Bill—that it is unnecessary and that we should trust to the delicacy of honour of the minister. If that is a good argument in regard to ministers, why is it not an equally good argument in relation to members of Parliament? Section 14 of the Senate and House of Commons Act sets out very clearly that a member of Parliament shall not be concerned

> —directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown.

The cases are not exactly analogous, but they are very similar. In enacting this legislation, Parliament in its wisdom has not relied upon the honour of members of Parliament. What the member of Parliament is told he shall not do are exactly the things which delicacy of feeling will prevent him from doing; nevertheless it has been thought wise to incorporate these prohibitions in the statute.

The next point to which I wish to refer was that made by the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), whose idea was that Parliament should resent a Bill invading the realm of private honour—I think I quote his exact words. Well, this Bill no more invades the realm of private honour than the legislation we already have upon the statute book.

There is no demand for this legislation, says the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I do not know whether the hon. member is apprised of the fact, but there is abroad among the people of Canada a very strong impression—to put it in the most moderate language—that the large business interests of the country now have and have had in the past, whether one party or the other was in power, a great deal too much to say as to how the country should be governed. The legislation which I am asking the House to adopt is for the purpose of preventing, as I said before, interlocking directorates from entering into the circle of the Cabinet.

The member for Vancouver Centre expressed the view that if such legislation as this were adopted the Bill should be extended so as to make ineligible for entry into the Cabinet a man who was acting as counsel for a large company. Now, that depends upon whether or not my hon. friend has reference to counsel acting under a yearly retainer. For instance, if a man acting as solicitor for a large company on the basis of a standing retainer of perhaps $10,000, $15,000 or $20,000 a year should enter the Cabinet without resigning that position as solicitor, the procedure would be just as improper as it would be for a director to enter the Cabinet and retain his directorship. If I correctly apprehend what my hon. friend said, I am

perfectly willing to enlarge my Bill to that extent. I do not agree with him that auditors should be in the same position. The auditor, after all, is a man who sees that the books are kept properly. My hon. friend, who is not, I think, a member of the legal profession, should realize, as an intelligent layman, what a vast difference there is between the part played by the auditor in his connection with the company, and the part played by the lawyer as respects the advice which he gives. The hon. member also made a reference to including the insurance agent, but I think that was a species of humour on his part.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that it is unnecessary and inadvisable to provide that members of the Cabinet shall not be directors in incorporated companies. But if I mistake not, it is specially provided in the Act creating the Railway Commission that no Railway Commissioner shall be a director in an incorporated company. Well, the cabinet sits as a court of appeal form the decisions of the Railway Commission; therefore we have this peculiar position: the court of original jurisdiction is forbidden to hold directorships, but the court of appeal from that court is allowed to do so. That does not seem to me to be logical.

Now, I come to the argument made by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). I may say—and I would call all members of this House to witness who heard me the other day—that in introducing this measure I studiously refrained from imputing any wrong-doing to any minister, and I refrained absolutely from making a personal attack upon anyone. But the Minister of Marine has endeavoured to attract the lightning upon himself; his doing so has been no fault of mine. The minister has been frank, if he has been anything. He said: I am a director in many large industrial companies, in banks and in trust companies. He seems to think that his holding of these positions is perfectly compatible with his being a minister of the Crown—and he now nods his head in token of assent. But, Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say this: The energy and the skill required in the administration of a large department of the Government is such that I have not been able to give any attention to my company matters—and he nods his head again. Well, in all kindness I ask him, is it fair to the shareholders of the Royal Trust Company that he should remain a director of that company, that he should give his name to the institution and the prestige that his name carries with it, while he gives no attention at all to the affairs of the company? Is it fair, is it right, for a man to hold himself out as a guardian of the interests of the shareholders and of the depositors, if there are any, of the Royal Trust Company, and yet give no attention to the affairs of the company? My hon. friend is a director, if I mistake not—and he will correct me if I make any mistake—of the Merchants' Bank of Canada. Is it fair or right that the workingmen of this country should be invited to place their hard-earned savings in the care of the Merchants' Bank of Canada, relying upon my hon. friend being a director of that institution, when as a matter of fact he tells us that he can give no attention to the matter? I do not think it is right, and I think that on further consideration, my hon. friend will come to the same conclusion.

Now, I do not want to make this a personal quarrel between the Minister of Marine and myself, because I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman. But he has endeavoured to justify his retaining of directorships while acting as minister of the Crown. Let us return for a moment to the Royal Trust Company, which, he will admit, is a kind of side-door of the Bank of Montreal, or represents the same or almost the same business interests. Is it right that the minister should be a director of a company so closely associated with the Bank of Montreal as the Royal Trust Company when the Bank of Montreal is one of the bankers of the Government of this country? I do not think it is. My hon. friend may think it amusing, but there are members on this side who fail to see the humour of the situation.

In connection with this matter I wish to direct the attention of the House to an item published in the Ottawa Citizen of to-day, which states that Andrew Mellon, the new Secretary of the United States Treasury, resigned all directorships which he held on taking office under President Harding. I think that is the better method to adopt.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) endeavoured to push the matter to an absurdity. He wanted to infer that we wished to impose celibacy upon the Cabinet. We do not wish to go that far—that, I understand, would be a difficult job. I wish no longer to detain the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: —and I am sorry if my remarks have caused such pain to

hon. gentlemen as to force them to give audible expression to what seems to me an almost discourteous desire to see me finish my remarks. There is no need for me to recapitulate what I said. It seems to me that the whole matter resolves itself down to this very simple proposition. The position of a minister of the Crown demands all a man's energy and skill, and I think that is one thing on which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) and I agree. That being so, if a minister retains directorships, he must, perforce, either neglect state matters or neglect company matters. I believe in most cases he will neglect company matters and give his time and attention to the state. That is unfair. I have made no imputation of wrongdoing to anyone; but there is a possibility that there may be conflict of interest, and the public interest suffers. Even if that never happened, there is always the liability of the public thinking there is something wrong, and we should avoid that at all costs.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. McMaster for the second reading of the Bill, which motion was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault	McCoig
Béland	McDonald
Boivin	McKenzie
Boyer	McMaster
Brouillard	Maharg
Bureau	Marcile (Bagot)
Cahill	Michaud
Cannon	Molloy
Chisholm	Pacaud
Copp	Parent
D'Anjou	Pedlow
Déchêne	Pelletier
Delisle	Prevost
Demers	Proulx
Desaulniers	Reid (Mackenzie)
Deslauriers	Rinfret
Duff	Savard
Fafard	Seguin
Fontaine	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro.)
Fortier	Stein
Fournier	Tobin
Gauvreau	Trahan
Johnston	Truax
King	Turgeon
Knox	Verville
Lanctôt	White (Victoria)—54
Lapointe	
Leger	

NAYS

Messrs.

Allan	Arthurs
Anderson	Ballantyne
Argue	Ball
Armstrong (Lambton)	Best
Blair	MacKelvie
Blake	Mackie (Renfrew)
Bolton	Maclean (Halifax)
Bonnell	MacNutt
Boyce	McCrea
Boys	McCurdy
Brien	McDermand
Calder	McGibbon (Muskoka)
Caldwell	McGregor
Campbell	McIsaac
Casselman	McLean (Royal)
Chabot	McQuarrie
Chaplin	Manion
Charlton	Martin
Charters	Meighen
Clark (Bruce)	Merner
Clark (Red Deer)	Mewburn
Clarke (Wellington)	Middlebro
Cockshutt	Morphy
Cooper	Mowat
Cowan	Munson
Crerar	Myers
Crowe	Nesbitt
Cruise	Nicholson (Algoma)
Davidson	Paul
Doherty	Redman
Douglas (Strathcona)	Reid (Grenville)
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.)	Robb
	Sexsmith
Edwards	Shaw
Elkin	Sheard
Finley	Simpson
Foster (Sir George)	Spinney
Fripp	Stacey
Fulton	Steel
Gauthier	Stevens
Glass	Stewart (Hamilton)
Green	Sutherland
Halbert	Thompson (Weyburn)
Halladay	Thompson (Hastings)
Harold	Thompson (Yukon)
Harrison	Thomson (Qu'Appelle)
Hartt	Tremain
Hay	Tweedie
Henders	Whidden
Keefer	Wigmore
Kemp (Sir Edward)	Wilson (Wentworth)
Lang	Wilson (Saskatoon)
Long	Wright—105

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the junior member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. R. H. Butts). Had I voted, I would have voted against the Bill.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE JAMES MacLAREN COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN, for Mr. Fontaine, moved the second reading of Bill No. 8, respecting the James MacLaren Company Limited. He said: When this order was called yesterday, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) made some objections to the reference of this Bill to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. I see that in

his remarks he stated that the Bill concerned the construction of railway terminals and telegraph lines, and that possibly it ought to be referred to the Select Standing Committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. Since the order has been allowed to stand, the hon. member for Three Rivers has looked into the matter, and he has authorized me to say that he is perfectly willing that the Bill should be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 20, to incorporate The Mayo Valley Railway, Limited.—Mr. Thompson (Yukon).

Bill No. 21, respecting The Oshawa Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 22, respecting The Thousand Islands Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

OIL IN THE PRAIRIE PROVINCES

RESOLUTION WITH RESPECT TO OWNERS OF SURFACE RIGHTS WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

Resuming the adjourned Debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. Griesbach. That in the opinion of this House, should oil be found and produced in or under any lands in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, in which ownership to the sub-surface is in the Crown, the Owner of the surface right shall be entitled to one-sixteenth of such oil, provided that such owner shall have made a homestead entry, or other entry, for the said land prior to the date of the application for the oil lease in the sub-surface. And whereas, all existing leases contain a provision that they are subject to the provisions of the regulations in force at the time of the granting of the same and also any regulations subsequently adopted. Therefore alteration should be made in the regulations to give the owner of the surface rights a similar interest in the oil produced under leases heretofore granted in which no development work has been done upon the said lands under the said leases.

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker in the absence of the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach) it might be deemed unfair to go on with this debate just now. Perhaps the order might stand in the meantime. The hon. member, I am just informed, is now in the House and is prepared to withdraw his resolution.

Resolution withdrawn.

STANDARDIZATION OF PARTS OF AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. McCoig moves that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the standardization of parts of agricultural machinery, and to enact,—

1. That from and after the first day of November, 1922, all agricultural implements and farm wagons manufactured in Canada for use within Canada, shall with respect to the following parts, namely:—Grain Binder Knife Sections, Knife Heads and Pitmans, Mowing Machine Knife Sections, Mowing Machine Knife Heads, Mowing Machine Pitman's Clamps, Mowing Machine Guards and Guard Ledger Plates, Hay Rake Teeth, Land Cultivator Teeth and Cultivator Points, Sprocket Chains—different sizes, Plows Points, Plow Sole Plates, Plow Clevises, Ensilage Blower Pipes, Nuts for Wagon Arms, Machine Bolts and Nuts; be made to conform to the standards prescribed by regulations to be made by the Minister of Agriculture prior to the first day of November, 1921, and approved by the Governor General in Council; and that further and other regulations may be made by the minister from time to time.

2. That from and after the first day of November, 1922, no agricultural implement or farm wagon shall be manufactured in Canada for use within Canada which with respect to the said parts fails to comply with the regulations then in force, and any manufacturer of agricultural implements or farm wagons for use within Canada violating these provisions or regulations shall incur a penalty of not less than $200 and not more than $1,000.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, O.): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair—

Mr. SPEAKER: I put the motion that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution. Does the hon. member desire to debate that motion?

Mr. McCOIG: I desire to say a few words in connection with the resolution standing in my name. In the first place, it is very gratifying to be able to present to Parliament a resolution of a non-contentious nature such as this which I think will meet with the general approval of the people of Canada, including the manufacturers as well as the users of agricultural implements. I think the manufacturers of agricultural implements should be glad that such a resolution has been presented to Parliament, and particularly if it should be adopted. There never was a time in the history of Canada when the manufacturers were enjoying greater prosperity or higher prices for the goods they are disposing of to the agriculturists of Canada. This resolution, if carried into effect, would put them in the position of having many of the parts of their different implements interchangeable. The parts would be standardized so that if an agricultural implement shipped to a foreign market required a spare part, the purchaser would be in the

fortunate position of being able to get the required part from any Canadian manufacturers' agent which would not be the case with purchasers of agricultural implements from manufacturers in other parts of the world. This matter is not an entirely new proposal. It was up last session before the Committee on Agriculture, and in all fairness to the chairman and members of that committee let me say that they all recognized the importance of this proposal, and gave it their hearty endorsation whenever the matter was up for discussion.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I was not able to advance the Bill I introduced in the House last session dealing with this matter, because it had not been preceded by a resolution, but I repeat, the members of the Committee on Agriculture discussed the matter, and one and all approved the proposal of having the different parts of farm machinery made in this country interchangeable.

For the benefit of hon. members who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture I might say that the first item dealt with in the resolution is grain binder knife sections. As you no doubt are aware, Mr. Speaker, all the sections are of exactly the same size, three inches, the only difference between different makes being that the holes are drilled differently, so that the sections are not interchangeable; that is, one manufacturer's knife sections could not be used on the machine of another manufacturer. At present a man using a Massey-Harris binder who required a knife section would have to get it from the Massey-Harris repair man, whereas if these sections were made interchangeable he could go to the International Harvester Company agent, or the agent of any other Canadian manufacturer living up to these proposed regulations, and get the part he required. The same thing applies to pitmans. They are all wood, but they are made in different sizes, so that if a man breaks a pitman he has to get another part from the agent of the particular company that sold him the machine. The same thing applies to mowing machine knife sections. All the sections of the mowing machines are of the same size, but they are drilled differently. Then the pitman clamps are all of the same length, but they also are made just a little bit differently, so that they are not interchangeable. If this resolution were carried into effect these parts would be standardized, and then if a man wanted a repair part he would not have to drive to the agent of the particular company from whom he bought the machine, but could get the part from any Canadian manufacturer of these implements. If for instance a farmer broke a pitman clamp on his machine while in the hay field at a busy time of the year he would not have to drive to some dealer at a distance to procure the necessary repair. It is an article worth only thirty-five cents, but it is of very great importance, and if these clamps were the same for all makes of machine it would obviate considerable trouble and annoyance when time is of the utmost value. As it is, they are made just a little different in the various makes of machine and are therefore not interchangeable. The same thing applies to the knife heads on mowers. All mowing machine knives are made in five, six and seven foot lengths, and but for a little twist they are almost indentical; but this slight difference renders them uninterchangeable. Now, if this article were standardized a company would not need to reconstruct a mowing machine because the knife heads would be standardized and be made interchangeable, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the resultant saving would be considerable, not only in money but in time also, which is of equal if not greater importance.

Another article which should be standardized—and this is of vital importance—is the ledger plate. The ledger plate has to be repaired from time to time during the lifetime of the machine, and I think it is highly important that a farmer should be able to procure this repair with the slightest possible inconvenience. This also applies to the hay rake teeth and land cultivator teeth. Let me say, for the benefit of hon. members who are not conversant with agricultural implements, that these teeth are of the same size, but they are slightly different in some minor respects and if a man wishes to buy teeth for a rake he may find that the ends of the teeth in one make are bent in the opposite direction to that of the rake he is using, and consequently no end of trouble and annoyance is involved. The standardization of this part of farm machinery could be accomplished without any expense or reconstruction of rakes; the expense to the manufacturer would be very slight indeed. This applies not only to hay rake teeth but also to land cultivator teeth. If a man owned a rake purchased five or ten years ago he could, if my proposal were adopted and these parts were standardized,

be able to go to some concern near at hand and get the proper repair.

The next article to which I desire to refer is the sprocket chain. I may say for the benefit of the uninformed on these matters that we could have three or four different sizes of chains but have them all standardized so that whatever number of chain a man wanted he could go to a repair house and get it without any trouble. The next thing is the question of plough points. We have in Ontario to-day five or six different plough firms making what is known as the No. 21 plough, which is the most desirable general purpose plough that can be procured. But the points in the different makes are not identical; there is just enough difference in the way the holes are drilled to prevent their being interchanged. All that would be necessary would be to have the points standardized and the holes drilled in the proper place so that the farmer might be able to go to any plough firm and get the necessary repairs for his machine. The same thing applies to plough sole plates. Let us take blower pipes, which are very much in use. Farmers throughout the country are erecting silos and it is necessary to procure a lot of piping. These pipes could with very little expense be standardized and it would be a great blessing to any farmer using a silo filler. Next we have the question of wagon arms. Now, I would not say that the arm should be standardized, but I contend that the nuts should have the same thread on all wagons. It would cost practically nothing to change the present nuts so as have the threads on all arms of wagons the same. If that were done a farmer who lost a nut off his wagon would not have to go to five or six different repair houses to get his wagon fixed up. There are some other articles on the list such as machine bolts, etc., and while I do not refer to them, I think I have said enough to show the inconvenience to which users of agricultural implements have been put in securing parts for their machines. This is why I am anxious to have this matter brought to the attention of the House. Now, some manufacturers might tell hon. members that they are keeping a large supply of repairs for their particular line of goods in every agency and municipality throughout the country. Well, why did the provincial legislature of Saskatchewan pass the legislation that it did during last session? I quote the following from "Canadian Farm Implements:"

The Saskatchewan Farm Implement Act has been altered by the addition of two new provisions. The first provides a penalty of $100 for each offence where a vendor fails to maintain a sufficient supply of repairs required for machines sold by him and in operation in the province; and the second authorize the Minister of Agriculture to appoint inspectors whose duties shall be to inspect the stocks of repairs kept by vendors and who shall have free access during business hours to the vendors' premises.

This goes to show the importance of having a repair stock kept on hand by different vendors in the agricultural implement business. It is evident that a lot of agencies have not been keeping repairs to supply the farmers; otherwise, it would not have been necessary for the provincial legislature to pass this legislation. If the repair parts were standardized as I suggest it would be unnecessary for a lot of different agents to keep a full stock because one stock would supply the demand in small towns and villages throughout the country. As hon. members know, there are many articles in common household use now that are standardized. It was not such a long time ago when we could not get an electric bulb that would fit any socket. To-day all bulbs are standardized and the convenience in consequence is incalculable. The same thing applies to plumbing; we have plumbing repairs standardized so as to be interchangeable. And so far as automobiles are concerned, tires and rims are standardized; so that a man, regardless of the kind of car he owns, can easily get these parts of his car from any dealer. Now, we have a precedent for standardization of farming implements in action that has been taken abroad, and I might read from "Canadian Farm Implements," printed in Winnipeg, the following:

The Standard Committee of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers reports that excellent progress has been made in stadardization during 1920. The following standards are now ready for final adoption. Standard belt speeds, in which it is proposed to include five speeds, viz., 1,500, 2,600, 3,000, 3,250 and 3,500 feet per minute. Standard tractor and plough hitches, which include height of vertical hitch on tractor and lateral adjustments for ploughs of two, three and four bottoms.

Farm wagon standards, including the standard automobile track of 56 inches and tire widths for wagons of various capacity ratings.

The following standards are in the process of development:

A standard code for testing and rating the belt and drawbar power of tractors.

A standard manger form for dairy barns.

Standard ratings for letter carrier capacities and dimensions.

Standard ratings for capacities and power requirements of ensilage cutters.

This is not an entirely new matter. It started in the United States in many

different lines and I feel satisfied that if we do not carry out legislation in the same direction we shall be very much behind the times. I think that the benefits to be derived from the standardization of parts of agricultural machinery are so obvious that this matter needs no great argument. This question has been directed to the attention of many prominent men in this country who are interested in agriculture, as, for instance, the Minister of Agriculture in the government of Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Doherty. I desire in this connection to quote the following:

I represent the United Farmers of Ontario. This matter has been up for discussion at meetings of the United Farmers during the past year. It is a very live question with the farmers of the province. They are very quick to see the immense advantages that would accrue to them from the standardization of the wearable and breakable parts of their machines. Last fall there was a meeting of the Fairs and Exhibitions Association in Toronto, and they discussed this matter at some considerable length, and passed a resolution. I only refer to these matters to show the members of this Committee that the farmers of the province of Ontario will appreciate anything you can accomplish along the line which you are now following, and would be very grateful for any results that can be secured, along that line. I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee upon taking up a question that is of such vital importance to the farmers. At the Fairs and Exhibitions Association, in which 350 agricultural societies of Ontario are represented, the following resolution was passed:

"That this Association in Convention assembled hereby express their hearty approval of the standardization of the breakable and wearable parts of farm machinery and would respectfully recommend that the Federal Government arrange for a committee of mechanical experts, three to be appointed by the Federal Government and three by the manufacturers of farming implements to arrange for such standardization and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Sir Robert Borden and Hon. T. A. Crerar."

This statement, Mr. Speaker, only goes to show that the farmers of this country know how important this question is. They know the hardships everybody engaged in farming has to contend with during the busy harvesting time and they know how easy it would be for the manufacturers of our country to standardize some of the parts I have referred to. I hope the members of the House will give this matter their most serious consideration and will follow it up by according their support to the resolution. I feel satisfied that if they do so, the users of agricultural implements will be extremely grateful to this Parliament. The Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements will not be hurt to any extent but will be fortunate in the years to come to be in the happy position that they will be able to secure in European markets, as well as at home, the patronage of the users of agricultural implements for their machinery, in preference to the implements of foreign manufacturers.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, as the mover of the resolution has remarked, that this question is not a new one but has received some consideration from the House in previous sessions, I, as chairman of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, before whom a full discussion of the matter took place and upon whose advice arrangements have been made for the carrying on of an investigation with regard to securing all the necessary information as to what would be a proper solution of this very important question, deem it to be my privilege and my duty to make a few observations at this time. I wish it distinctly understood that any remarks I have to make will be perfectly in accord with those of the last speaker as to the desirability of a standardization of the important parts of agricultural implements. But my special object in speaking on the present occasion, is to draw attention to the fact that the Standing Committee on Agriculture has been giving consideration to this question for a considerable time, and that it has appointed a sub-committee to conduct an investigation and to hold conferences with manufacturers who are directly interested in the other side of the question. I may state that such conferences have been held and such discussions carried on, as tend to throw some light on this important question. Further, the matter is still under review by the Committee on Agriculture. The first meeting of that committee for the present session, which is now arranged for, has on its agenda the taking up of business left over from the sittings of the committee last session. Under that heading the present question will come under review. No doubt the sub-committee, of which the mover of the resolution is a member, will make certain recommendations to the general committee. Then the Standing Committee on Agriculture, with all the facts before it, will bring in certain recommendations to the House. Therefore in view of what has been done by that committee, and the sub-committee as well, I think it would be better for the House to defer any lengthened discussion of the matter until such time as the findings of the committee are brought down. I therefore beg to

move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Harold):

That all the words after the word "that" in the first paragraph of the said resolution be struck out and that the whole question incorporated in the Motion before the House be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture for their further consideration, requesting said Committee to bring in such recommendations as their investigation of the facts will warrant.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think, perhaps, the amendment would be in better form if the two paragraphs by way of preamble were omitted.

Mr. HENDERS: The last clause is the important one, and in fact all that I included in the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: If you strike out everything except the word "that," there is no question to be referred to the Committee. I do not know whether my hon. friend is prepared to accept it or not, but the better way would be, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, which, it seems to me, would affect the purpose he has in view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It struck me that way at first, but on further consideration, I am inclined to think the amendment is in order.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not say it is not in order, I say it is not very intelligible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not very intelligible to me before. The motion is, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair in order that this resolution be referred to the Committee of the Whole. The hon. member moves that everything after "that" be omitted.

Mr. FIELDING: In the motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That the Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that instead of this motion this resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FIELDING: No. That the question incorporated in the resolution be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: The resolution reads properly and carries out the intent of the mover. I suggest in the first place that the two paragraphs by way of preamble be stricken out because they are not essential to the motion at all. The motion as submitted by the hon. member is as follows:

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and that the whole question incorporated in the resolution before the House be submitted to the Standing Committee on Agriculture for their further consideration, requesting said committee to bring in such recommendation as their investigation of the facts shall warrant.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Mr. BUREAU: The amendment reads?

Mr. SPEAKER: That all the words after "that" be struck out, and that the whole question incorporated in the resolution before the House be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture for their further consideration—

Mr. BUREAU: You leave the word "that" in No. 1?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not essential that the word "that" should be left there at all. The essential thing is to have the resolution referred back to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not what the amendment says.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Should not the amendment be, that the Speaker do not now leave the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: That would give the amendment a better form, but I did not want to emasculate the motion entirely. I may say that I had not seen it before, and I am trying to assist the hon. mover of the motion.

Mr. McCOIG: In view of the statement made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) as chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, I shall be glad to adopt his suggestion that the resolution be sent to his committee.

Mr. CRERAR: I should like to ask a question of my hon. friend for Macdonald, who is the chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. Can he give the House any assurance that this matter will be considered by that Standing Committee and a report presented in time for action by this House if deemed necessary?

Mr. HENDERS: I have pleasure in stating that notice is already in the hands of the secretary of the committee to deal with this matter as unfinished business from last session.

Mr. CRERAR: That answer is not quite satisfactory. I should like to have an assurance that the matter will be placed before this House for action this session, if necessary.

Mr. HENDERS: I cannot speak for the committee, but, speaking for myself, I can

say that this matter will come regularly before the committee for their consideration, and it will come in the form in which this amendment presents it, which simply means that the question will come up for consideration by the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the amendment as I have put it to the House reads properly and is quite in order.

Amendment agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. What steps, if any, has the Government taken to appoint a Canadian representative at Washington, in pursuance of the authority obtained for that purpose from Parliament at the last session?

2. Was any representation made to the Government with reference to such appointment by Sir Auckland Geddes, the English Ambassador at Washington, or by any other representative, or member of the British Government?

3. If so, was it because of such representation that an appointment has not been made?

4. Is there any correspondence on the subject? If so, will it be produced in Parliament?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. The question of the appointee is under consideration.

2, 3 and 4. No.

NIOBE AND RAINBOW

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government disposed of or sold the naval cruisers Niobe and Rainbow? If so, when?

2. Was said disposition or sale made after tenders were called for, or otherwise?

3. What are the names of the parties who submitted offers and the respective amounts of each tender?

4. To whom were said ships transferred?

5. Have the moneys been paid in to the Receiver General? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes. Niobe in October, 1920. Rainbow in September, 1920.

2. Sale of the Niobe and Rainbow was effected as the result of tenders invited by advertisement published in the Press of Canada, United States and England, and of succeeding negotiations.

3. Niobe—Mr. John Simon, Halifax, $20,000; Messrs. J. Lipsitz Co., Chelsea, Mass., $56,000; Messrs. Baker & Betcherman, Ottawa, $75,000; Messrs. J. Lipsitz Co., Chelsea, Mass., $80,000; Messrs. Baker & Betcherman, Ottawa, $88,000; Messrs. Baker & Betcherman, Ottawa, $100,500; Messrs. A. Garson & Co., St. John, $112,000; Messrs. New Brunswick Rolling Mills Ltd., St. John, $130,000; Messrs. New Brunswick Rolling Mills Ltd., St. John, $135,000. The offers of the New Brunswick Rolling Mills Ltd., included the submarines C.C. 1 and C.C. 2. The highest offer previously received for these vessels was $17,000 for the two.

Rainbow—Messrs. C. S. Sutherland, Edmonton, Alta., $5,000; Messrs. Zarrows Ltd., Vancouver, B.C., $8,000; Mr. Alex. Zeeve, Seattle, Wash., $34,565; Messrs. Evans, Coleman & Evans, Vancouver, B.C., $36,855; Messrs. Nieder & Marcus, Seattle, Wash., $67,777; Mr. Alex. Zeeve, Seattle, Wash., $35,565; Mr. Alex. Zeeve, Seattle, Wash., $40,000.

4. Niobe—Sold to the New Brunswick Rolling Mills Ltd., St. John, but not yet transferred pending receipt of final payment.

Rainbow—To Nieder & Marcus, Seattle, Wash.

5. The first instalment of $20,000 on the sale of the Niobe and the two submarines was paid in to the Receiver General on November 16th, 1920.

The sum of $67,777 realized from the sale of the Rainbow was paid in to the Receiver General on September 25th, 1920.

TAR SAND RIGHTS REGULATIONS

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

Why were the regulations established by Order in Council dated the 14th day of February, 1910, for the disposal of Tar Sand Rights in the province of Alberta, suspended by Order in Council dated the 31st day of May, 1912 (P. C. 1486)?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

As it appeared that no process for the commercial recovery of oil and other by-products from these tar-sands had at that time been perfected, and as a further examination of the deposit and research work in connection therewith appeared to be necessary to determine the value of these tar-sands, it was considered advisable in the public interest to suspend the regulations for the disposal of such rights.

GENL. WM. BETHUNE LINDSAY, M.I.E.C.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. Has General William Bethune Lindsay, M.I.E.C., secured or selected the 1920 acres of Tar Sand Rights in the province of Alberta, as granted to him by Order in Council, P.C. 1547, and dated the 8th day of July, 1920?

2. If so, what is the description of the lands so selected or secured?

3. Are any of the lands enumerated in Order in Council, P. C. 1495, dated the 3rd day of July, 1920, as published in the Canada Gazette of July 24th, 1920, and found on page 248 thereof, included in the selection made by the said General William Bethune Lindsay?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. Yes. Selection has been made of the area referred to, but no portion of the area so selected has yet been granted to General Lindsay.

2. The following are the lands selected:

	Sec.	Tp.	Rge.	Mer.
N ½ of ls. 12	7	88	6	W.4
N ½ of ls. 10	3	89	"	"
E ½ of E ½ of ls. 14	3	"	"	"
ls. 15	3	"	"	"
ls. 2	10	"	"	"
SE ¼ of ls. 15	8	"	"	"
NE ¼ of ls. 10	"	"	"	"
W ½ of NE ¼ of ls. 2	"	"	"	"
E ½ of NW ¼ of ls. 2	"	"	"	"
N ½ of NW ¼ of ls. 10	5	"	"	"
N ½ of NE ¼ of ls. 11	"	"	"	"
E ½ of ls. 14	"	"	"	"
W ½ of ls. 15	"	"	"	"
S ½ of SE ¼ of	29	92	"	"
Ls 16	20	"	"	"
Ls. 13	21	"	"	"
Lss. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (E. of R.)	32	97	10	"
Lss. 1, 7 and 8 of	32	94	11	W.4
Ls. 15	29	"	"	"
S ½ of NW ¼	20	"	"	"
Lss. 1, 2 and 7 of	19	"	"	"
Lss. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 16 (E. of R.)	24	95	"	"
Lss. 15 and 16	21	"	"	"
Ls. 13 of	22	"	"	"
Lss. 4 and 5 of	27	"	"	"
Lss. 11, 13 and 14 of	27	"	"	"
Lss. 1, 2 and 8 of	28	"	"	"
Lss. 14, 15, 16 (E. of R.)	36	96	"	"
Lss. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 (E. of R.)	1	97	"	"

Part of lots 1, 6 and 7 in McMurray Settlement.

3. Yes.

ALBERTA OIL LEASE RENTALS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Strathcona):

1. What amount of money has been collected by the Government from oil leases in the province of Alberta during the years 1905 to 1920 inclusive?

2. What amount of money has been collected by the Government from gas leases in the province of Alberta during the years 1905 to 1920 inclusive?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. $2,384,008.29.

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

2. The petroleum and natural gas rights are included in all leases issued, so that the above amount was collected on account of petroleum and natural gas.

HUDSON BAY COMPANY LANDS

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry-Stormont):

1. When does or did the time expire for the selection of lands provided for in the transfer of the Hudson Bay Company's right to the Government in 1870?

2. When are or were lands reserved by the Crown for selection by the Hudson's Bay Company, and not selected, released for settlement?

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY:

1. 23rd June, 1920.

2. Such lands have not been released for settlement.

BRIQUETTING PLANT AT BIENFAIT, SASK.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the total amount of moneys spent up to date on briquetting plant in Saskatchewan at the lignite coal fields?

2. What is the estimated cost of the plant when completed?

3. What will be its briquetting capacity?

4. When may we expect to have briquettes on the market?

5. Are there any by-products to be developed in connection with this plant? If so, what are they?

6. Is the erection of the plant being done by contract or day labour, or on a percentage basis?

7. If by contract, were tenders called and who are the contractors?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

1. The total expenditure by The Lignite Utilization Board on the briquetting plant at Bienfait, Saskatchewan, and in preliminary investigations up to February 24, 1921, was $399,578.45. Of this sum one-half was provided by the Federal Government, and the other half, in equal amounts, by the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

2. The estimated total cost of the necessary preliminary investigations, the plant (and houses) when completed is $675,000.

3. The minimum capacity of the plant will be 100 tons of briquettes per day.

4. It is expected that briquettes will be produced at the plant about the month of June, 1921, and as soon as the necessary period of trial and adjustment is concluded these will be placed on the open market through the ordinary channels of trade.

5. The only by-products that the board contemplates removing from the gas are the lignite tars and pitches. The board is attempting to find a market for this material at the present moment. The gas

itself is to be used to heat the carbonizers and also probably the rotary dryers.

6. The buildings, plant and houses are being erected by contract. The contract is of a special cost plus nature with bonus and penalty clauses of various kinds. The raw lignite handling equipment, the conveyors, the piping, the valves, power wiring, the motors, the dryers, the boilers, the mixers, and the briquetting press, are being supplied on contract after competitive bidding. The carbonizers are being built by day labour (owing to exceptionally high prices quoted on competitive bidding), and the erection of a great deal of the equipment is being done also by day labour.

7. The plant buildings and the houses have been erected by contract for which public tenders were advertised. Seven tenders were received, and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, Messrs. Smith Bros. & Wilson, Limited, Regina, Sask.

*Mr. COWAN:

1. When will the briquetting plant now being erected at Bienfait be completed?
2. After completion, how is the product to be handled?
3. If sold by local agents, who will appoint the said agents?
4. At what price will the briquettes be sold?
5. What is the amount now expended by the Federal Government in this plant?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

1. It is expected that the briquetting plant being erected by the Lignite Utilization Board at Bienfait, Saskatchewan, will be producing briquettes about the month of June, 1921.

2. The product of the plant is to be marketed through the ordinary channels of trade.

3. The question of agency has not yet been settled. The appointment of any agent or agents rests with the Lignite Utilization Board.

4. The Lignite Utilization Board cannot at present commit itself to any statement as to price at which briquettes will be sold, but the price will be well below the price at which anthracite coal is selling to-day in the Manitoba market.

5. The total expenditure by the Lignite Utilization Board on the briquetting plant at Bienfait, Saskatchewan, and in preliminary investigations up to February 24, 1921, was $399,578.45. Of this sum one-half was provided by the Federal Government, and the other half, in equal amounts, by the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

OIL LEASE FEES—ALBERTA

Mr. GRIESBACH:

What sums of money have been paid the Government of Canada with respect to applications for oil leases in the Province of Alberta from the first day of January, A.D. 1920, showing such payments in totals month by month to the latest date?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

January,	1920.....	$10,012.55
February,	"	64,684.57
March,	"	28,579.58
April	"	10,337.80
May,	"	13,747.28
June,	"	18,058.62
July,	"	13,554.79
August,	"	45,926.22
September,	"	35,948.11
October,	"	40,760.36
November,	"	46,641.17
December,	"	78,560.92
January,	1921.....	42,352.03
February,	"	80,719.01
	Total.....	$529,883.01

PRINCE ALBERT—SOLDIERS SETTLEMENT BOARD

Mr. WHITE (Victoria):

1. Were Messrs. J. S. Fowlie, A. E. Fox, R. H. Hall, Alex. Thompson and George Reid, members of the advisory and qualification Board of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan?
2. If so, when were they appointed and when did their services cease?
3. What compensation was paid to each of them to date, and what amount, if any, is still owing them?
4. Have any of these gentlemen seen service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force? If so, in what capacity?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

1. Yes.

2. They were appointed on March 16th, 1919. The services of Mr. Reid terminated on his death, September 13th, 1919, and Mr. Fox resigned on December 20th, 1919. The others are still serving.

3. These gentlemen are paid at the rate of $10 per diem while employed, and have received to date:

J. S. Fowlie.....	$1330
A. E. Fox.....	950
R. H. Hall.....	1730
A. McD. Thompson....	1740
George Reid.....	440

There are no amounts at present owing them.

4. No. They are all over military age. Mr. R. H. Hall, aged 70 years, had two sons overseas, both of whom were badly wound-

ed and are still receiving treatment. Mr. G. H. Reid, aged 58 years, had two sons overseas.—one was killed and the other lost his left leg. Mr. J. S. Fowlie, aged 48 years, has a son who was rejected as underage, being 17 years old. Mr. A. E. Fox, aged 47 years, has no sons. Mr. A. McD. Thompson, aged 50 years, is unmarried.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. RINFRET:

For a copy of all correspondence in connection with the employment and resignation of M. Abel Guibeau, engineer on board the Canadian Traveller, in 1919, and on the Canadian Sower in 1919-1920.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy of all letters, papers, documents and agreements leading up to the passing of the Order in Council, dated the 8th day of July, 1920 (P.C. 1547), whereby General William Bethune Lindsay, M.I.E.C., secured the right to a nineteen hundred and twenty acre lease of Tar Sands in the Province of Alberta.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy (a) of the report made by Mr. S. C. Ells, an officer of the Department of Mines, to the Department of the Interior, touching the Tar Sands in the Province of Alberta, as related in an Order in Council, P.C. 1495, and dated the 3rd day of July, 1920; (b) of all letters, papers and documents of whatsoever nature they may be, leading up to the passing of the said Order in Council.

GREAT LAKES—ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TRANSPORTATION

Mr. F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Special Committee consisting of members should be appointed to consider and investigate the benefits to be derived from a deep waterway for transportation from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence river, having regard in particular to the benefits arising from the then increased navigation facilities and the utilization of the Hydro-Electric energy of the St. Lawrence river, and that the Special Committee have power to hold sessions in Ottawa or elsewhere during the recess of Parliament and have power to call for persons, papers, or records and to examine witnesses, under oath, and to report from time to time to this House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the St. Lawrence river has been pronounced by some of the best minds of the United States and Canada as probably one of the greatest economic questions of the day. It is greatest in its magnitude, greatest in the benefits which its accomplishment would bring about. It is desirable, therefore, that the matter should be investigated by members of the House so that when we return to our constituencies we can, in turn, explain it to them, and it is with that purpose in view that I have moved this resolution. I hope that the press will do all that they can to give publicity to the matter.

I think it advisable to give at this stage a short account of the history of the deep waterway transportation question from the Great Lakes to the sea, by way of the St. Lawrence river. About two years ago five of the states of the Northwest United States organized themselves into a body known as the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, with the sole object of endeavouring to get their products to the sea. To show you how serious they were in the matter, I may point out that each of these states subscribed $10,000 from their legislative moneys, making a fund of $50,000 to carry on a propaganda at Washington. They went to Washington with their senators and congressmen, and, of course, the Administration granted their request, and the matter was referred to the International Joint Commission. The International Joint Commission then received from the two Governments certain questions to be answered—questions of a two-fold nature, one economic, and the other engineering. Each Government appointed an engineer to assist the Commission and prepare estimates as to what the cost of the project would be. The Commission has been holding sessions all over Canada and the United States; with, I believe, one more sitting at Detroit they will conclude their public hearings, and it is expected that their report will be published in Ottawa about the second week in April, when their regular statutory sittings are held.

Now, this motion for a committee is in no way to interfere with or to derogate from the International Joint Commission. It is important that we come to understand this question just as our cousins to the South have understood it. They have realized the importance of it; it is equally important to us—not, of course, in point of population, the United States outnumbering us ten to one, but the benefit is common in all other respects.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the benefits that will be derived from this project when completed. They are two-fold in their nature, one affecting the question of transportation, and the other the question of fuel and the development of power as a substitute for fuel. As regards transportation, it goes without saying that it is the tie which binds the different parts of the country together. If isolated parts of a dominion or an empire are without means of transportation, with-

out means of getting to or from the centres or the markets, the sentiment of attachment slowly dies out, and, feeling their isolation, the separated parts are liable to drop off and fall away. It is apparent therefore, that the development of means of transportation is bound to promote the public good. I would like our friends in the prairie country to realize that the problem in no way conflicts with that which is very dear to their hearts—the Hudson Bay Railway project. When the International Joint Commission held sittings at various points on the prairies the suggestion was made that there might be an interference in this connection. But we do not wish in any way to interfere with the Hudson Bay Railway project; this proposal in no way touches it or affects it.

9 p.m.

Now, what are the benefits of these transportation facilities? I have lived for some thirty years at the head of the Lakes. Originally the movement of freight was from the East to the West. I have seen the wheat going into the West steadily and none going out, and I have seen, as is the condition to-day, hundreds of millions of bushels going from the West to the East. Heretofore Canada has endeavoured to meet this situation by the use of her canal systems but owing to the changes which have taken place we are now behind the times. We ship the grain from Port Arthur in vessels carrying 500,000 bushels, but vessels of that kind can only go as far as Port Colborne, and it takes four ships of present Welland and St. Lawrence canal size to carry that same cargo from Port Colborne to Montreal. Necessarily, because of the large carrying capacity, the freight charge to Port Colborne or to Buffalo is lower than it is for the comparatively short distance from Port Colborne to Montreal. The rate last year was four cents from the head of the Lakes to Port Colborne or Buffalo, a voyage occupying about five days. If the rate for that five days trip is four cents a bushel, it is not unreasonable to assume that for two days additional journey the rate would be an additional two cents a bushel. If therefore, the vessel did not have to discharge at Port Colborne, the rate through to Montreal from Port Arthur, Duluth or Chicago would be six cents a bushel. But under the present procedure the grain does not go to Montreal; it is unloaded at Buffalo and shipped to New York. It costs twelve cents a bushel to get it from Buffalo to New York by rail and the barge canal rate is now practically the same as the rail rate. People do not realize that Buffalo or Port Colborne are as near to the market at, say, Liverpool by the St. Lawrence as New York is in distance.

That being the case, why unnecessarily transport this grain four or five hundred miles more to New York and have that cost of transporting the grain and then be just as far away as when you were at Buffalo? I make the statement that there will be to every producer of grain in the West a direct saving the moment a ship can go straight through with a large cargo to Montreal, instead of breaking bulk en route. When the vessel is at Montreal, she is three or four hundred miles nearer Liverpool than if she were at New York, and the rate from Montreal to Liverpool is the same as the rate from New York to Liverpool. It is quite clear that you can save five cents a bushel on all the grains of the West if they can be moved without breaking bulk at the foot of lake Erie. Let me explain the reason why. The price of every article is, of course, governed by the market, and the market for our grain is in Europe. The producer, the farmer in the West, gets that market price, less the cost, including brokerage, insurance and everything else, of getting his product to the market. If, therefore, you can reduce the transportation charges by five cents, you are going to put that saving into every producer's pocket, and it needs no mathematical computation by me to show how the producers of the West are going to benefit. Grain for export and grain which is used for home consumption command the same price. So much for grain.

As regards flour, the moment you handle any package freight, the cost runs up very largely, and the saving on package freight will be very large. One of the problems with which this country has to grapple is to get the flour out instead of simply moving out the grain, because it is very much more profitable to Canada to ship out flour and to keep the by-products of grain in our country as far as we can than it is to ship out wheat. One can readily see that on articles like dairy produce, canned goods and package freight of that kind, that has to be handled two or three times, the saving will be considerable. I should like to call the attention of hon. members to what I found in my mail box this morning. This is a newspaper called the Weekly Market News and Financial Farmer. I do not

know where or by whom it is published. It was sent to me as a marked copy containing a report of the Wheat Board; but in it is a copy of an address given by Julius H. Barnes, who was formerly Wheat Director and President of the United States Grain Corporation, and with the permission of the House I should like to read what Mr. Barnes said in his address to the Farmers Marketing Committee of Seventeen at Chicago on November 5, 1920. Mr. Barnes is the recognized authority in the United States on these questions. In the middle of his address he speaks of the improvement possible in the relative position of the producer, and under the head of water transportation he says:

> It follows then that a project such as that before the country to-day of so improving the St. Lawrence that ocean carriers reach the western ports of the Great Lakes or that the Lake carriers may deliver their cargoes alongside the ocean carriers in the St. Lawrence instead of breaking the bulk at Buffalo, deserves the earnest consideration and support of those who have at heart the improvement of the relative position of the western producer.

Then he goes on to say:

> Its relation to the farm delivery cost simply stated is this: The present rail rate from Buffalo to New York is twelve cents per bushel. Also, to reach Montreal, the rail rate from Georgian bay is also approximately 12 cents per bushel. Ocean carriers may be secured at the same rate from Montreal as from New York. The opening of the St. Lawrence waterway and the improvement of the Welland canal, already undertaken by Canada, would enable the lake carrier to Buffalo to extend its trip to Montreal—only forty-eight hours longer—at a cost probably not exceeding two cents per bushel. This promises a saving of ten cents a bushel during part of the year. Its influence may reasonably be calculated to affect and improve the farm price by five cents per bushel on the entire grain crops of that section of the country whose arc of competitive rail rates would thus be centred on the Great lakes ports —Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland.

He is speaking from the point of view of the United States side of the line and, of course, what he says is equally applicable to the Canadian side.

> This applies to home consumption as well as exportable surplus, so it may reasonably be calculated on some 4,000,000,000 bushels of grain or $200,000,000 annually.

If the United States and Canada could realize that they are losing to the producers of grain $200,000,000 annually by not setting this canal built, I think we would get a little more rapid movement than we have had so far. There are in the United States some gentlemen who, since this organization started, made this statement —and I believe it can be justified when you compute the package freight as well as everything else—that it would pay the two countries, Canada and the United States, to build this canal each year and tear it down and rebuild it rather than continue without it as at present. If that be true, or anywhere nearly true, the question arises, even if we are hard up, even if we need to conserve in every respect, which is better—to spend some money on this project and pay sinking fund and interest upon it and have something from year to year, or to throw away twice, or three times, or five times the amount annually? That is what the situation is going to boil down to. I feel perfectly certain that when the Government and this House realize the financial side of this question, they will not allow this project to be delayed any longer. So much for the question of package freight.

I see the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) opposite me. I hope to see the day when a ship will be able to come with coal from his town of Sydney up to the head of the lakes and deliver it there, which is a thing that cannot be done to-day. Ontario is and has been suffering from a coal famine, and I cannot see why that coal should not be marketed in Ontario and brought up even to the head of the lakes and used on the railways further west. Every year large quantities of Pennsylvania coal are brought up to the head of the lakes and stored for railway systems. There is, to my mind, no reason why, if those vessels did not have to break bulk, they could not load with coal in Nova Scotia, carry it right to the head of the lakes and bring back grain which could be shipped overseas from Nova Scotia.

Somebody may say, as has frequently been said, that this will never be used by salt water ships, but it is rather difficult to say these days that anything will not happen. Let us think for a moment what is happening. The Kiel canal did not simply open up a new navigation system; it shortened a journey by about three or four hundred miles. Formerly, ships could go round by Jutland; now they go through the Kiel canal, thus saving three or four hundred miles, and before the war many ships were using that route. We know the situation in regard to the Suez canal. What is the effect of the Panama canal, which is a locking system and which is quite a long one?

Let me show you what effect the Panama Canal has had upon the Middle States and

the same thing will apply to our Middle Northwest. In Montana the Anaconda mine produces zinc and copper ores. The market for that zinc and copper is New York city. To transport it by rail would cost so much. Since the Panama Canal has been built, the owners of that mine have found that by shipping their product to Seattle, and then by vessels through the Panama Canal to New York, they are saving six cents a hundred pounds in freights, or $1,000,000 a year. They transport by rail to Seattle, on the Pacific coast, I said, which is exactly the same distance from their mine as Duluth, upon Lake Superior. They could transport their product to Duluth by rail, and the rate ought to be less because they do not have to climb the divide. Then from Duluth to New York by water, the rate is forty per cent. of what it is from Seattle, and therefore it is computed they will save at least three cents a pound, which will amount to a saving of $500,000 per annum on that one mine, if they could ship without breaking bulk from Duluth by water. So it will be with many another industry in Canada and the United States.

Ah, but some say, you will never have coastwise trade from the Great Lakes to the sea board. Why not? If the Strait of Gibraltar were not open boats would not go past there, but as it is open, the boats do go in. It is much longer to go around by Gibraltar from the Baltic ports than to ship across land by rail, and yet the produce of all those countries goes round by water. The route to Constantinople is 800 or 900 miles longer by water than by rail, yet the freight from, say, Antwerp or London, all goes by water. Why should not the same thing happen here? Why should not ships from Boston, New York and inland ports on the great lake system use this waterway once it is open?

Take another example of a canal. Manchester was feeling the loss of her manufacturing business. In order to get rid of the high cost of handling, manufacturing firms were moving away from Manchester to the sea board. A man, I think, by the name of Stevenson hammered away until he got the Manchester Ship Canal built. It is some 35 miles long, with 5 locks. What has been the result of the building of that canal? To-day Manchester is the third largest shipping port in Great Britain. Now, if salt water ships will go up that 35 miles of canal and through 5 locks, for the traffic coming out of the one port of Manchester, why should not salt water ships come up this inland waterway to Buffalo, Detroit, Erie, Chicago and Ontario ports, and serve both them and the whole country tributary thereto? Why, Mr. Speaker, there is no country in the world that is so rich in products natural and manufactured as the Great Lakes country. You take any area 300 or 400 miles away from the Great Lakes and draw a line round on the map and see what you cover. Look at the natural timber wealth, look at the natural mineral wealth, look at the agricultural wealth and the manufacturing wealth of all those cities and prairie towns. This waterway would double and treble the transportation facilities, and the minute you reduced the cost of freights you would get articles moving that are not moving now.

Some may say that salt water ships would not be able to come up on account of their draught. They may not want to come, but they do elsewhere. Salt water ships go a thousand miles up the Amazon river. Now, ships can float in fresh water as in salt, and on the question of draught, let me give you some figures of the large ports of the world. The depth at Odessa, the great wheat port of Russia, is only 24 feet, Petrograd, 19 1-2 feet, Riga 23 feet, Libau 27 1-2 feet, Constantinople 22 feet. Our canals are going down to 30 feet on the sill, and 25 feet in the channel of over 800 feet in length and when the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence canals are built, it is estimated that 86 per cent. of the salt water tonnage can, if it wishes, reach Lake Erie. The popular idea is that ships are too large to come up these canals, but the number of very large ships on the ocean is very small compared with the number of tramp vessels, just as the number of Pullman cars is relatively small compared with the number of box cars on the railways. The number of vessels that draw more than 24 feet of water is relatively small. You have a few Mauretanias, Lusitanias, Leviathans, and so forth, but not many, while you have thousands of tramp vessels carrying only freight cargoes. I expect to see the day when these ships can find their way into any port on this inland Mediterranean. In the early days I have as a lawyer protested a ship from Antwerp, coming up the lakes with a cargo of rails. Now if that ship can come over from Antwerp, I cannot see why, if the canal is made large enough, any other salt water ship cannot come. These vessels will not take the place of our fresh water marine. These vessels are built for quick transportation with 30 or 40 hatches than can be quickly opened and shut, ensuring rapid

receiving and rapid delivery. They will always continue to handle iron ore and wheat. A tramp steamer may occasionally come in for a cargo of wheat, but these tramp vessels in the main would take a large amount of stuff that is not now moving, but that would move if the freight rate was reduced. They would take dairy products, for instance, and any kind of package freight, and it is in that kind of freight that the cost of handling runs up very fast on account of there being so much handling in and out of cars, vessels, and freight sheds. That class of business would materially be benefited. Meats, bacon, and all that sort of thing would move more freely and cheaply. One of the chief objections to this route has come from the city of Buffalo. It was very pleasant indeed to be in Montreal, and to observe the contrast. Each of these two places was largely affected in the same manner. They feared the stoppage of breaking in bulk. Montreal took the broad view and said that what was good for Canada was good for Montreal. Buffalo said: Why, this will ruin Buffalo. You take a 10,000 ton ship that comes to Buffalo and it means employment for so many hands to get the freight out of the ship, transport it across to the railway car, and get it to New York; the same thing in New York, and vice versa on the return. "Exactly," said those opponents of Buffalo in the West. "That is what we want to stop. We do not want to continue paying that tribute to you unnecessarily, and that will be the effect. Buffalo will however gain greatly by this development; she will become a seaport as near to Liverpool as New York is. She will have the Erie Canal to bring in by barge freight a large amount of manufactured products from the centres of industrial life, and instead of losing business she will gain." On the contrary, it is pleasing to see that Montreal took the view that even though she should lose she would not stand in the way of the development of the great West of Canada.

The other phase of the question is that of Hydro-Electric energy. It has been estimated that on the St. Lawrence river the horsepower available is some 4,000,000 and only a small fraction thereof has been used. It could not all be used at once, nor could it be consumed for some time to come. But we are rapidly running short of electrical energy. We of Ontario know what the significance has been during the last two years of orders coming from the Hydro-Electric: "shut off your current for such and such a time." It is a serious thing for the industrial life of the country. What would be the effect of this in a town that depended on this electric energy? Ordinarily it is estimated, I think, that it takes ten tons of coal for one horsepower. That means $100 per horsepower, and yet we can do it Hydro-Electrically for $25. Why do we not do it? Simply because we are asleep. We are wasting that much money all the time. Ontario has awakened to this fact until she has used up all the power produced at Niagara Falls and is building a canal down to Queenstown, the intention being practically to scrap the plants built at Niagara Falls eventually in order to get the full benefit or head of the water there. We have 4,000,000 horsepower running to waste on the St. Lawrence. Practically three-fourths of that is Canadian. That 4,000,000 horsepower would represent 40,000,000 tons of coal. We are importing every year fifteen or twenty million tons of coal, going on our knees to the United States to obtain it, and paying high exchange for it. The day is not very far distant when that coal will not be allowed to come into this country, for eventually it will have to be conserved for use in the United States. It behooves us, therefore, seriously to consider this matter. I see that the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) has a motion on the Order Paper asking for a committee to investigate the coal question, and I think it would be well for him to associate himself with this motion and, if we get that committee, to bring out before it the facts which he desires to deal with. Once the barrier at the St. Lawrence is open we can have coal come up from Nova Scotia or anywhere else, even Swansea, England, or any other place. Coal carriers do come over from the Old Country to United States ports and I see no reason why they could not enter Canadian ports as well. If we once get this energy developed there will be between Montreal and Toronto on both sides of the river the greatest hive of industrial life that the world has ever seen. We do not realize what it means. If we can once get the people to realize that there is any quantity of electrical energy there that can be developed steadily, with industry after industry located there, it will mean an enormous benefit for Canada, because they can get their power cheap as well as transportation to and from there on the highway of the sea. The salt water ships can come to them, and the point is an ideal manufacturing one.

I do not know that there is anything in regard to which the whole of Canada would be so greatly benefited. I have roughly outlined the benefit that would accrue to the farming community of the West, and the consumer would be benefited by the increased production that would ensue. Why should Boston and the large cities of the East be short of food when it is rotting in the interior? The cry all the time is "No cars." In addition to that, the cost of manufactured articles should be reduced because of the cheapness of electricity. I hope, therefore, that this House will begin to study this question and try to realize that although we are hard up and need to be careful and not spend money unnecessarily, we should not continue to lose money as we are doing at the present time.

That is the whole gist of the motion. I do not know a better time at which this matter could be brought up. This project would be mutually beneficial to the two countries. The United States and Canada would be co-operating in its construction and that could have only one result, namely, a great benefit. It would also be world-wide in its effects in the cheapening of products. And above all things, I do not think there is a better time for us to begin to tackle this question. It will take a year yet before we can get the proper engineering data to tackle the question. But, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this matter in the light of a peace memorial. Just before the war broke out in 1914 there was under way a project to construct an international bridge at Niagara as a memorial to the hundred years of peace between Great Britain and the United States, and it does seem to me that a work like this, international in character, would make one of the finest peace memorials and of our co-operation as allies which we could possibly conceive.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) and I find that his resolution calls for a special committee consisting of an unspecified number of members for the consideration and investigation of the benefits to be derived from a deep waterway for transportation from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence river. The House is very well aware of the fact that a similar commission was appointed some years ago to study the water-powers, the water levels, and the whole question which my hon. friend would like to have investigated at the present time, and that that commission decided at the time, after a study of the St. Lawrence waterway, that the only possible settlement of the transportation question by way of water would be from the Great Lakes down through the Ottawa river to Montreal.

There were very many reasons adduced in favour of the project, some of which my hon. friend (Mr. Keefer) has mentioned this evening. I recall the discussion of this matter in this House upon different occasions. I remember it was pointed out that our Nova Scotia coal could not get farther west than Montreal owing to the expense of its carriage by rail; but that by the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal, Nova Scotia coal could be transported up the Ottawa river. The great advantage of the Ottawa River route over the St. Lawrence route, which my hon. friend endorses to-night, is that it would give the whole of the upper Ottawa country, and all the lands within reach of the Ottawa river, a chance of being developed. There are untold natural resources in that country, but they cannot be developed and the products carried out at present because of the expensive rail rates. This is a story that many members of the House are familiar with. Still there are a considerable number who were not in Parliament when the discussion of the Georgian Bay Canal project invariably formed part of the proceedings of the House on one, if not two days of each session. My hon. friend surely would not like to see set aside the recommendation of the commission which the Government appointed to inquire into this project, and whose report is a wonderful work which must be in the Library of Parliament; I know I would not be without a copy of it in my own home. Surely he would not ignore the surveys which were then made of the whole of the waterway system from the Great Lakes down, and in which due account was taken of the possible electrical development. The power development possible on the St. Lawrence system does not begin to compare with that capable of being developed through the medium of the water powers along the Ottawa river. Many people have mistaken the idea of the Georgian Bay canal by imagining that it is proposed to construct a canal from one end of the system to the other. The canal system is a very small part of the project. There are a

great many natural water courses along the route and out of approximately four hundred miles, if I remember correctly, there would be but very few miles of canal system to be constructed. My hon. friend from Port Arthur would enjoy, through the Georgian Bay system, all the facilities that he would have if the system which he has so eloquently advocated to-night were built. I really would not like to embarrass the Government but I am sure that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) is now telling the Prime Minister that his department is already in possession of the reports, plans and surveys made in the past of the water ways along the proposed Georgian Bay Canal route; and that department is perfectly familiar with the matter.

Mr. McCURDY: A pretty good guess.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does the minister say that those reports are not in his possession?

Mr. McCURDY: I am not saying.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not think I am making a wrong guess.

Mr. KEEFER: Is the hon. member aware of the fact that the St. Lawrence route involves the construction of only about five locks from Prescott to Montreal; that out of these five, two are necessary to get into Lake St. Louis; and that when you get into Lake St. Louis there is only six feet—something like that, a small amount at any rate—of a rise by means of a lock to get into the Ottawa river? Therefore two-fifths of the St. Lawrence locks would form part of the Georgian Bay Canal system?

Mr. DEVLIN: How many locks are there at present?

Mr. KEEFER: There are twenty-five now. There are twenty-six on the Welland canal, and there would be seven on the new Welland canal, and five on the new St. Lawrence system.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am convinced that what would tend to the success of the Georgian Bay system would not only be the carrying power which it would give, but the development of electrical power which would result from it. My hon. friend from Port Arthur must admit that there is a greater electrical power to be developed on the Ottawa river than on the St. Lawrence. The fact must also be held in mind that at the present moment there is considerable data in existence dealing with the cost of construction of the Georgian Bay project, and other details. However, that is all I wish to say at this stage of the proceedings, because I have spoken so often on the subject of the Georgian Bay canal, that I prefer not to speak now at any greater length.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the very able presentation of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer). I have also listened with considerable interest to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, (Mr. Devlin) and I must frankly say that it afforded me very great and unusual pleasure to hear him say in the course of his remarks that he would not wish to embarrass the Government. Such political mellowness on the part of my hon. friend is so extremely unusual that it could not pass unnoticed. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on this new development of a kindly nature hitherto unsuspected on my part at least. I hope he will continue to develop along the same line and that he will exhibit in the days and years to come the same desire which he has expressed to-night, a desire not to embarrass the Government. Hitherto I have never seen the hon. gentleman manifest any such spirit. However,

> While the lamp holds out to burn
> The vilest sinner may return.

I do not wish to insinuate that the hon. gentleman is the vilest of sinners or even a sinner, but I do hope that he will continue along that line and not try to embarrass the Government.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. EDWARDS: Certainly.

Mr. DEVLIN: I merely wish to ask my hon. friend if I did not use the words "unduly embarrass the Government"?

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize most abjectly to the hon. gentleman for leaving out the word "unduly". It was certainly an oversight on my part, for I might have known that the hon. gentleman would have some qualifying word in regard to his attitude towards the Government. We are to assume by that qualification that he is prepared to carry on this work of embarrassment of the Government to the extent of his ability.

However, Mr. Speaker, it was not in reference to that feature that I wished to

speak. This matter of the canalization of the St. Lawrence river for vessels of the deepest draft is something which has long since passed the dream stage and has reached the point where men of the greatest ability, both in the United States and Canada, are giving the question most serious consideration. I have nothing to say in regard to the project for the Georgian Bay-Ottawa route. I can understand the position of my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin), representing the constituency that he does, in availing himself of this opportunity to make a little political capital for himself. Very well, there is no objection to that, I presume. And if he has that right, and honestly he will raise no question along that line, then I will claim the same right for myself, and, situated as I am down near the foot of deepwater navigation in the county of Frontenac, in which county the city of Kingston has the honour to occupy a little corner, I may say that we in that part of the country are very greatly interested in this project of making the St. Lawrence navigable for vessels of the deepest draft.

There may be very serious objections to this project. Unquestionably it will cost a large amount of money; so will the proposed Georgian Bay-Ottawa scheme. Is that any reason why we should not give it the most serious consideration? The resolution of the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a special committee consisting of hon. members should be appointed to consider and investigate the benefits to be derived from a deep waterway for transportation from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence river,—

The matter has been considered by able gentleman on both sides of the line—very seriously considered. Why, then, should it not be considered by hon. members of this House? I think the resolution is most proper and most opportune. You cannot throw this scheme to one side. Let a special committee be appointed, as the hon. gentleman asks, and let that committee investigate, seek evidence and so on. All the points which my hon. friend from Wright would seek to advance in favour of the route which appeals to him will of course come before that committee.

Mr. DEVLIN: Not for political reasons.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, perhaps not. But, still sticking to the notion which I expressed awhile ago, that my hon. friend would make use of such an opportunity for political purposes—

Mr. DEVLIN: But the county has been all divided.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well apart from political considerations, let us look at this matter from the standpoint of a great national enterprise.

Mr. DEVLIN: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why should my hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman object to this special committee? May I repeat, and I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me, that such a committee in considering evidence connected with the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence route would unquestionably have brought before it alternative reasons for the other route which my hon. friend favours. Surely he will agree with me there. The whole thing, it seems to me, is very advisable, because the object is to bring out the facts in connection with this route. If it has advantages over any other route, well and good, we want to know that. If in the opinion of the committee it turns out that some other route has advantages over this route, then I presume that my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) as well as myself would be the first to say "Very well, let us adopt that route."

Nature has so placed these Great Lakes that I believe it was intended that they should be utilized for the benefit of the people of this country. We have undertaken to utilize them to some extent, for we have a canal system, constructed perhaps in accordance with the needs of the country at the time it was undertaken. We have time and again acknowledged that that system was not sufficient for this growing country, and this House accepted that principle when it decided to enlarge the Welland canal. If you enlarge the Welland canal so as to permit the largest vessels to pass down lake Ontario, what follows as a matter of course? The largest vessels would load at Fort William, come down through the Welland canal and into Lake Ontario. Already Oswego is taking steps to look after all the grain which will come down from the head of the lakes by those big vessels, and they will try to get more than their share of that business. I want to avail myself of the opportunity to say that the time has arrived and long since passed when every dollar voted by this Parliament for the deepening of the Welland canal should be voted with the distinct understanding and the declared policy on the part of the Government that the Welland canal is only part of a larger

scheme, and that the deepening of that canal carries with it the providing of grain facilities at the foot of deepwater navigation, namely, Kingston. In my judgment the Government should announce as part of its policy harbour improvements at the city of Kingston, and the building of a Government elevator there for the handiing of the first cargo that passes down through the enlarged Welland canal, and that that should be brought forth not merely as a local matter but as part of a great scheme which has for its object the carrying at the cheapest possible rate of the grain of the West right through to the port of Montreal; and as the St. Lawrence is enlarged, and as I believe it will be in the course of time, the carrying of that grain straight across the Atlantic to the markets of Europe.

But apart from that and apart from the question of the development of hydro-electric power, surely we must all admit that we have arrived at a time in this country when we cannot throw to one side the development of the St. Lawrence river as a navigable channel for the largest vessels that are afloat. If we even consider that as a scheme which is possible—and in view of the attitude of every prominent men on the other side of the line as well as on this side, we cannot regard it as something which is not worth considering—then I give my support to this resolution, which asks for the appointment of a committee of this House to investigate and take evidence in regard to the matter. This, after all, is the Parliament which will be asked to vote the money to carry on any scheme of this kind. Surely the appointment of such a committee as is proposed, to consider this matter and to hear such evidence as may be brought before it, should meet with the approval of every hon. member of this House. Having regard to the fact that this matter has now passed what we may call the dreamland stage and is something that we should grapple with, I do submit that a committee of this House is a proper body to appoint for the taking of evidence and the gathering of all available information. I do not wish to be understood as knocking what I assume to be dear to the heart of my hon. friend, the Georgian Bay and Ottawa route. I have given considerable attention to the facts that were adduced in regard to that route, and I may say that I have been much impressed by them. But what I do want to see is this Dominion of Canada taking whatever steps are necessary to bring about the carrying of Canadian grain through Canadian channels to the point of export instead of its passing through—as sixty or seventy per cent of it has done in the past—American ports. That is what I want to see, and I believe this country is big enough and courageous enough to do what is necessary to bring that about. The time will come when it will be generally recognized that we should make use of this great waterway provided by nature. It was not put there simply to be looked at or as a place in the vicinity of which rich men could build their summer homes It was put there to be utilized for the benefit of humankind, and I want to see the people of Canada utilize it and get the benefit of it.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the House who live upon the Great Lakes, I should like to say a few words upon this question. In speaking to the subject dealt with by the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) I do not wish it to be thought by anybody that this is a proposal put forward by the head of the Lakes, including Port Arthur and Fort William. As a matter of fact the proposal, as my hon. friend pointed out, was originally put forward within the last year or two by committees on the American side, in conjunction with committees on the Canadian side, particularly committees from the neigbourhood of the constituency of my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Kennedy). It was at a meeting of that committee that this idea developed for the working out of some scheme whereby ocean freighters could enter the Great Lakes and make of the Great Lakes an American Mediterranean. Any one, Sir, who has read the fascinating stories of Parkman with regard to the original explorations about the shores of the Great Lakes must naturally be interested in such a question as this. When we remember that it was the men, those old French voyageurs particularly, who explored every mile of the Great Lakes, and down to the mouth of the Mississippi,—men like La Salle, Marquette, Joliet, Duluth, De la Verendrye, and those other great explorers who went from the mouth of the St. Lawrence and up through the Lakes, through what is proposed as the Georgian Bay route by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) and also through what is proposed as the southern route by the committee that has been discussing this question—when we

remember that, the matter is one of romantic interest to all of us.

With regard to the Georgian Bay Canal, I may point out to my hon. friend from Wright, who, naturally, by virtue of the fact that his constituency would be more interested in the building of that canal than in the carrying out of the southern route project, is a supporter of that scheme —that the parts of the Great Lakes west of the Sault are as much interested in the Georgian Bay canal as they would be in the carrying out of the southern or St. Lawrence route project. So far as Port Arthur and Fort William are concerned we would be just as much pleased up there to see the Georgian Bay route built as the southern route. But since the Government of Canada has undertaken to spend some seventy or eighty million of dollars upon the Welland canal, and since the great industrial part of Canada so far as Ontario is concerned is situated along the southern route, it appears that the most likely proposal to be gone on with is the southern route, and it appears also that that southern route would obtain a great deal more traffic than the northern route. The question of the building of the Georgian Bay canal has been discussed at the head of the lakes as far back as I can remember, and the construction of that route would be received with as great pleasure as the other. But the point is that opportunities come, perhaps, in one particular direction and we are ready for them as they come. So that with regard to this question I am supporting in a general way the project for the building of one of these canals.

10 p.m.

A point for my hon. friends in Quebec to remember is that Montreal is closer by about five hundred miles to London and Liverpool than New York is. That can hardly be believed until one looks at the map and observes the exact directions of traffic. Another point which is worth remembering is that the area of the Great Lakes and the industrial part of Ontario are not the only parts of the country interested in this project. It is stated by the American supporters of this scheme—and there are many more of them than there are Canadian supporters of it—that one-third of the population and one-third of the area of the United States are concerned in matters affecting the states bordering on the Great Lakes; and they go on to say that seventy per cent of the raw materials and foods produced in the United States are produced in the neighbourhood of the Great Lakes. That naturally makes the southern route of much more importance from the commercial standpoint than the Georgian Bay route. In the Georgian Bay route the ships would have to go up around Lake Nipissing, up around the Georgian bay, down lake Huron, and then make a circuitous trip in order to tap such parts of the Great Lakes as those around lake Ontario and lake Erie. It is worth while pointing out the amount of traffic which is going through the Soo canal much of which would be influenced or affected by the building of a southern route. In 1855, 106,000 tons passed through the Soo canal; in 1881, 2,000,000 tons; in 1891, 8,000,000; in 1901, 24,000,000 tons; in 1916, 70,000,000 tons. It is said that the amount of tonnage passing through the Soo canal is four times the amount which passes through the Suez canal.

Some hon. gentleman—either the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) or the member for Wright—remarks that ships have in the past taken advantage of this route to go up the Great Lakes. I well remember when I was a boy—and that was quite a few years ago now—seeing a Norwegian vessel which had travelled across the Atlantic ocean and which came through the Welland canal and unloaded a cargo at Fort William. True, it was a small vessel, but this goes to show that vessels have already made this trip. It is a fact also that during the war a number of small war vessels were built for the French Government at the head of the lakes.. Therefore, this route has already been navigated to a certain extent.

It is true that before the war $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 was looked upon as a vast amount of money to think of spending on transportation routes, such as railways or canals, or any other investment of that kind, but since Canada alone has spent in the war something like $2,000,000,000, perhaps a question of this kind will receive more kindly consideration and will not be looked upon with so much dread because of the fact that it might cost Canada $100,000,000 or $200,000,000. The fact that there are, as my hon. friend (Mr. Keefer) has pointed out, some 4,000,000 horsepower of potential electrical energy in the waterfalls of the St. Lawrence river must be considered. We can get some idea of what that means when we realize that in Canada there is said to be some 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 horsepower of potential electrical energy

of which only 2,000,000 horsepower has so far been developed.

My hon. friend also pointed out that there would be a saving in the cost of transportation of wheat. That means that on every bushel of wheat grown in the West which is exported—and that includes about 80 per cent of the wheat of the West—there would be a possible saving of from five to ten cents. My hon. friend read part of a speech delivered by Mr. Julius Barnes who is known to every hon. member who has had any dealings with the wheat question, and in that address Mr. Barnes pointed out that there might be a saving of ten cents a bushel. In other words, it would probably cost ten cents a bushel less to take wheat from Buffalo to Montreal than from Buffalo to New York. It might be worth while recalling that in the past 65 per cent of the wheat of the Canadian West has gone by Buffalo to New York, so that this canal would be the means of bringing that Canadian traffic back to Canadian channels again.

Whatever opposition has come to this proposition has come from New York and Buffalo, and without blaming them in any way for the stand they are taking, one must admit that their stand is taken from an entirely selfish point of view, just as I presume our standpoint may be regarded as a selfish one from the outlook of those Canadians who live on the shores of the Great lakes. But at the same time this is a matter which is of the utmost moment to those living not only on the shores of the Great lakes, but on the vast prairies of the West, not only of Canada, but of the United States. It has been stated by authorities that 80 per cent of the present ocean freighters could utilize these canals once they were built without these canals being made to a depth greater than 24 feet. In other words that means that only 20 per cent of the ocean freighters are so large that they could not use this route.

In closing these rather desultory remarks, I should like to point out the importance of the international aspect of this question. We cannot help remembering that for over 100 years the United States and Canada have been living side by side without a fort on either side of the international boundary line, without a gun pointing across the boundary, and this would be of the utmost importance as an example to the rest of the world how two great countries, the United States and Canada, can join together to build up such an important international project as this.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) this evening, and I think the members of this House are indebted to that hon. gentleman for the very clear and lucid exposition of facts that he gave us in connection with this project. To-day, there are agitating the minds of most of the thinking people of this country two great questions that are very closely allied, one being the question of transportation of all kinds and the other the question of freight rates. The recent increase that was granted in freight rates was granted, so I understood and so it was stated in the press, in order that the railway companies might operate without from month to month, having a deficit which they were threatened with on account of increased cost of operation. So far as I have been able to judge from the financial statements that have been published, I am not quite sure that the railway companies have benefited by the increases; but I know the increased freight rates have succeeded in stifling manufacture, in limiting production and in increasing the cost of the necesaries of life in every home in this land. Therefore, it seems to me that any project that has for its purpose the lowering of freight rates is one that should meet with the approval of the people generally, and the motion of the hon. gentleman this evening asking for consideration of this project by a special committee, is one that should be readily granted by this House.

The war has changed to a certain extent the alignment of trade. We in Canada hope to make this a great exporting nation, not only of natural, but of manufactured products, and if we are to take our products abroad, if we are to meet competition in the open markets of the world, surely one thing that we need more than almost anything else is all the assistance we can have in the way of low carrying charges. There are two elements that enter into the matter—the carrying of the raw material and the carrying of the finished products. Low freight rates will not only enable us to meet competition abroad, but mean that we shall be gainers as regards our domestic business. As has been said in this House this evening by one hon. gentleman in speaking of the probable cost of this project, it will

mean a large expenditure of public money. I am not insensible of the financial condition of this country to-day. I appreciate that this is a country with a population of approximately 9,000,000 people; that we have a net debt of over $2,300,000,000 and that it is asking everything that the people of this country can bear to meet the fixed charges upon that debt. I appreciate too that there is throughout this country to-day a demand on the part of the people that there shall be retrenchment in regard to the actual expense of carrying on government, and also that there shall be a cessation of borrowings in connection with capital charges. But there are capital charges and capital charges. It is one thing to incur an expenditure in connection with a massive pile of buildings that do not earn one dollar of income during the year, and that probably cause an increased expenditure in the way of maintenance and other charges in connection therewith, while it is quite another thing to spend money in developing a project such as that pointed out by the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer), one that will mean lower freight rates, cheaper carrying charges and, in addition to that, the development of electrical energy that, if the figures quoted to-night are correct, will mean that interest charges on the capital expended will be met from that source.

Those of us who live in municipalities that border on the Great Lakes or on their tributaries are keenly interested in this project. In the city of Windsor two years ago we had a meeting of the International Waterways Commission, and when the people of that city had the facts presented to them and an opportunity of considering the question as it was discussed at that convention, they were unanimous in their approval of this project. I believe that would apply equally well to the people throughout the Dominion; and if this Government will grant the committee that is asked for, so that the facts will be adduced, and considering, I believe, it will have the approval of the people in connection with such an outlay.

I rise also to-night for the reason that, with your permission, Sir, I desire to place on Hansard a telegram that I have received from the chairman of the Board of Commerce of our city. This telegram reads:

> The Border Chamber of Commerce unanimously and emphatically endorsed deepening of the St. Lawrence waterways and the development of the power consequent thereon, as advocated by Canadian Deep Waterways and Power Association organized at Windsor in November, 1919. We believe this to be greatest economic project of the age.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, lest any one should come to the conclusion that only those living at the head of the lakes or in the country immediately bordering on the lakes are interested in this particular question, I rise simply as one from the far West to give endorsement to the proposal introduced by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer). I may say that I certainly was not a supporter of this project until recently, not that I knew anything particular about it, but as my hon. friend from Port Arthur has said, a very large number of our people have been opposed to this project simply because they believed it would kill the Hudson Bay railway. Let me say as emphatically as I can that if I thought for one minute that this canal system was going to kill the Hudson Bay Railway project, or injure it in any way, I for one would not support this proposal, because for years, like thousands of others in Western Canada, I have been thoroughly convinced of the feasibility and practicability of the Hudson Bay route, and I am thoroughly satisfied that as soon as this Government can find the money to complete that project, and does so, it will be a success. But I have been led by the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) to look into this deep waterway scheme in the past year or two, because I have always found them men who took a keen interest in practical questions as opposed to academic or theoretical questions. A project that was practical always found their support, and they are the kind of men I like to associate myself with. So I looked into this scheme, and I have come to the conclusion that it has very substantial merit, and that the Canadian people ought to give it their very best attention.

What has surprised me most is the ease with which the scheme can be carried out? Had I been asked some time ago whether or not it was a difficult engineering problem, I think I would have answered, as thousands of other Canadians would, that it was too difficult altogether for the Canadian people to undertake, but when I find that there are only some 40 miles of canalization necessary, and that those who have investigated the project estimate that it would require only about $100,000,000, and that there is a drop only of some 220 feet, I say at once that it is not such a

tremendous project that the Canadian people need be afraid of it. Why, even the Welland canal comes almost up to it in magnitude. The Welland canal, I understand, is 25 miles long and has a drop of over 300 feet, so the project at present under discussion is not much greater than what we have already done. Such being the case, why need we be afraid of it? My own opinion is that if the St. Lawrence waterway had been wholly within the Dominion of Canada or wholly within the United States this project would long since have been carried to completion, but the difficulty is that it is an international waterway, and as a consequence a great deal of unnecessary delay has occurred.

Now, why should we support this scheme? My candid opinion is that it will be of such enormous benefit to the whole of Canada, and particularly Western Canada, in increasing production that we cannot afford to do without it. My hon. friend from Port Arthur has suggested to-night that if we had this deep waterway scheme we would save 5 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat we produced. We would make that much, if his figures are correct, for that is what it amounts to. In a case such as this, it is not the consumer who pays, because we must deliver our grain from Canada to Liverpool in competition with the grain with the rest of the world. Therefore, every cent that is added in the way of unnecessary cost of transportation must be borne by the farmers of Western Canada, and if you can reduce that cost you put just that much into the pants pockets, or into the treasury, which is the same thing, of our farmers. At present we are exporting anywhere from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels a year. That would mean a saving of from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 a year.

But does that state the whole case? Far from it. Even if a start were made on this project now, it would be from 3 to 5 years before it would be completed and if the progress of Western Canada continues at the same rate as in the past few years, we shall be producing in Western Canada before these canals are completed anywhere from 300,000,000 to 500,000,000 bushels for export. There is no question about that. Do not think for one minute that Western Canada has ceased to progress; do not think for one minute that we have stopped our development. We have no intention of doing anything of the kind. My candid opinion is that within twenty years Saskatchewan will be the most populous province in the Dominion. At any rate by the time the project is completed we will have at least 400,000,000 bushels a year for export, and what an enormous profit this project will mean,—not only in cash,—for at the present time a great deal of our very superior wheat goes to Buffalo, is transported from there to New York, and, I am sorry to say, my information is that very inferior wheat is mixed with it and the mixture is then sold on the British market. Somebody makes an enormous profit out of that transaction on the American side. If we could get our grain straight on to the British market, we would prevent anything of that kind. Our good Canadian wheat would get on to the British market as good Canadian grown wheat, and our people would get the full benefit of raising grain superior to any grown anywhere else on the continent of America. It is these reasons that have induced me to support this scheme and the Hudson Bay Railway, so that we can get away from this foreign interference with our wheat.

As has been stated, this project has been supported very strongly in the United States, and lately it has been receiving very great support in our part of the country. I have before me a list of sixteen states, each of which is contributing $10,000 a year, making a total of $160,000 for propaganda work in favour of this project. They are as follows: Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Missouri, and one other which I cannot recall at the moment. All these sixteen states are supporting the project, backed up by a large part of the population of Western Canada. We do not intend to allow selfish interests anywhere to interfere with our determination to develop our country in such a way as to give to our people the full value of everything they produce and for that reason I am satisfied that this project will be started some time, and the Government might just as well make up their minds to get into the procession and take the credit for having started it. I merely rose to give my support to this proposal, feeling that somebody from west of the Great Lakes should speak in support of it.

Mr. HENRI E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): The project which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) is one of great importance. I listened with great

interest to the speech of the hon. gentleman and I think that the proposal is certainly one that merits the attention of the House and of the country at large. If, however, I may be permitted to offer the hon. gentleman a suggestion, I think that he might add to his resolution that the Committee to be selected from among the members of this House be empowered to investigate the question of grain traffic by waterways and also by way of rail. There is no doubt that this project is one of great importance, and it was really a revelation, at least to some of the members of this House, to hear the hon. gentleman state, and confirm his assertion with official figures, that over two-thirds of the grain from the west of the Great Lakes was shipped by way of American seaports at a cost of from five to ten cents per bushel more than it would cost by water-way from the Lakes down to the St. Lawrence. I am sure that if an investigation were held in regard to the shipment of grain by rail from Toronto to the American seaports it would be found that a further additional cost, to say nothing of loss of time, could be obviated by shipping the grain by way of the Transcontinental direct from Winnipeg to Quebec. This would represent a great economy, if we take into consideration the great advantages that could be derived from this means of transportation.

It is not too much to say that the great national port of this country, Quebec, would, if some money were spent on it to provide proper equipment, be beneficial to the whole country. I do not think that I am pessimistic in saying that at present Quebec stands in need of improvement in this respect. I believe that if the port of Quebec were adequately equipped the bulk of navigation could be concentrated there and the accruing advantage would be great. If this committee that is to be appointed to investigate the proposal before the House undertook to study the needs of Quebec I am sure that it would decide to recommend to the Government that proper equipment be provided and that adequate steps be taken to take care of grain transportation from the West direct to Quebec. I principally desired to urge upon the hon. member for Port Arthur, that he add to his resolution a clause empowering the investigation by the committee of the question of grain transportation by rail.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): In a great movement such as this it is necessary first of all to have, in any country but especially in Canada, men of vision and optimism who constantly advocate their views and bring them before the people until their proposals become accomplished facts. In the old days of the '20's people regarded the Welland canal as something only to be hoped for, and it would not have materialized had it not been for the special efforts of William Hamilton Merritt and George Keefer. It is a significant and interesting fact that we have in this House now a descendant of George Keefer who is advocating as mover of this resolution, for the benefit of the country, an improvement of very much greater magnitude. Coming from the head of the Lakes he, along with my hon. friend, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), supports this proposal; and it is only proper that I, representing people at the foot of the Lakes, should also say that he will have on lake Ontario an almost unanimous assent to the project. Indeed, it has been so well thought over by the people of Toronto that they have anticipated the movement, and are not dismayed by engineering or financial obstacles. They have spent millions of dollars, and propose to send twenty million dollars and more, for the improvement of their own harbour by making it a thirty-foot harbour with dockage facilities for the ships which they hope and believe will eventually come from the ocean to increase the commerce between them and the old countries. It is true we do not expect so much benefit from what comes from the West; but if it is accomplished we shall have a harbour that will accommodate all the shipping that will come either way. Having spent this vast sum of money, with certain assistance from the Dominion, it is natural that we should desire in Toronto to see this work carried along. I know that in a matter of this sort there is always jealousy of water-borne traffic on the part of the railways. But I am convinced from what I have read on the subject that this jealousy is altogether unwarrantable. When water-borne traffic increases, the business of the railways increase at the same time. The one helps the other, and if it should turn out that there is any opposition or any coldness from the friends of the railways in regard to this scheme, I am sure that a consideration of the examples both in America and in England will dispel such opposition and show that it is unfounded in view of the facts of history.

When the Manchester Ship canal was constructed it took a great many years for the British parliament to put the project through, largely owing to the opposition of the railways. But Manchester was put upon the seas, so to speak; and yet it increased in railway traffic from Liverpool, and this vastly beyond the expectations of all concerned. The railway earnings were largely increased. The same thing will probably apply in this case. This is but a motion for a committee, and until we have that committee we cannot know where we stand. At any rate, the project is big enough and can be limited only by money and engineering consideration. We have been told on most excellent authority in the United States that this is by no means an insurmountable project financially, especially if by friendly arrangement we can be assisted by American capital. And from the engineering standpoint there is no great obstacle. It is true we are dismayed at present at the thought of spending money. But if, as my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) pointed out, the profit will eventually be very great, and if prominent engineers, whom we cannot ignore, are of the opinion that the scheme is practicable, we can proceed, call these engineers before the committee, get something definite as to what the cost will be and a sound opinion regarding its feasibility and for the first time place before the country the engineering and financial data.

I am also impressed with the importance of the scheme from the fact that it gives an immense increase in Hydro-electrical power. On the St. Lawrence rapids, where there is a fall of 92 feet, it is estimated that we can get as much power as we now get from Niagara, and as the country on the St. Lawrence is by no means at its hayday yet it will naturally become a thriving manufacturing centre by reason of the adjacency of this power. It has been estimated by a man of eminence in the engineering field that there can be collected from tolls for electric power in the St. Lawrence valley and adjacently at least $12,000,000 a year. That sum at five per cent would represent a capitalization of $240,000,000. I do not think the scheme could be put through for $100,000,000 as has been estimated—$300,000,000 would be a more likely figure. But if we could make it pay by developing hydraulic power through its medium and could raise an income as has been estimated, namely $12,000,000 we have almost the whole cost of the work financed already, and the rest would be easy enough. The whole thing is something that appeals to every patriotic man. Water borne traffic is absolutely necessary, as we all know, to a successful country. The canals of the older countries, both in Europe and in Great Britain, have proved of immense importance; and the improvement in the building of small ocean going vessels, constructed of steel leads us to believe that it is not a chimerical idea that we should have the Great Lakes tributary to the ocean, and would have indeed a waterway that could be used with facility by all ocean going vessels except those of the very largest type. If this is so we need not be dismayed about the expenditure initially of a large sum which we can readily see will return to us at no very distant date.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Naturally I would be in favour of anything that would make for the development of Canada. For that reason I believe I would be inclined to support the resolution of my hon. friend from Port Arthur if there were not a better project, entirely through Canadian territory, capable of more easy development. The Georgian Bay Canal, rather than the St. Lawrence deep waterways would develop Canadian territory entirely for the advantage of the Canadian people. On the other hand my hon. friend in speaking of the advantages that would accure to the country from the development that he proposes said, if I caught him aright, that it would be of great benefit to the cities of Buffalo, Clevland, Toledo, Detroit and Chicago. Now none of these cities are within the borders of Canada. A few years ago when hon. gentlemen on this side wanted a little closer trade relationship with the American people my hon. friends opposite would not have any truck or trade with them. Now they are willing to develop Canadian water courses and Canadian water powers for the benefit of Buffalo, Clevland, Toledo, Detroit and Chicago. I would very much rather, Mr. Speaker, see the Georgian Bay Canal developed, and build up such towns as North Bay, Mattawa, Pembroke, Campbell's Bay, Arnprior, Ottawa, and Hawkesbury. These are all Canadian towns that would be developed by the Georgian Bay project. That project would also develop a country that is rich in low grade minerals, rich in agricultural possibilities, just as rich in waterway possibilities as the St.

Lawrence route, and rich in timber resources. If the Georgian Bay Canal were constructed it would be entirely through Canadian territory, and would develop Canada to a very much larger extent than would be possible by aiding the St. Lawrence route. It is true that the latter enterprise would be of greater advantage to a portion of Ontario adjacent to the St. Lawrence; but it would not be of any particular advantage to the rest of the Dominion that would not be equally benefited by the Georgian Bay Canal. The latter project would be in the interest of the greater portion of the country, it would develop the interior of Canada, and would altogether be a very much better project than the deepening of the St. Lawrence. I have not much confidence in the possibility of the deepening of the St. Lawrence at the present time when we are called upon to vote $165,000,000 to bolster up our transportation system. Mr. Sanford Evans was engaged on a report of the Georgian Bay Canal route for some two or three years; but that gentleman's report never having been presented, it does not seem that the Government are very much interested in the development of the waterways of this country. Otherwise they would have at least made public Mr. Sanford Evans' report on the Georgian Bay Canal project. Furthermore I understand that private enterprise is willing to undertake the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal. I understand there is a company that is quite willing to undertake the construction of this work and make it possible to move grain from the great West, and move to inland points coal brought from the Eastern Provinces, at no cost whatever to the taxpayers of the Dominion. If that be the case I do not see the force of my hon. friend's argument in asking for a commission to spend more money investigating the St. Lawrence route, when the Government have already in their possession reports giving full details as to the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I have just one or two observations to make on the resolution before the House. I listened with interest to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) and to the rest of the discussion that has taken place. I listened particularly to my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) and if I gathered aright the sense of his observations he proposed to make the National Railway System pay by another vast expenditure of money to deepen our waterways. Well, that proposition may have some merit, but I have grave doubts about it. It does strike me, Sir, in connection with this whole matter that we should have a little regard to the financial position of the country at the present time. My hon. friend (Mr. Keefer) proposes to have a commission of inquiry that I presume will travel round the country and gather evidence wherever it can be gathered, sit during the recess of Parliament, and undoubtedly spend some money. I do not wish to be considered as opposing the principle of the scheme. I am among those who believe that this country would have been very much further ahead if we had spent a few of the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been expended on railways in providing this deep waterway. But we did not do so, and I do submit now that until we get our financial house in good order this is not the time to consider additional expenditures of public money on a large scale.

I am not so certain that the bringing of ocean-going vessels to the Head of the Lakes will achieve all that is expected or hoped for in the reduction of rates on grain to Europe. One very important factor which must be taken into consideration in any survey of the matter is the ocean rates from the Atlantic seaboard to Europe. It is a well established principle that ocean rates from America to Europe depend in a very considerably degree on the amount of goods that are carried from Europe to America. In other words, a vessel operating on the high seas must have a cargo both ways if it is to establish a fair rate one way. We also know that to-day a large amount of our western wheat is going out by United States Atlantic ports. The reason is simply this, that ocean-going vessels can get return cargoes from Europe to the Atlantic seaports of the United States while they cannot get them to our Canadian Atlantic ports, and that is due to the fact that the United States Atlantic ports are supplying a population of 106,000,000, while our Atlantic ports are supplying a population of only 8,000,000. For that reason exporters of grain, and I speak from knowledge, can always secure from Philadelphia, Newport News, New York or Boston much better ocean rates to Europe than can be secured from Canadian ports, which is a most important consideration to be kept in mind in a consideration of this whole question.

I would suggest that this resolution might well stand for a year and then possibly the scheme could be looked into in the manner suggested by my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer). I see very little to be gained in prosecuting an inquiry at considerable public expense while we have no possibility, as far as I can see, of finding the money necessary to carry on the proposed development. In a few years when our financial difficulties have cleared away and when we have put our financial house in order, we might be open to consider such a proposition; but in the meantime I would suggest that no very great harm will come if the proposal is allowed to stand over for another year.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer), not as a partisan either of the route proposed by him or of the route proposed by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) and the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill),—the Georgian Bay canal—because I at once confess that I am not in a position to say which of the two is the more advantageous. But as one who is interested in the whole question of transportation, I believe that the subject brought before the House by the hon. member for Port Arthur is deserving of very careful consideration.

I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that it is too early to begin an investigation of which is the proper route and what is the best method of relieving the country of some of the burdens it is carrying on account of the tremendous transportation charges that now obtain. As I view the situation, if Canada is to develop in competition with other countries—and she has tremendous latent resources awaiting development—it will only be by means of making transportation easier and cheaper, so that our resources may be transported from the interior of the country to the markets of the world at less cost than is possible at the present time. Transportation cost is to a very considerable extent strangling the whole progress of this country, and will continue to strangle it until we find means of cheapening the cost.

The question of the deficit on the Canadian National railways has been referred to. My judgment is that the development of our waterways will not injure our railways in the least, but rather that the increased prosperity resulting from that development will make it possible to so increase the freight traffic of those railways that their revenues will be more than sufficient to cover their operating costs.

A point that in my opinion cannot be emphasized too strongly is that by making it possible for ocean-going vessels to run from Nova Scotia ports, or from England if you will, to the very centre of Canada two results will be at once achieved. First it will put us in a much more independant position than we are in at present; and secondly, it will cheapen industry and make it possible as a consequence for Canada to get what she must always have, a supply of reasonably cheap coal. Then there is the question of electrical development that will accrue in connection with the deepening of our waterways. It is said that there is enough electrical energy going to waste on the St. Lawrence to operate every single line of railway in Ontario and save the tremendous quantity of coal that now has to be used for that purpose. The steady increase in the cost of fuel is one of the difficulties that our railways have to contend with. These two things would go hand in hand with either of the projects. As I said, I am not a partisan of either, and we should endeavour to find out accurately and beyond question which is the better scheme and go ahead with it. As has been pointed out, it will take time to get this under way, and if we start an investigation this year it will be one or two years before we are in a position to spend a dollar on which ever route may be chosen. I believe that the resolution is along the right lines and that the House should give it concurrence.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this resolution before it is finally disposed of. The transportation question is one of the most important for the future of Canada. This project has been before the country for some little time, having originated, I think, in connection with the development of the Northwest. The western provinces are, in my opinion, probably the most important factors in connection with our national development, and it is absolutely necessary that their development should be encouraged in the interests of the Dominion generally, and to ensure that development we must give them the cheapest transportation possible. It was considered in the interests of the West that we should enlarge the Welland canal, which resulted in

reducing the cost of transportation of the products of the great West to the seaboard by several cents per bushel. Later it was considered that if the St. Lawrence route also was developed the cost of transportation of the products of the West would be further decreased. The matter was brought to the attention of, and was considered by the Government, as it had been by previous governments. Later the question of the development of water-powers and of electrical energy was considered in that connection. I think it is in the interest of Canada that every possible chance of decreasing the cost of transportation, whether by the St. Lawrence route, the Georgian Bay route or the Hudson Bay route, should be considered and taken advantage of, if it is going to assist in the development of the great natural resources of Canada. When the matter was brought to the attention of this Government they took it up with the government of the United States. I would like to read a letter which was addressed to Mr. C. A. Magrath, Chairman of the International Joint Commission, as showing that the Government are alive to the situation and that they have already taken steps to ascertain exactly what the conditions are and what they would be if these routes were developed. The letter is dated at Ottawa, January 21, 1920, and is as follows:

C. A. MAGRATH, Esq.,
Chairman, Canadian Section,
International Joint Commission,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Governments of the United States of America and of the Dominion of Canada, under the provisions of Article IX of the Treaty of the 11th of January, 1909, between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, herewith refer certain questions, as set forth below involving the beneficial use of the waters of the St. Lawrence river, between Montreal and Lake Ontario, in the interests of both countries, and, in general, the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other, or to the inhabitants of the other along their common frontier.

It is desired that the said questions be made the basis of an investigation to be carried out by the International Joint Commission, to the end that the said Commission may submit a report to the two countries covering the subject matter of this reference, together with such conclusions and recommendations as may be considered pertinent in the premises.

Question 1.—What further improvement in the St. Lawrence River, between Montreal and Lake Ontario, is necessary to make the same navigable for deep draught vessels of either the lake or ocean-going type; what draught of water is recommended, and what is the estimated cost?

In answering this question the Commission is requested to consider:

(a) Navigation interests alone, whether by the construction of locks and dams in the river; by side canals with the necessary locks; or by a combination of the two.

(b) The combination of navigation and power interests to obtain the greatest beneficial use of the waters of the river.

Question 2.—Which of the schemes submitted by the Government or other engineers is preferred, and why?

Question 3.—Under what general method of procedure and in what general order shall the various physical and administrative features of the improvement be carried out?

Question 4.—Upon what basis shall the capital cost of the completed improvement be apportioned to each country?

Question 5.—Upon what basiis shall the costs of operation and maintenance be apportioned to each country?

Question 6.—What method of control is recommended for the operation of the improved waterway to secure its most beneficial use?

Question 7.—Will regulating Lake Ontario increase the low water flow in the St. Lawrence ship channel below Montréal? And if so, to what extent and at what additional cost?

Question 8.—To what extent will the improvement develop the resources, commerce and industry of each country?

Question 9.—What traffic, both incoming and outgoing, in kind and quantity, is likely to be carried upon the proposed route both at its inception and in the future? Consideration to be given not only to present conditions, but to probable changes therein resulting from the development of industrial activities due to availability of large quantities of hydraulic power?

Pending the receipt of plans, estimates, and other engineering data necessary for the final consideration of this reference, the Commission is requested to hold such public hearings as may be considered necessary or advisable in order to obtain all information bearing, directly or indirectly, on the physical, commercial and economic feasibility of the project as a whole.

To facilitate the preparation of the desired report each Government will, from its official engineering personnel appoint an engineer with full authority to confer with a similar officer of the other Government for the purpose: first, of acquiring, each in his own country, such data as may be found necessary to supplement the existing engineering data and surveys, and second, of preparing complete outline plans for and estimates of the cost of the proposed improvement, including the value of all property easements, damages and rights connected therewith. These plans and estimates are to be submitted to the Commission as soon as practicable but not later than one year from the date of appointment and the Commission is requested to forward to the two Governments its final report with recommendation not later than three months thereafter. A copy of the instructions furnished these engineers is attached hereto.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
N. W. ROWELL,
Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

So that over a year ago the Government took action in this matter. The United States government agreed, in accordance with the subject matter of this letter, to a reference of the whole question to the

International Joint Commission. That commission has held hearings in the United States and in Canada, and its report will be presented to each government in due course. The matter had to be brought before both governments because the St. Lawrence river is, in part, an international waterway and the consent of both governments would have to be obtained before we could proceed with any such development as is advocated in this resolution.

I know the St. Lawrence waterways route. There are at present twenty-six locks between the upper entrance of the river St. Lawrence and the city of Montreal. There is a fourteen foot draught for vessels passing through that waterway. If five dams were constructed we would have a waterway through which any vessel could pass that crosses the Atlantic and such vessels would be able to proceed to Port Arthur when the Welland canal is completed. In the construction of these five dams, at least two million horse-power would be developed. In my opinion, once the Welland canal is completed, it will be almost absolutely necessary that the St. Lawrence waterway should be proceeded with and, if financial conditions will allow, that it should be completed. I believe the development of the St. Lawrence waterway would decrease the cost of transportation by several cents per bushel on all grain produced in the western provinces, but I feel that the development of this waterway is also of very great importance to Ontario and part of Quebec as well, in another way.

Every year the people of Ontario, yes, and I may say part of Manitoba, are in fear and trembling on account of coal strikes taking place on the other side of the line, because, when strikes occur, it is almost impossible to secure coal. If we had the St. Lawrence waterway completed, we would be able to bring coal from Nova Scotia to that part of Quebec that is on the St. Lawrence river west of Montreal, also to Ontario up to Port Arthur and even as far as Winnipeg, thus saving a recurrence of the fear and trembling that we have had in the past on account of the possibility of a shortage of fuel during the winter months.

Some hon. gentlemen have referred to the Georgian Bay route, and while I do not wish to take issue with them in regard to that route, I wish to draw their attention to the fact, that vessels that would cross the Atlantic could not possibly make use of the Georgian Bay route. Vessels that would pass through the St. Lawrence canal and through the Welland canal and on to Port Arthur would be vessels of 12,000, 15,000 or 18,000 tons. The route along the Georgian Bay canal is narrow, and vessels of that type could not possibly go through that canal. There is no doubt that there would be a large development of waterpower if the Georgian Bay canal were proceeded with, but it would not take the place of our great St. Lawrence Canal route. Private parties, I believe, would build the five dams along the St. Lawrence river if we would give them the water-powers, but I am one of those who do not believe it is in the public interest to hand over our natural resources, such as two or three million horse-power to private parties to develop. They should be held in the public interest, but I mention that to show the House that the development of the great water-powers on the St. Lawrence would almost pay for the investment that would have to be made for carrying out this great project.

It has also been mentioned that a large proportion of our products goes via Buffalo, and there is no doubt about that. Up to the present time, each year a large percentage of the products of the great West goes via Buffalo. It should go via Montreal and our great St. Lawrence route, but it cannot go that way until we are able to compete with our transportation rates, and as long as the development of the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence route is delayed, just so long will the transshipment of grain via the St. Lawrence route be delayed.

An hon. member mentioned that this project was in the interest of Cleveland and other American ports, but that is not a fact, except in this way. Americans, at least in many of the Western States, are looking at this project in much the same way as people in Western Canada. If they can ship their products via Duluth and by the St. Lawrence route, and in that way get their products more cheaply to the European market, it is in their interest to urge their country to take part in developing this route which Americans are interested in on account of its being international.

Some hon. member has referred to the large amount that the development of our railways is costing the country, and there is no doubt that that is a very serious matter. I had not intended referring to it were it not that some hon. members mentioned it casually in the discussion this

evening. The cost of operation of railways, not only in Canada, but in the United States, has increased so tremendously in the last two or three years that, in my judgment, it is hindering or preventing the future development of our country, and unless some means are taken to decrease the cost of operation of our railways, the development of our country will continue to be hindered. The development of this country and the United States has been hindered by what is called the McAdoo award in fixing the wages of railway employees. Some action must be taken, and I think the railway employees themselves should look into this matter and endeavour to adjust matters in such a way that the future of this country will not be hindered on account of the enormous cost of operation of railways as is the case at the present time.

The Estimates that have been presented to the House to-day, perhaps, may not and cannot be understood until we are able to explain them to the House in detail, but the fact that the sum of $160,000,000 appears in the Estimates does not mean that there has been that loss in connection with the railways, or that it is estimated there will be that loss next year. What it really means is that it has been estimated by those who are in charge of the Canadian National railways, which include the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, that there will be a loss of some $50,000,000 during the year 1921. But in addition to that loss, large amounts are required for construction—betterments that are really charged to capital account—and in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific a large amount will have to be charged in connection with capital account. As regards the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which the Government must take over, the Government has to assume responsibility in connection with liabilities that are falling due. It must not, however, be considered that the amount mentioned in the Estimates means a deficit of that amount next year. There is no doubt that the Canadian National railways and the other Canadian railways are meeting with great losses; but the railways in the United States are meeting with proportionately much larger losses than our Canadian railways. I mention this in passing simply for the reason that one or two speakers who have touched upon it do not, I believe, understand the situation. Otherwise, they would not have given out the impression that the railways were losing the amounts mentioned in the Estimates.

I am myself very anxious that these great waterways should be developed, first, for navigation purposes. I believe in the development of this great waterway. I believe it would be worth the amount it would cost simply because of the development it would bring to the West from Port Arthur to British Columbia. In addition to that, I believe it would be of the greatest importance in developing the natural resources in Ontario and Quebec from Port Arthur east. I believe also it is one of the most important projects that could be undertaken for the protection of that part of the country from Manitoba east, so far as its coal and fuel supply for the future is concerned. There is the additional fact that it would develop some 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 horse power. This development would cheapen the cost of transportation on the railways between Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa. It would furnish power for a very large number of industries in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada, and would assist in the development of the natural resources of this province and Canada generally. It would mean the bringing of more people to Ontario and Canada. Population is what we want, and everything should be done towards that end. As Minister of Railways I have hesitated to urge proceeding with this work during the last two or three years, on account of the very great expenditures due to the war, and also on account of the large amounts that are required to complete at the very earliest possible date projects that have already been undertaken.

So far as this resolution is concerned I do not think it would be advisable to appoint a Special Committee while the present Waterways Commission is investigating this question.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. REID: But I believe it would be in the interests of Canada as a whole that hon. members of this House should have the opportunity of learning just what this waterway means towards the development of the West, of Central Canada, and of the country as a whole. Having already referred this matter to the International Joint Waterways Commission, I would suggest to the hon. member that if he can see his way clear to withdraw his resolution, I would undertake to have it brought before the committee of this House which has

already been constituted, consisting of some 30 or 35 members, and known as the Forest Waterways and Water Powers Committee, with a view to having the committee take whatever steps they think necessary to secure all available information on this project. In that way we would not be interfering with the Joint Waterways Commission, and probably before Parliament prorogues the committee would have before it the final report of the Waterways Commission, and would then be in a position to bring before the House all the facts in connection with the matter, and the question could be discussed here. I am sure that when the committee has received the report of the International Joint Waterways Commission, and has collected information on its own account, its decision and that of the House will be to proceed with the development of this great waterways system, not only for navigation but for power purposes, just as soon as the financial conditions of the country will permit.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): At the risk of being considered unprogressive in the promotion of this enterprise, I feel very much inclined to agree with the leader of the Progressive party. That is perhaps all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the original movement for the development of the great waterways was launched in the city of Kitchener, or Berlin as it was then, something like eight years ago. A meeting was held there of representatives from various municipalities throughout western Ontario to develop an organization that should promote the deepening of the waterways to permit of the bringing of ocean vessels up to the head of the lakes. The result of that meeting was that a deputation of something like 1,800 or 2,000 men waited upon the Government in the House of Commons Chamber in the old building about eight years ago; but nothing particular came of it. At that time I was in favour of the development that is suggested now, because I believed it would do a great deal of good. But that was before the war, before we had laid on this country a debt of nearly two-and-a-half billion dollars. I for one do not look lightly as one hon. member did to-night, on the expenditure of a mere bagatelle of $100,000,000 at this time and which would probably expand to twice this amount before completion. I think the country ought to set its financial house in order before it takes upon itself any such heavy financial obligations as are suggested at this particular time.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Just in passing I might refer to an argument made by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan), who stated that if he felt this development would interfere with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway he would be against it. Now, Sir, that is one of the reasons, if there were any, why I would be for it, for I believe, in regard to that particular enterprise, that this country has entered upon an expenditure which is almost entirely wasted and should not be continued. It has also been stated that the deepening of the waterway will decrease the cost of carrying wheat from the West. Probably it would do so; but I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that just to the extent to which the wheat is carried by waterway, the railways will find their business diminished. The result, I presume, would be that in order to get larger receipts and decrease the deficits on the railways we would continue again and again to increase the railway rates, and finally the latter would do a constantly lessening business and the deficit would accumulate from year to year owing to lack of traffic. I for one believe, Mr. Speaker, that the present deficit is, to some extent at least, the result of an increase in rates which makes it impossible to do business at a profit.

The Minister of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Reid) advanced another argument which is of considerable interest to those of us who come from Central Ontario where we have no coal. He believes that with the deepening of the waterways it would be possible to bring coal from the Maritime Provinces at a cheap rate and sell it in Ontario and also farther west. I think the argument is a good one; but accompanying it I believe there would have to be a stipulation that the coal of the Maritime Provinces be taken from the control of the two great corporations which have it in their possession at this time. And I for one, speaking in the light of the history of the development of resources in this country, do not believe for one moment that, even if the cost of carrying coal were greatly reduced, the general public would benefit a great deal from such reduction so long as these great and necessary natural resources remained entirely under the control of private interests.

Now, that is all I have to say. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to the project ultimately, but I do not think that the present is the time for entering upon the expenditure of another hundred

million dollars for this work. We should first find out where we stand, and it will be time enough to proceed with an undertaking of this nature when the Dominion of Canada has adjusted itself to the burden under which it is labouring to-day.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Coming from the far East, Mr. Speaker, and being as you know directly and indirectly interested in this discussion, I should like to say something on the motion before the Chair. But it is now getting late, and as I understand that there are other hon. gentlemen who desire to speak on the subject, with your permission I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednesday, March 9, 1921.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—PUNISHMENTS

Bill No. 18 (from the Senate) to Amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments.—Mr. Tweedie.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEAMSHIPS

Mr. DUFF:

1. What are the names of the steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine which entered at the port of Montreal since May 1918?

2. What are the names of the steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine on which work was performed by the Hall Engineering Co., of Montreal?

3. What is the total amount paid to the Hall Engineering Company for work on said steamers?

4. Was said work performed after tenders were asked for and contracts granted or was said firm allowed to charge their own rates?

5. What other engineering firms if any, made repairs and performed work on said steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and what amounts were paid each such firm?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. From Customs reports, the following Canadian Government Merchant Marine steamers entered at Montreal since May 1918: Canadian Adventurer, Canadian Aviator, Canadian Beaver, Canadian Carrier, Canadian Conqueror, Canadian Farmer, Canadian Gunner, Canadian Miller, Canadian Miner, Canadian Navigator, Canadian Observer, Canadian Otter, Canadian Pioneer, Canadian Planter, Canadian Raider, Canadian Rancher, Canadian Ranger, Canadian Recruit, Canadian Rover, Canadian Runner, Canadian Sailor, Canadian Sealer, Canadian Seigneur, Canadian Settler, Canadian Signaller, Canadian Sower, Canadian Spinner, Canadian Squatter, Canadian Trader, Canadian Trapper, Canadian Trooper, Canadian Victor, Canadian Volunteer, Canadian Voyageur, Canadian Warrior, Thos. J. Drummond, J. A. McKee.

2. Information in so far as work performed on Government steamers, no reports are filed at Ottawa as these are matters in connection with operation and under the Board of Management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine who are responsible for all matters in connection with operation.

3. See answer to No. 2.

4. See answer to No. 2.

5. See answer to No. 2.

EXPENDITURE FOR OIL DISCOVERY

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

What amount of money has been expended by the Dominion Government in discovery of oil: (a) In the Northwest Territories, (b) In the Province of Alberta.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, nil.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ST. AUGUSTIN STATION

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is the Government aware that no agent is in charge of the so-called Transcontinental station in the Parish of St. Augustin, in the County of Portneuf, and that the Government Railways are consequently losing an annual income of at least $15,000?

2. If so, why is not an agent appointed?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Canadian National Railways are operated by a Board of Management who appoint agents at stations approved of by Board of Railway Commissioners. No information as to any such loss of income.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS AND ENUMERATORS

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Did the Government authorize the Dominion Statistician to consult members of the House of Commons as to the mapping out of enumeration districts for census taking in their respective districts?

2. Does the Government propose to follow this action, if such action was authorized, by consulting members as to the persons to be appointed as commissioners and enumerators for the taking of the census in their respective districts?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. The Government will consider recommendations from members as to the officers in question.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the Government appointed a census commissioner for the Province of Quebec in connection with the census to be held in the current year?

2. If so, who is he and what is his salary?

3. Has a census director been selected and appointed for every County in the Province of Quebec?

4. When is the actual census work to begin?

5. What salaries will be paid to enumerators and their chief in each County?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Appointments have been made in nearly all the electoral disivisions.

4. The enumeration will begin on June 1, 1921.

5. No salaries will be paid; census work will be performed on a piece basis.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—LOCOMOTIVES

*M. DUFF:

1. How many locomotives have been built for the Government Railways by the Montreal Locomotive Company since 1917, and how many are under contract, or in course of construction by the said company, but not yet completed?

2. What has been or will be the total cost of all the said locomotives?

3. Were public tenders called for the building of the said locomotives? If not, why not?

4. Is the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a member of any board or committee connected with the Montreal Locomotive Company? If so, what are the duties or functions of such board or committee in relation to business done with the Government?

5. If not, when did the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries cease to be a member of such board or committee?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The management of Canadian National Railways advise 227 locomotives have been ordered since 1917 at a cost of $13,293,000. None under contract at present. Public tenders were called and contract awarded to lowest tenderer. Neither the management nor Government have any information as to who are directors or shareholders or parties interested in Montreal Locomotive Company. Their interest is to see that the lowest tender receives the contract for supplies for Canadian National Railways.

Information from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is that he is a director of said company, but not on any committee.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY STATION AGENTS

M. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that on the Quebec and Saguenay line there is no agent in charge at either St. Irenée, Les Eboulements or at Petite Rivière St. François and that owing to this deficiency the National Railways lost considerable revenue?

2. Why were the agents taken away from these stations?

3. Has the Government the intention of reinstalling them? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Canadian National Railways are operated by a Board of Management who appoint agents at stations approved of by the Board of Railway Commissioners. No information as to any such loss of income.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

BAIE ST. PAUL—LIQUOR SEIZURE

M. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that a seizure of liquor was made at the station of Baie St. Paul on the line of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway in the month of January last?

2. What is the name of the constable of the Canadian National Railway who was sent to hold an investigation in reference to the said seizure?

3. Has a report been made by the said officer?

4. If so, will the Government produce same?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

DUTY ON GERMAN IMPORTATIONS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Are German goods subjected to the same Customs regulations as other European goods coming into Canada?

2. If not, in what way is the duty upon them determined?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

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

COL. JOHN A. COOPER

Mr. PROULX:

1. What publicity services did Col. John A. Cooper render for Canada while in New York City?
2. What was his salary?
3. What were the operating expenses of his office?
4. Has he resigned? If so, for what reason?
5. Is Col. Cooper to be absorbed by any Government Department?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The Canadian Bureau of information in New York was established in 1919 for the specific purpose of securing greater publicity concerning Canada in the press of the United States. It was placed in charge of Col. John A. Cooper, who succeeded in effecting greatly improved arrangements with the various telegraphic news agencies for the regular and systematic dissemination through the press of information regarding Canadian affairs.

2. $5,000.

3. 17 July, 1919, to 31 March, 1920, $14,428.12; 1 April, 1920, to 28 February, 1921, $24,009.04.

4. Col. Cooper has intimated his intention to resign in order to attend to his private affairs.

5. No.

PERMANENT POSITIONS FOR RETURNED MEN

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

Has the Post Office Department taken advantage of the Civil Service Act passed on November 10th, 1919, as it applies to making returned men permanent who have given six months' satisfactory service? If not, why?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he must be mistaken in speaking of an Act passed on November 10th, 1919. There is not any such Act; the House was not sitting at that time. It has been suggested to me that the hon. gentleman's question may have reference to an Act which was passed in September of that year. If that is the Act to which he refers and the question is corrected accordingly, I would be glad to give the answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will direct the attention of the hon. member to the question and have him revise it.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Mr. VIEN:

When does the Government intend to lay before the House the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the statistics relating to the Canadian National lines?

Hon. Mr. REID: I may say to the hon. member that I am laying on the Table to-day the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals, and that the statistics relating to the Canadian National Railway lines will be brought down as soon as they are received.

GRAND TRUNK AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONTROL

Mr. VIEN:

1. Who has the control of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific at the present time?
2. In what way is this control exercised?
3. In what manner is the Board of Management elected?
4. What are the names of those belonging to it at the present time?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The control of the Grand Trunk Railway System is provided for under the provisions of Chapter 17 of 1919. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is in Receivership, the Minister of Railways and Canals being Receiver.

2. See answer to No. 1.

3. Two members of the Committee of management, Messrs. C. A. Hayes and S. J. Hungerford, were appointed by the Government as representing the Canadian National Railways; two others, Messrs. Frank Scott and W. D. Robb, were appointed by the Grand Trunk Railway. These selected the fifth member, Mr. Howard G. Kelley.

4. See answer to No. 3.

UNITED STATES DISCRIMINATORY TONNAGE DUES

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Has any notice been received by the Dominion Government from the Government of the United States indicating an intention to abrogate an existing treaty restricting the right of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on Canadian vessels?
2. If so, what action has been taken in the matter?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This enquiry, no doubt, has reference to the Merchant Marine Act of the United States, approved 5th June, 1920, which authorizes the President to denounce such commercial treaties as restrict the right

of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on foreign shipping. This the President refused to do.

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CHICOUTIMI CUSTOMS OFFICE

Mr. SAVARD:

1. How much has been collected at the Customs Office at Chicoutimi for the years 1918, 1919, 1920 respectively?

2. How many employees are there at the said office and what are their respective salaries?

3. Is this office directly responsible to Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. 1917-18, $103,087.61; 1918-19, $102,-534.51; 1919-20, $116,458.56.

2. Two. Alexander Blair, Sub-Collector $1,680; Jos. E. Demers, Customs Examining Officer $1,140.

3. No. Chicoutimi is under the survey of the Port of Quebec.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many Soldiers' Hospitals are there in Canada at present?

2. What is the number of patients in each hospital?

3. What staff does each hospital carry?

4. What is the total expenditure on these military hospitals?

5. Have any of the said hospitals been closed recently?

6. What is the number of soldier patients who have been transferred from military to general or civic hospitals throughout the country?

7. What staff is maintained at Ottawa for the inspection and general direction of these military hospitals?

8. What are the names and respective salaries of the members of said staff?

9. Have any efforts been made to save money by having soldier patients attended by local doctors?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How much was expended in construction of vessels by the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine up to December 31st, 1920?

2. How much was expended in repairs to said vessels up to the said time?

3. What was the total expenditure for all purposes to December 31st, 1920?

4. What were the gross receipts from operation to December 31st, 1920?

5. What were the net receipts from operation to December 31st, 1920?

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy of all letters, papers and other documents leading up to the passing of the Order in Council, dated the 6th day of September, 1919 (P. C. 1860), whereby authority was given (a) For the withdrawal from disposal, under the provisions of the Quartz Mining Regulations, of the available Sodium Chlorid (common salt) Rights in Township 88, Ranges 7 and 8, and Township 89, Ranges 8 and 9, west of the 4th, to admit of prospecting operations for the discovery of that mineral being conducted in the interests of the province of Alberta.

(b) For the withdrawal from disposal of the Gypsum Mining Rights under the said property.

TRANSLATION OF FRENCH SPEECHES

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchéres) moved:

Considering that the French language is official in the House of Commons.

Considering that a great number of speeches are delivered in French;

Considering that it is important that the members should be acquainted with all that is said in Parliament;

Considering that the majority of the English members do not understand French;

Considering that speeches delivered in French do not appear in English in Hansard, unless in the revised edition six or seven months hence, whilst the English speeches are translated in French the next day in Hansard;

Therefore this House is of the opinion that the speeches delivered in French should be immediately translated and published; that the Government should at once instruct the translators and the King's Printer to publish every Monday, during the session, a special sheet of Hansard containing the translation into English of all the speeches which have been delivered in French the preceding week.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution standing in my name is non-partisan and will, I am sure, appeal to all hon. members. A similar resolution was introduced by me on the 24th March last year with the same object in view, but probably not in as definite form in regard to the means to accomplish it. I am confident, Sir, that it would be unfair to state that some hon. members do not desire to know all that is said in the House. Nevertheless I am sorry to say that at least two-thirds of hon. members do not understand the French language, and therefore if the translation of the speeches delivered in French is not made a few days afterwards the English-speaking members will not have cognizance of those speeches until six or eight and sometimes ten months later, in the revised edition of the Debates.

Let me explain in a few words what I mean. The first day after speeches are delivered in this House they appear in the unrevised Hansard in their original text. Two or three days later there is a new publication of the unrevised Hansard wholly in French, and the speeches which were delivered in English are translated and published in this second edition, together with the speeches

which were delivered in French and which have already been published in the first edition. I submit, Sir, that that procedure is unfair to the English-speaking members who, I am sure, are anxious to know what their French-speaking colleagues have said; and it is also unfair to the French-speaking members who desire that their English-speaking colleagues should know what they have said. The object of my resolution is to remedy this state of affairs and have the translation of the French speeches published every Monday; that is, every Monday the speeches which have been delivered in French during the preceding week shall be published in English in a special pamphlet for the benefit of all hon. members.

Last session when I moved this resolution not a dissenting voice was heard; on the contrary, much sympathy was expressed with the object sought to be obtained. The leader of the Government at the time, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said on that occasion, and his words are to be found at page 700 of vol. 1 of last year's debates:

> I am entirely in sympathy with the idea that these speeches should be translated and at the disposal of members within a reasonable time; and if it be true that it runs to five, six or seven months before these translations appear, that is not a condition of things that ought to be continued. My sympathy, then, is entirely with the purpose of the motion.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) also expressed sympathy with the motion in the following words:

> This motion has been moved and seconded by two French-speaking members. As a matter of fact it is the English-speaking members who should desire the improvement that my hon. friend is asking for... But if we cannot all understand the French language and have the pleasure of listening to and enjoying the addresses of our French friends, the next best thing is that we shall as early as possible afterwards have those addresses translated into English.

The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) and the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and other hon. members also spoke in favour of the resolution and, as I said before, there was not a dissenting voice.

My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the time suggested that I should call a meeting of the Debates Committee and have the matter discussed. I did so, and the meeting was presided over by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). The matter was discussed, the Chief Translator, Mr. Léon Gérin, and other translators were present, and two suggestions were made. The first suggestion was that to the English unrevised Hansard published every Monday should be added a translation of the French speeches made during the preceding week. The second suggestion was that a special pamphlet should be published every Monday containing the translation of those French speeches. I wrote my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the time and had several interviews with him, and he continued to show his sympathy with my motion. On the last day of last session I called the attention of my right hon. friend to the matter and he again expressed his sympathy with my purpose in these words, which will be found at page 4588, vol. 5 of last year's debates:

> The sympathy that I expressed at the time my hon. friend introduced this matter still exists. I hope that before another session those of us who are spared to come back will have reached a reasonable and sensible solution of this question. Certainly I feel that in some sense an injury has been done to my English colleagues in that they have not had an opportunity to read the translations of the speeches of their French confrères.

Of course, I expected that during the recess I would receive a letter from my right hon. friend, but I understand he was away on very important duties. When he came back I wrote him under date of 28th January last, reminding him of his promise on the last day of the session and asking him to discuss the matter with the members of the Debates Committee in order that this improvement, as I may call it, should be put into effect this session. The Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote me a letter informing me that he would endeavour to have the matter settled at an early day.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Did the Debates Committee last year make a report after holding that meeting?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, I do not think they made a report, but I had a conversation with my right hon. friend and I think he promised me that he would confer with the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and also with Mr. Leon Gérin. I was disappointed to find, when I came back here at the beginning of the session, that no instructions had been given in the matter, and that is why I put this motion on the Order Paper. It is all very well to have the sympathy and encouragement of the minister, but these must be

coupled with practical results. My resolution is a very fair one, I submit; it seeks to accomplish a very useful object. I think I can say without boasting that the English-speaking members of this House would find very valuable and interesting information and suggestions in the translation of speeches made by French members. The object is definite; it is feasible; it is practicable. The session has now proceeded for nearly four weeks, and I would like to see action taken in this matter. I trust that the ministry will accept the resolution; at any rate, I wish to have the opinion of the House with regard to it, and I am confident that it will be favourable.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy only a moment or two of the time of the House in availing myself of this opportunity—an opportunity, which I regret to say, very seldom offers itself to me—of agreeing with hon. gentlemen opposite. I am in entire sympathy with the resolution proposed by the hon. member from Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Archambault). No reason occurs to my mind why this resolution should not be adopted and effect given to the proposal which it contains. Having said that, I do not know that it is necessary to argue the point further. I agree that we on this side of the House, and, for that matter, some hon. gentlemen opposite whose education has been neglected to a certain extent—I mean, those of us who are unable to understand the French language as it is so eloquently and beautifully spoken by hon. gentlemen opposite—feel that we are handicapped because of that lack of understanding. I certainly think that the hon. member voiced the opinion of every hon. gentleman in the House when he said that we would find in the speeches of those who chose to address the House in French very much valuable and instructive information. I shall have very great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. EMMANUEL d'ANJOU (Rimouski): (Translation.) I am glad in the first place to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) for the support that he gives to the resolution of my hon. friend, the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), and I am sure that every hon. member from the other side will follow his example, by unanimously passing this resolution, so ably presented to the House.

Last session, I had the honour to be the seconder of the motion which was presented by my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères. I wish to congratulate him because he has thought proper this year to bring it up once more to this chamber and it is with an equal pleasure that I heartily endorse it to-day. It is not necessary for me to argue at length, as the hon. member has explained the question very clearly. Therefore, my remarks will be very brief.

As it is stated in the motion, the French language is one of the official languages of Canada and, therefore of the Canadian Parliament. It is useless to argue this point, inasmuch as the fact is generally known and acknowledged. I do not see then any reason why this motion should not be passed, on the other hand, as the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères so pointedly said, it is more in the interest of the English speaking members that it is introduced. I may say, without boasting, that I am one of those who always spoke in French and I am glad of it. In 1918, when I sat for the first time in this House, I remember that, during the session, barely five or six speeches were delivered in French and I think that, for my part, I delivered three of them. During the session of 1920, if we take the Hansard it will be found that thirty-five or forty French speeches were delivered. We can see then that the idea made its way and that this resolution is well-timed.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères quoted a moment ago the English text of the remarks made last year on this subject by the right hon. Minister of Commerce, and I will now quote them in French:

> I am entirely in sympathy with the idea that these speeches should be translated and at the disposal of the members in a reasonable time; and if it be true that it runs to five, or six, or seven months before these translations appear, that is not a condition of things that ought to be continued. My sympathy then is entirely with the purpose of the motion, but this is a matter which pertains to the management of the translators and the publishing of the debates and is under the Debates Committee, composed of members of both sides of the House.

As it was said by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, nothing was done in that direction. We are now in the fourth week of the session and we do not hear that the Government has the intention to comply with my hon. friend's request.

I will not urge that point any longer, because I trust that the Government will agree this year to the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères. It is a question of justice as well as of courtesy toward hon. members of this House who do not know the French language. On the

other hand I have adopted as a line of conduct to speak in French in this House, and I would be pleased, when I take the floor, to be understood by all, because I do not fear to say what I think.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hope the House will unanimously agree to the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères. It will only be doing what is right for the French element of this country and, at the same time, it will help to tighten more firmly the bonds that should exist between the several groups which make up the Canadian nation.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer given by my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) last year to the representations made by the member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault), I had hoped that at this session arrangements would have been made to enable English-speaking members to read the speeches made by their confreres in the French language. It is only a matter, I understand, of working out the details. I am sure that every hon. member who does not understand the French language misses a great deal of pleasure and interest as well as education on account of not being able to follow the remarks made in the House from time to time by hon. gentlemen speaking in that language. I want to associate myself with those who ask that at the earliest moment arrangements be made for the translation of the French speeches into English. I differ with the mover of the resolution in only one respect: I would like to see the translation done from day to day instead of only once a week. If the translation is done only once a week there may be quite a number of speeches in French and some of them might not be read, whereas if we had them from day to day along with speeches of other hon. gentlemen delivered during the same debate or discussion, we should find it much more convenient. I have no desire to take up any more of the time of the House except to associate myself entirely and emphatically with the motion moved by my hon. friend.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Archambault) and the communications which he had with me, perhaps, make it necessary that I should occupy a very few moments by way of explanation. At the time my hon. friend brought his motion before the House, I expressed my entire sympathy with the object of his proposition, and he has detailed absolutely as they occurred the communications which have taken place. On the receipt of his last letter, I at once put myself into communication with the Chairman of the Debates Committee; but unfortunately he has been suffering from ill health, and he has not been able to be present or to attend to the work of that committee. I also had a conversation with the Speaker in reference to the matter, and we saw no particular difficulty in coming to an arrangement which would practically carry out the views held by my hon. friend. I am of the same opinion still, and the different wording which he has given and the more definite statement of his proposition seem to me to offer a solution which might very well be accepted. Personally, not only am I still in entire sympathy, but I would be quite willing to add a little boost to that sympathy on this particular motion.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the English-speaking members on this side deeply appreciate the hon. member's motion, the purpose of which is to enlighten them in regard to the French speeches in Hansard. He also, by a genial touch, disclosed the inability, which we must admit, of hon. members on this side to read or speak the French language. In these days of supposed strict economy, might I venture to suggest that the hon. member should to-morrow bring in a motion to do away with Hansard altogether. I do not know whether it would be acceptable to the House, but I believe it would be to the country. In that way a great economy would be effected; the work of the House would be expedited and we would not be sitting here so long.

Mr. BELAND: Make the motion yourself.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when I saw this motion on the Order Paper at the opening of the session, I endeavoured to get into touch with the Editor of Debates in order to ascertain what the effect would be were this motion to pass. His unfortunate illness and subsequent death prevented me from doing so. I asked for a memorandum from the Chief Translator, and though he asked to be consulted again on the subject so that he would have an opportunity of giving further and more reliable details, I gather from his memorandum that there is nothing insuperable in the way. While I would prefer that this motion should go to the Debates Committee, I do not think

the importance of further consideration is such as to justify deferring the matter at all. I am quite content that the motion should pass, with only this one proviso, that if it is considered more convenient to print the translations on Monday morning as part of Hansard, that method may be adopted instead of the special sheets.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) on having again brought this motion to the attention of the House, and on having brought it forward in such a manner as to secure the unanimous endorsation of hon. members. In connection with the subject to which the motion refers, I was reminded, while the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was speaking, of two remarkable instances in connection with members in this chamber. The first that I was reminded of refers to the case of a Mr. Gigault who, many years ago, I think between 1882 and 1887, occupied a seat in this House. In those days, my participation in the work of Parliament was from the gallery of the House in which I was, perhaps, at that time the most frequent attender. The gentleman to whom I refer came to Parliament and in the first session was unable to speak a word of English; but by continuous application and close study, that gentleman, in the last session of that Parliament, delivered in English an address which, in cogency of argument and in felicity of phrase, equalled the speech of any English-speaking man who then occupied a seat in the House. That was a remarkable performance. I understand that the gentleman to whom I refer was the representative of Rouville. In this Parliament and in our own day, indeed, in very recent days, we have seen that achievement duplicated the other way around in the case of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Although still quite a young man, I remember the right hon. gentleman's advent to this chamber; I was in the gallery when he entered the House, and I heard him make his first speech here. I have been a fairly close student of his political career since then, not always agreeing with it, but always maintaining a very great respect and esteem for the right hon. gentleman's capacity and ability. While there are in that right hon. gentleman's career some things to which, of course, as a political opponent, I am bound to take exception, I want to pay this tribute to him to-day, that of all the things that stand to his credit, there is none which equals his mastery of the French language within the last few years. For that reason, as well as for the cordial way in which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and other hon. gentlemen opposite have received the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, (Mr. Archambault) I think the House and the country are to be congratulated upon this brief discussion this afternoon, and the Government also upon their hearty aceptance of the principle embodied in the motion.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise, not so much to support the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), as to agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Copp). Very few speeches are delivered in French nowadays, and I see no reason why they should not be translated and in our hands the next morning; I do not see the necessity of carrying the translation over for a week. Many issues which are discussed on the floor of this House are past and ancient history in a week and the speeches have passed into oblivion by that time. I agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland that these French speeches should be translated each day and form part of Hansard the next morning.

Motion agreed to.

THE CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (South Ontario) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it would not be in the interests of Canada should the Government of Great Britain remove the embargo upon cattle going into the United Kingdom.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in asking the indulgence of the House for a very short time while I speak to this resolution, I should like it to be distinctly understood, first of all, that I am speaking for no party and no particular body of men. This embargo question is one that has engaged the attention of succeeding administrations in this country during the last 30 years. Before the embargo was placed upon Canadian cattle entering Great Britain, all kinds of fat and store cattle could be landed there, and that may have been advantageous to some extent to the Canadian people; but when the embargo was placed upon our Canadian cattle it was felt that a stigma had been laid upon them, because it had been generally ad-

mitted that our herds were free from all contagious diseases. So much did I feel that to be the case, that some years ago when I had the honour of a seat in this House I moved a resolution to the effect that the Canadian Government should ask the British Government to send one or more of their most eminent veterinarians to Canada, to go from coast to coast and inspect our herds wherever they thought inspection advisable. I thought this should be done. However, my resolution was side-tracked in one of the ways in which this can be done, just as this resolution may also be side-tracked; but I accomplished my purpose in introducing the resolution.

The embargo that was imposed by Great Britain included cattle from all other countries as well as Canada, and it is now held that it was put on for the purpose of satisfying particularly the Irish people. In passing, I might say that in the year 1920 Ireland sent 924,000 cattle across the channel to England, at a value of £30,000,000, so you can imagine what that trade meant to Ireland. Call it protection, or what you will, it makes but very little difference. Efforts were made from time to time by different Canadian governments to have the embargo removed, but all their efforts failed. During the last few weeks representations have been made to the British Government by private individuals who are taking the matter in their own hands and dictating, as it were, to the British Government what they should do in a matter of purely domestic concern. Whether they will succeed or not I cannot say, but I do feel that if they succeed they will make one of the greatest possible mistakes so far as Canada is concerned. To-day we can send cattle across the sea. They are landed in Great Britain and have to be slaughtered within ten days of their arrival. It therefore follows that only a finished animal can be sent because you would not want an unfinished or store animal to be slaughtered. I admit that if the embargo were removed no harm really should take place, but from our experience in the past, and from my own observation not only in Canada but in the Mother Land, I have come to the conclusion that if the embargo were removed we would do in the future what we did in the past, that is, we would send not only our finished cattle across, but also unfinished or store cattle.

Now, my contention is this: We should feed and slaughter our own cattle. The Government should build an abattoir at Halifax, which is twenty-four hours nearer Great Britain than any other Canadian port, and is open all the year round. Our cattle could be slaughtered there, and the meat should be chilled, not frozen, and sent across. If you ship across the water a 1,000-pound animal, you are sending across 460 pounds of waste matter, which is not worth a great deal, and which could be manufactured into something just as well in Canada as in the Old Country. Our cattle would then be fed in Canada; it would be our grass, our corn, our grain, and our labour. I noticed the other day that even labour has been petitioning for the removal of the embargo. Now, if any one can tell me how labour will be benefited in the slightest degree by the removal of the embargo, they can tell me something I do not know. Why, the people of Deptford in the south of England are petitioning the British Government to establish a slaughter station there. They formerly employed 1,500 men. Now, why not have these 1,500 men in Canada instead of across the seas?

The removal of the embargo might lead to other difficulties. Disease might break out amongst the cattle on their way across to England. Then we might have difficulty with our American friends. If the embargo were removed against Canadian cattle and not against American cattle, there would undoubtedly be a certain amount of irritation, and probably many of their cattle would come through Canada to be shipped across the sea. That would cause trouble, because their cattle are not altogether free from disease.

I have no doubt that some hon. gentlemen who will speak to this resolution will talk a good deal about sentiment, about our having sent our men across the sea, and their having fought and bled and died for the British Empire; but I want it distinctly understood in that connection that when our bushel basket was overflowing with sentiment, there was a whole lot of selfishness mixed with it. I do not propose to follow that thought any further, but I could if necessary.

In connection with this whole matter I believe that it would be in the interests of Canada to produce, feed and slaughter within her own borders all the cattle that we can. I have arrived at this conclusion after a fairly long life upon the farm and a great deal of experience with live stock. I have seen how it has worked in the Mother Land, and I have seen its workings here. The

Minister of Agriculture in the Ontario Government stated the other day that he had convinced a very prominent man in Scotland that the embargo should be removed. I have talked more hours with Mr. Montgomery than this gentleman ever talked minutes with him, and I know that he has not persuaded Mr. Montgomery that it would be in the best interests of the Old Country that the embargo should be removed.

One word more, and then I will leave this matter in the hands of the House. It is just possible that I may not have the sympathy of the Government, the sympathy of the House, or the sympathy of the country at my back, but notwithstanding that, I am convinced from my own observation and experience that my resolution is in the right direction.

Mr. WILLIAM H. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) has brought this question before the House. He is a man who has had a great deal of experience in the live stock business and knows stock conditions on both sides of the Atlantic. His opinions are therefore of considerable weight. From personal experience I cannot say what advantages might accrue to this country if the embargo on cattle were raised. Although I have been interested in a small way in the raising of stock during a large part of my life, I have never been a shipper or importer of cattle, but I take it from the large stock growers, particularly of Western Canada, who have both exported and imported stock, that their anxiety to have the embargo removed must be attributable to some definite advantages which they foresee. The raising of the embargo is a thing with which this Parliament or this Government has little to do, and it is very doubtful whether we shall ever succeed in that direction. The alternate proposition of my hon. friend I heartily agree with, and that is to establish cold storages and abattoirs on this side of the water to enable us to send our dead meat over.

The first year I came to this House, in 1908, I placed a resolution on the order paper, and, like that which my hon. friend has mentioned, it got side-tracked in some way, not however before it had been discussed to some extent. I remember that both sides of the House agreed with me, and the strongest advocate of cold storage at that time was the right hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen).

There is one thing that is beyond dispute, and that is that, whether by embargo or by the establishment of cold storage throughout this country, something must be done to carry on the live stock business of the western plains. If our market were closed to the United States there would be no future whatever for this industry, and we know that there are still large areas of grazing land that might be used for the purposes of cattle raising. The Government has made an attempt to stimulate the industry and enhance production, and unless we have some assurance that we are to have outside markets for our cattle very few men will remain in the business for any length of time.

When you reflect that the same grade of cattle that were selling in 1919 as high as twelve and fourteen cents as now sold in the western yards at between five and seven cents, you can see that the business is not in a very healthy condition. The slump in grain prices was large but the slump in prices of cattle was unexpected, and after the experience of the bad winter the year before last many stockmen were thrown out of business. Indeed, I believe that the number of those engaged in the business has declined some 50 per cent in the last year as compared with what it was during the past three or four years. With my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Smith), I say emphatically that something must be done. The removal of the embargo would be highly beneficial and the stockmen of the country seem to think that it would be advantageous. But whether or not the removal of the embargo would be the means of keeping up our industry in Canada, the one thing that I heartily agree with is that some steps should be taken to establish on this side of the water a system of cold storage and abattoirs so that if we were forced out of the American market and could get no relief from the embargo being removed, we should still have a way of handling our stock in this country.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): I do not favour the resolution on the Order Paper. This matter has been the subject of discussion for the last two or three weeks in the Provincial Legislature of Alberta because a candidate was defeated on this question in an election recently held in England, and it is a sore point with every cattleman in Western Canada. I do not know by what method of reasoning my hon. friend arrives at the conclusion that it is necessary for England to

put a stigma on our cattle in order to develop the industry in Canada. I am not going to take any issue with the mover of the resolution (Mr. Smith) as to the method of increasing our trade in Canada and improving our labour conditions. He may be right on that point or he may be wrong. But there is one thing that the Canadian people in Western Canada will not stand, and that is an indirect method of adopting protection in England without a tariff, by placing a mark of inferiority on our cattle which they do not deserve. I sincerely hope that if the resolution is adopted it will be only after considerable protest on the part of hon. members. I will not go into any lengthy discussion of this matter, because the press has been full of the subject for the last two or three weeks, dealing with it from a provincial as well as a Federal point of view. But I wish to take my stand against the resolution and to say that I differ from the hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. White) who supports it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Like my hon. friend from Victoria, Alta. (Mr. White) I have the highest appreciation of what the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) has done for the live stock industry of this country, and I am sure that every member of this House who has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the record of my hon. friend on this subject will listen with the greatest respect to any views which he advances at any time upon the live stock industry of this country. I go this distance, at any rate, in sympathy with my hon. friend's resolution and in opposition, I think, to the spirit of the remarks of the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie), that I have no sympathy whatsoever with the attempts to get Canadian cattle into Britain by means of the crowbar. I observe there are politicians over in Britain who tell the British people how they should conduct their business. Well, the attempts of these gentlemen remind me of the fact that a distinguished British statesman was sitting forty years ago at a dinner table in London next to a distinguished European diplomatist who was loud-mouthed in his criticisms of Mr. Gladstone's Government of that date because he could not keep order in Ireland. The British statesman said that he refrained from pointing out to this diplomatist that he would be in a better position to criticise the inability of Mr. Gladstone's Government to keep order in Ireland if his own Government could keep order in its capital. The friend to whom he spoke asked him why he had refrained from so stating. He replied: "Because I have learned the truth of Chamfort's saying, that in this world we have often to be instructed upon many things by people who know nothing about them." I am opposed to the method of the crowbar because I believe in the golden rule. I believe in doing to others as I would be done by, and I know nothing in this world that would create a greater storm in Canada than if any British statesman were to come here and insist that we should have a free market for Lancashire cottons because they were better than Canadian cottons. I have not imagination enough to conceive of the storm that would be created. Of course there is a reason for that. While we, who have lived any time in the world, know that all men are equal, we have also learned that as a rule, especially to-day, youngsters know a great deal more than their fathers. While I have a great respect for the knowledge of Canadians, and I have great respect for their knowledge of their own business I do think that we ought to extend an equal respect to the British people in regard to their business.

I want to endorse what has fallen from my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. White), and to carry his remarks a little further. He said we have very little to do with what the British people take into Britain. I should say that we have nothing to do with it; and I support my view upon that by reminding this House that we would not for one moment stand for British statesmen interfering to-day with any tariff we liked to put on goods here. However, I have to differ from my hon. friend in regard to his resolution to this extent—that I think under freedom we should get a great many of the advantages that he dilates upon very wisely and very truly. I think the more of our cattle we finish at home the better it will be for the live stock industry; but if we have a free entry into Britain for our cattle we should not be compelled to sell them there—we should have perfect freedom in the matter. After all it is rather an abstract question to discuss. We could send cattle alive or we could send the meat frozen, or in any shape that it pleased us to send it and the people with whom we were dealing to receive it. Under freedom we should have all the advantages that my hon. friend points out; we could sell just as we wanted to do.

I do not know whether the House would bear with me if I offered to tell them how they could sell more beef in Britain. They could sell more beef in Britain if they bought more cotton and woollen goods there. It is very elementary—and here I am talking about what pertains to Canadian rights, Canadian opinions, and Canadian business. If, as my hon. friend from Victoria asserts, we need more markets for our agricultural produce, and I certainly agree with him, if such a market is to be found in Britain, there is one way to get it: We must give some inducement for the ships to come to Canada and carry produce over, and ships do not carry loads one way in this world if they can carry them two ways. Now, as a matter of fact, at the present moment Manchurian wheat, Argentine wheat, Australian wheat, is beating Manitoba wheat out of the markets in Britain by its cheapness. That is a matter of fact at the present moment. What is the consequence? That British ships are going to Manchuria, going to Australia, going to the Argentine—especially to the Argentine where the tariffs are extremely low against British goods—and they are carrying wheat from all these places. If we want to compete with these countries in the matter of wheat then the lesson is obvious—bring the ships to our coasts. The same thing applies to cattle.

I consider this Government had a magnificent opportunity at the end of the war if they had had the courage and initiative —a magnificent opportunity. We are very much the nearest of the outlying portions of the Empire to Britain. During the war immense sympathy was created between Britain and this country. Not only was sympathy created, but we had a ferry boat service established between this country and the Old Country by the exigencies of the war. Reduced to economic considerations why was that ferry boat service established? Because we had the markets for our goods: not only Britain but the other nations of Europe had to have our goods. Thank God, the exigencies of the war disappeared, but the exigencies of economics remain with us; and the thought I want to leave with my hon. friend and with the House is, that if we want markets we must give them. If we want to get our cattle into Britain we must reduce our tariff against British goods and bring the ships to our shores. I say there was a magnificent opportunity because of the sympathy that had been created between this country and the Old Country, and because of our nearness to the Old Country. If we had had a government of initiative and courage at the end of the war they would have seen the state of affairs coming to which I have referred. They would have seen the wheat produced in other countries beating our western wheat, they would have seen the cattle from Australia and from the Argentine beating our cattle—because there is a large amount of cattle being taken from both of these countries to Britain, three and four times the distance that Canada is from the Old Country—and they would have reduced the tariff and kept up some portion at least of what I have ventured to describe as "the ferry boat service" that was established during the war.

I regret extremely on personal grounds that if my hon. friend takes this resolution to a vote I cannot vote with him. I see much force in many of the things that he said but he would hardly expect me. While I agree with him that we have nothing to do with telling Great Britain what she should do, he would hardly expect me as a free trader to do anything to persuade Britain to keep up obstacles against trade in any shape or form whatsoever. For these reasons if my hon. friend takes his resolution to a vote I am afraid I shall have to vote against it and, I repeat, I shall do so, on personal grounds, with very much regret.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): The Order Paper would indicate that the resolution now before the House is one that is commanding the attention of quite a number of hon. members. The present resolution is followed on the Order Paper by another motion from an hon. member who holds entirely opposite views to those advocated by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith). I doubt if there is in the Dominion a man who can speak with greater knowledge of the subject than the mover of the resolution we are now discussing. He has been identified with the live stock interests of Canada for many years. He has occupied a very prominent place among the live stock breeders of this country, and I am inclined to attach considerable importance to the views which he holds with regard to this question which is apparently exercising the minds of a great number of people to a marked degree at the present time.

I have a very distinct recollection of the coming into effect of the embargo against Canadian cattle. At that time my special interest in farming was in finishing

beef cattle for the British market, and I have since been engaged in that business to a greater or less extent almost continuously. I have a very vivid recollection of the predictions that were made when the embargo was placed against our cattle, and I have followed the discussion very closely from that time down to the present. In November of 1892, when some suspected cases of pleuro-pneumonia were discovered in a shipment of cattle from Toronto, the embargo was placed against Canadian cattle. It was in effect previous to that time against cattle from the United States from the year 1879. I have a recollection of a motion moved by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) in 1905 advocating the bringing to this country of British experts with a view to having them ascertain whether there was any disease among our cattle or not. There is no contention on the part of the British authorities to-day that this embargo is being maintained against our cattle by reason of disease; they freely admit that it is a system of protection in favour of those engaged in the cattle industry in the Old Land. Notwithstanding the address this afternoon by that ardent free trader from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) on his old hobby, I think he can find examples in Great Britain of protection that ought to be a lesson to a younger country like Canada, and it seems to me that we might very well copy some of the policies pursued by the British Government.

As far as I am concerned I do not presume to advise the people of Great Britain what they should do in this matter. For many years I felt very sore to think that while our cattle were free from disease the embargo was still maintained against us, but after having heard such an ardent free trader as the hon. member for Red Deer get up in this House a few years ago and take an entirely opposite view to the one that he would like us to believe that he is in favour of to-day, I have not felt quite so sore. I have reference to the debate on the Naval question, which I am using just to illustrate the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman. His argument then was to manufacture the finished product (Battleships) in our own country in order to employ Canadian labour and have the money spent in producing the finished article spent in Canada. I do not wish to get away from the subject before the House, but I do desire to point out that there are two sides to this question, and that we had better make the best of what we now believe is the established policy in Great Britain in regard to the cattle embargo.

I am sorry to think that during the last few months an effort has been made in certain quarters to make this a political issue. Only to-day I notice prominently featured on the front pages of the Ottawa press references to the Ontario Minister of Agriculture who is now in London, and I am going to quote some of the newspaper articles which have appeared during the last few days. It is only about two weeks ago that the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario, Hon. Peter Smith, delivered an address in the town of St. Marys. I quote from the report of that meeting given in the daily press:

> St. Mary's, Feb., 20.—Hon. Peter Smith, in his address at the opening of the new U.F.O. Club room here Saturday afternoon, touched briefly on the Drury-Morrison controversy, declaring it was an unfortunate affair.

Excuse me, I have started reading in the wrong place. This is the part to which I wished to call attention. The speaker referred to is Hon. Peter Smith:

> The speaker mentioned the amount of tuberculosis in cattle, saying that it had been necessary to kill 84 out of 85 head at Monteith.
>
> To Hon. Manning Doherty, he said, will go the whole credit if the embargo on cattle is lifted by Great Britain which is likely to be the case.

A herd of cattle on a Government farm managed by the provincial authorities of Ontario diseased to the extent of 84 out of 85! This would not indicate that our bill of health is so clean as some people imagine. I also notice the following in the Ottawa press of February 23rd:

> The resolution moved in the Quebec Legislature by the Hon. J. E. Caron, Minister of Agriculture, and seconded by Premier Taschereau, is as follows:
>
> "This House, after obtaining knowledge of the facts of the embargo against Canadian cattle, believes that this embargo is not justified and regrets that it is maintained. Mr. Caron speaking on the question, said, in part: I do not like the policy of the British authorities. It is a strange stand they take on this embargo question. They claim that Great Britain is the country of free trade in commerce. That does not exist for us, but does exist in large degree for the United States. We have helped England and made so many sacrifices that I believe that Great Britain should consider us at least as favorably as the United States."

As a matter of fact this embargo does not rest against Canadian cattle any more than it does against cattle from the United States or any other country, it applies to all countries. In November, 1902, regulations were put in effect by the British Board of Agriculture to prevent cattle from Canada coming into that country, and in

1894 the British statuts with regard to cattle embargoes were consolidated. In 1895 the provision by which the Board of Agriculture might exempt cattle coming from any country was cancelled and the embargo was embodied in a statute. In that statute Canada was not mentioned specifically; the embargo is applicable to all countries.

Now, why were the British authorities so anxious to keep cattle disease out of their country? It is not necessary to say that the British people are pretty shrewd and well able to take care of their own interests. Stock breeders from all parts of the world look to Great Britain to secure stock of high quality to improve their herds and flocks. Previous to the imposition of the embargo disease had for years decimated the British herds to such a degree that the authorities were amply justified in adopting protective measures. It is now admitted by those authorities that they cannot afford to remove this embargo. Those who are engaged in the livestock industry in Great Britain, and who are bringing tremendous revenues to their country by reason of their sales of livestock, do not feel that their interests ought to be jeopardized by permitting importations of livestock from outlying parts of the world. The hon. member for South Ontario has pointed out what the result is in respect to Ireland alone. The same might be said in respect to Scotland. The farmers in Great Britain have benefited immensely by reason of the embargo. I do not know, but possibly on account of the unsettled conditions that prevail in Great Britain, particularly in labour circles, the British Government may be forced to change their policy on this subject. I think myself that it is very unfortunate that we should endeavour to stir up any further labour troubles in Great Britain, because we all know they have enough to contend with in any event. But I notice in the Ottawa papers this morning the following:

> Hon. Manning H. Doherty, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, had a star place among the speakers and made special reference to London newspaper attacks on him in regard to his attitude on the embargo....
>
> Mr. Doherty proceeded to prove that Canada possessed a clear bill of health from thirty years of official records and denied the charge of disease as one of the most unmitigated falsehoods ever promulgated. The same was true of the assertion that those who believed in the agitation would make money by the removal of the embargo. Not one of them would make a dollar, he said.
>
> Mr. Doherty readily admitted that the matter was one for negotiation between Great Britain and the Federal authorities.

Evidently he recognizes that he has no authority to go over there and deal with the British Government or any one acting on behalf of the British Government. He is simply there in the capacity of a private individual, evidently trying to stir up trouble in labour circles in Great Britain. I think it is rather significant that the Minister of Agriculture for Quebec should adopt the same attitude; and I believe the same attitude has been adopted by some of the members of provincial governments in Western Canada. It is unfortunate, I think, that this aspect of the situation should be forced on the people as it has been. The resolution practically intimates that notwithstanding all these press notices that are being featured, we had better attend to our own business and let Great Britain do the same. In brief, I think that is the substance of the resolution, and I heartily agree with those sentiments. The hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. White), has pointed out the conditions that prevailed in 1919 and those which prevail to-day with regard to the live stock industry, and states that there has been a great fall in the price of beef cattle. That is quite true. There has been a serious deflation in the prices of all farm products, and it has struck the farmer a little in advance of most other people; consequently he is somewhat apprehensive as to what the future has in store for him.

In that regard I wish to refer to something which may have escaped the attention of hon. members who have not been engaged in farming operations. For the last few years we have been drawing very heavily upon our capital account and trying to make ourselves believe that we have been making good profits. The day is not far distant when we shall be forced, by the fact that our capital has become exhausted, to adopt different methods. That has been quite evident in the older provinces during the last few years, where there has been a desire to produce as much as possible while prices were high. A very poor system of farming has been carried on through those years, and the result is quite apparent. I believe that the same condition prevails throughout Western Canada. Reference has been made to the shipments of grain to England from Manchuria, Argentina and other

parts of the world. I have on a number of occasions pointed out the effect that the shipment of so much wheat and so little flour from this country has had, and have even gone so far as to advocate the putting into commission of some of the Government-owned transports in order that flour, the finished product, should not be discriminated against but should be put on an equal footing with wheat in regard to ocean rates. As it is to-day, there is a preference of about fifteen cents a bushel in favour of wheat and against flour, and I think that militates against the interests of the farmer of Canada to a greater degree than the average man realizes.

Before, during and since the war, Great Britain controlled the shipping of the world. While the people of that country are, in a sense, a free trade people, they are doubly protected in that their government arrange to bring them the raw material by which they can finish their stock with the mill feed and put that stock on the market—a market in which it will command the highest price because it has an advantage over stock from other countries by reason of the embargo. Now, I do not blame the people of Great Britain for doing this; it is good business on their part; and it would be good business on our part if we adopted similar measures with regard to our raw material and fed it in this country. I have always believed and contended that a country which ships out its raw material in the unfinished state is bound to remain a poor country. It is the finished article that commands the high price. Why is there a difference of from three to five cents a pound between the stocker and the finished animal? Because the finished animal is the one that is most desirable, and will bring to those who finish it a price that the man who raises the stocker will not receive. Why are so many anxious to have a market for the stocker? Because they are following the line of least resistance. Many of our friends in Western Canada have for some years found conditions much easier than we have in the older provinces. While they have been able to grow big crops and to let their cattle run on the ranches without the care we are forced to give to the cattle in the older provinces, they view with alarm the possibility of their cattle being debarred from the United States under the tariff that may be put into effect by the new government there. They think, therefore, that it would be advisable in any event, to have the British embargo removed, because their unfinished cattle would then be able to reach that market. That would be all right, but I believe that the remedy we should adopt is the one under which we shall not be drawing on our capital account but shall be enriching the soil that is under cultivation in this country. I have thought for years that instead of endeavouring to spread our people over more acres and bring more land under cultivation it would be better to farm more intensively the land that has already been broken up. Some hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to leave the impression that we have in Ontario quite a number of abandoned farms. I do not know where there is one abandoned farm in Ontario, notwithstanding the frequent assertions to the contrary made by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. VIEN: Is it not a fact that the rural statistics of Ontario show that there is a decreased acreage under cultivation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No, I do not think they do. There is a much larger area used for grazing than there was a few years ago, on account of farm labour not being available. What this country requires more than anything else is people from the Old Land. Bring the emigrants from the Old Land—those who will go on the land—and thus enable our farmers to carry on as they should carry on, and you will be doing something for the benefit of the whole of the people of Canada. Do not pay too much attention to this cry that is being raised that we must debar immigrants from coming into this country, because in our towns and cities hundreds and thousands of people are out of employment. Have hon. members ever stopped to ask themselves why so many people are out of employment? They are out of employment because they will not do the work that is here ready and waiting for some one to tackle; but rather than do the work that ought to be and must be done before we shall be able to meet our obligations, many people will accept aid in order to carry them on in the hope that something congenial may turn up. We must face the situation with courage. I am satisfied that we have been pursuing a most wasteful and prodigal policy with regard to our natural resources. We have found our natural resources being depleted

to such a degree that many people, it is true, are anxious to get off the farms and they are getting off the farms very fast. They have drawn on their capital, and with the profit they have made in addition to that, they are in a position to leave the farm and allow the land to be tilled by some one else, while they seek employment elsewhere.

To my mind, the live stock industry of this country is our only hope for replenishing the depleted soil fertility of our farms, and we should apply ourselves, with proper Government assistance, in order to see that those who are finishing the live stock of this country ready for the market are not hampered as they have been hampered, and seriously hampered, for many years past by reason of regulations passed which did not permit them to have a fair show in finishing their stock for the market. I have pointed this out on numerous occasions in this House, indeed, until some people have begun to think that this is a fad of mine and that there is really not so much in it after all. I refer to the adulteration of millfeed. But I am more convinced to-day than I have ever been in the past that I was right, and that we must remedy those conditions and make it possible for the farmers of this country not only to raise the best kind of stock that can be raised, but to finish them, and we must see that that live stock can be placed on the market in the easiest possible manner. I believe it would be much more desirable to have abattoirs at points nearer where the animals are finished than to have them at the seaboard as has been advocated by some hon. members. If our animals are shipped to Great Britain in a finished condition, as they ought to be, the farmers of this country will benefit much more than they would by shipping out the unfinished animals. I am not so much alarmed about this embargo which has been on the statutes of Great Britain since 1895, but which was in effect by an order of the Board of Agriculture in 1892. I believe the live stock industry of this country, with the high-grade breeding stock that we have been bringing out from Great Britain, has a bright future. But these things will have to be done; we shall have to have better facilities, and better transportation rates must be had for the shipment of stock than we have at the present time.

I might give just one illustration of the handicaps under which we are labouring to-day. I am now finishing cattle that were raised in Western Canada near Battleford, and hon. members can understand that with a six days' trip from Battleford to Toronto, and then from Toronto to my farm, considerable expense is entailed before those cattle reach the stable where they are to be finished. I have not the slightest doubt that the system in vogue in Western Canada will be changed very materially in the near future, and instead of sending out the unfinished animals, the raisers of live stock will finish with grain, which is raised in such immense quantities in that part of the country, thus finishing them in Western Canada, and in a few years the number of finished live stock that will be shipped out of Western Canada will greatly surprise many members of this House. I do not intend to take up any more of the time of the House in regard to this matter, but I contend that the finishing of our live stock in this country will be conducive to the breeding of better stock; that it will result in a much better system of farming, and that the fertility of the soil will be greatly enhanced as a result of such methods. Consequently, I approve leaving the British authorities to manage their own business in that respect, and we shall be doing very well when we mind our own, because they admit they have adopted this measure in Great Britain for the protection of their farmers.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House as I have on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the same subject. I am not rising to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) or the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) who, we all know, is very familiar with the subject and who is himself one of the best stock breeders in this country. His motion reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it would not be in the interests of Canada should the Government of Great Britain remove the embargo upon cattle going into the United Kingdom.

I do not oppose this motion on the grounds taken by my hon. friend, who is very familiar with the business and who, I understand, has in mind the establishment of abattoirs and of a big trade in beef and meat with other countries. As to that, I have nothing to say; but I rise this afternoon, not because I wish to meddle with any domestic business which concerns Great Britain, but because I think we should not let Canadian cattle lie under

the stigma with which it is now being branded throughout the world. That is the only point which I wish to make. I am too much a friend of Canadian autonomy myself to go and meddle with political matters in Great Britain. Great Britain is free to mind her own business as Canada is free to mind hers. We know that the tie between Great Britain and Canada is very slender. Indeed the only ties which bind us to the Mother Country, are first, the Crown; second, the Governor General, and third, the appeals to the Privy Council, and then there is that right of veto which the home Government has never exercised. As an hon. gentleman said the other day, in our domestic affairs, we are practically absolutely free. I do not wish to interfere with the policies of British statesmen when those policies concern only the United Kingdom; but whenever in Great Britain a policy is pursued which directly affects the interests or rights of Canada, I as a Canadian, as a free man, and, I will say, as a Britisher, have a right to remonstrate politely, but to remonstrate firmly with the Mother Country; and in the present instance I claim it is not meddling with British politics to protest that on this question of the embargo, to say the least, a very grievous mistake, nay more, a very serious wrong has been committed.

I know of only one man of late years who has taken up this matter and made a political issue of it. He is a Canadian, and we all know his name—Lord Beaverbrook. I think not many will approve the stand he has taken in England on this question. Personally I do not think he took the proper stand on the embargo in the by-election which took place in England only a few days ago. He had no mandate to speak for the Canadian people and was therefore simply importing a Canadian issue into British politics. But We, the members of the Canadian Parliament, speaking for the whole people of Canada, have the right to remonstrate with the Board of Agriculture in Great Britain and say: You have adopted a measure prohibiting Canadian cattle from being landed on the docks at Liverpool, Glasgow, or any other port in the United Kingdom on the pretext that these cattle are tainted with a disease; now it has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the disease did not exist in that case, and we protest against this libel against our Canadian cattle. If the Britsih Government wish to adopt a protective policy, which the embargo is in effect, I do not object to that, but in that case let them say openly that it is a measure of protection for the cattle breeders in Scotland and in the north of Ireland. The various Canadian legislatures which of late have adopted resolutions on this question have not been animated by any political motives. It is a Canadian question which effects Canadian stock breeders and Canada at large, and the legislatures of Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and Alberta also, I believe, spoke only the minds of the people. Their remonstrances were couched in very dignified language, and I do not think we in this Parliament are debarred from speaking to the Mother Country in language such as was used by these divers Canadian legislatures.

Let me say that I have had the honour to belong to a Government which gave a preference to the Mother Country. That preference was the crowning work of the hon. gentleman who sits beside me, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). There were Canadians at the time who said: Now that you are giving a preference to the Mother Country, you should at the same time claim a reciprocal preference from her. But the hon. gentleman answered: No, it suits Canada to give a preference to Britain; we ask nothing in return. That is exactly the attitude which as Canadians we take with the Mother Country in fiscal matters. We are free to act as we please, and if to-morrow Great Britain adopts a tariff against Canadian goods what complaint have we? Have we not ourselves taxed British goods for the last forty-five years, and was it not a Canadian statesman who in answer to the complaint that our tariff against British goods might perhaps break the British connection made the famous retort "So much the worse for the British connection." That is not my view, but it was the view held by someone well known to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). No, Mr. Speaker, on trade matters we are perfectly free, and for myself I admire good old England which in spite of all these tariffs against her from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the premier Dominion, and the United States has maintained free trade throughout all these years.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just for my own information I should like my hon. friend to verify the quotation he gave just now. Can he do it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is now a matter of history. The words were used by Sir John A. Macdonald, but we know that he was not always in earnest in what he said, and he might have used these words in a Pickwickian sense. At all events, they were attributed to him.

To come back to this question of the embargo, I think no one will deny the accuracy of the statement made by the late Sir Charles Tupper. He was a stout Canadian, and also a good Britisher, and when he was High Commissioner in London he tackled this question—and he was the first High Commissioner to do it—with the Board of Agriculture in England. I thought when I quoted him the other day in speaking on the Address, that I would find a report of his activities in connection with this matter in his memoirs, but I failed to find it there. I had read it in the Life of Sir Charles Tupper by Mr. J. W. Longley, where I read, at page 184:

> Sir Charles Tupper's acceptance of the High Commissionership left a large blank in the political life of Canada, but he acted in accordance with true patriotism in accepting this post, and raised it to an importance not contemplated when it was originally created. He infused great vigor into his discharge of duties previously regarded as prefunctory, and was watchful regarding everything which concerned Canada's interests. When the Imperial Government was about to take steps to prevent Canadian cattle being admitted to Great Britain on the ground that disease had been discovered among cattle in some parts of the United States, Sir Charles went straight to Liverpool with British experts, caused several animals selected by the experts to be slaughtered and carefully examined, in which technical investigation, his medical education gave him a strong position. So far as it was in human power to establish the unimpeachable freedom of Canadian cattle from all disease, Sir Charles was absolutely triumphant. Not a trace of disease was found in a single animal slaughtered. But this had no effect in staying the determination to place an embargo on Canadian cattle, which have remained ever since under the bann, though the most conclusive evidence has been repeatdly furnished that no disease existed. This leads to the suspicion that other reasons than fear of disease contributed to uphold this policy. It had every appearance of being a prohibitive measure in the interests of British cattle-raisers. This matter has only been referred to as an instance of the personal devotion of Sir Charles in determining that no means should be spared to see that the cattle industry of Canada was given fair play.

I have quoted this just to show that it has been established beyond a shadow of a doubt that the charge that our cattle are tainted with pleuro-pneumonia is unfounded. The intent and purport of my motion that humble representations be made to the British authorities that in the event of the embargo against Canadian cattle being maintained, the British authorities should state that it is not because our cattle are diseased, but simply because they wish to maintain a protective measure for the cattle raisers of the United Kingdom. That is the purport of my motion, which of course, is not now under discussion, but I might urge this in connection with the motion of my hon. friend the respected member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith). If a vote is taken on this question I shall vote not so much against the text of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend because he upheld by a very sensible statement the object of his resolution which is the development of the meat industry and the chilling process in Canada, and the establishment of abattoirs. I have no objection to that. But he spoke also about the embargo, and therein lies the difference between himself and myself. I have no objection to the embargo provided it is well understood that the reason for it is not that our cattle are diseased, for that is a mere myth. The British Government may impose all sorts of prohibitive measures they deem fit. It is their business and they are free to act in their capacity as legislators on the other side, as we do in Canada, on trade matters affecting us. But I do seriously object to our Canadian cattle being stigmatized throughout the world as tainted with disease.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not a fact that when the embargo was placed upon United States cattle going into Britain in 1879, the condition was laid down that Canada would have to impose a ninety-day quarantine against American cattle coming into this country? And, after that had been done, did not the United States retaliate by imposing a similar restriction on Canadian cattle going into that country?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not contest my hon. friend's assertion in this regard. He may be right. But what is absolutely true to-day is that as a result of investigation after investigation held during the last thirty years our Canadian cattle have been declared wholly free from disease, and this fact has been admitted without reserve. During the past summer the Imperial Press Conference, as is well known, visited Canada and it was a revelation to me to read some of the speeches made by some gentlemen who accompanied that delegation. In answer to questions put to them regarding the prohibition against our Canadian cattle, some of the representatives of the

Imperial Conference admitted that there was no contagious disease in the cattle raised in this country, but that the question involved was merely one of protection for the cattle-raisers of the Old Country. Once more, let me say that I do not object to Great Britain having a tariff against Canada or any other country. It is her business to act as she sees best in this respect, and John Bull is a shrewd old business man. But I certainly do object to the libel.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): As a contribution to history, if I can make nothing better of the matter, I think I can supply the information on which my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) desired regarding that quotation. I do not think it came from Sir John Macdonald. It came from the Toronto Mail and Empire, which was very close to Sir John and at that time was regarded as his organ. So much for the history of the quotation.

Now, the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Smith) is quite contrary to the one proposed by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). The mover of the resolution wants the embargo retained; my hon. friend from Maisonneuve seeks to have it removed. The question is a very old one. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve that we have the right to remonstrate in regard to any question that effects us prejudicially, and that as British subjects it is our privilege to go and state our views before the government of the Old Country. But having stated them fully and accurately, I do not see what there is to be gained by our continuing to nag at the British Government. As I say, this is an old story. Several hon. gentlemen have given us dates of the embargoes. I remember a good many years ago when Lord Onslow was Minister of Agriculture in the British Government. I had discussed the matter with him. I happened to be in England soon after there was a change of government. Meeting Lord Onslow I said: "I see that C. B. has come in"—C. B. was the familiar designation of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman—"and I presume that the folk who have been agitating for the removal of the embargo will now have their way." He said: "I bet you they won't." Well, I did not take the bet, and it was well that I did not, for I should have lost. Some British politicians occasionally argue in favour of the abolition of the embargo, but the Department of Agriculture of the British Government —strongly supported by the landed interests of England—have been determined to keep it up, and they will continue to do so. But the embargo is no longer put upon the ground that there is disease in Canadian cattle. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) says that what he complains of is the libel which the embargo places upon our cattle. Well, he is mistaken, for if ever disease was attributed as a reason for the embargo that is no longer the case. The reason is entirely one of self-protection on the part of the British people. They admit freely that our cattle are free from disease. But it is argued that there is more than a possibility of disease being introduced from the United States through Canada and in that way affecting the cattle in the Mother Country. That is the sole ground on which they place the embargo. I read recently a very interesting article from the pen of Lord Crewe on this subject. He was formerly Colonial Secretary, and to-day, I think, he is leader of the Liberal Opposition in the British House of Lords. He has written a strong letter regarding the action of Lord Lee, President of the Board of Agriculture, who preceded the member that was defeated the other day, and he says that the agriculturists of England are standing behind Lord Lee in this matter, and will insist on this regulation being kept up. I am inclined to think that at bottom it was a protective measure; I have a suspicion that it was designed to protect the cattle raisers of England and Ireland. An hon. member says that he wants them to admit that. Well, did you ever know a man to admit a protective policy squarely as such? You sometimes adopt measures which some people describe as protective, but you hate to call them so yourself, and that is about the situation to-day in England. I thing that this measure is retained owing to their desire—a desire with which hon. gentlemen opposite should not, I think, find fault—to protect the cattle trade of England and Ireland. In recent days, however, as I have already stated, disease in Canada is no longer given as a reason for the embargo, and the British authorities make this absolutely clear. The letter of Lord Crewe, to which I have already referred, and the declarations of other authorities in England, emphatically state that the cattle of Canada are free from disease. This being the case, therefore, I do not see that there is any libel on Can-

ada. It is contended, however, that there is a danger of cattle disease being brought into England from the United States through Canada.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): Has any statement been made by the British House of Commons to the effect that the embargo is merely a measure of protection?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not suppose that the British Commons have made any such declaration; I should not expect it. But even if that is so, I think it is beyond dispute that the ground is no longer taken that the embargo is due to any disease in our cattle. That reason has been abandoned, and it is now useless to argue against the embargo on the ground that there is any objection to our cattle by reason of disease. The British Board of Agriculture admit that there is no disease in Canadian cattle; Lord Crewe and Lord Lee both admit the same thing; and all the literature on the subject is clear that the whole ground, good or bad, has nothing to do with any question of disease in our cattle.

Mr. CURRIE: As the hon. member is a student of this subject, may I ask him to go further and state that Lord Beaverbrook's contention was not one in favour of the admission of Canadian cattle but in favour of cheap meat and cheap bread? That is the whole question.

Mr. FIELDING: I would rather not introduce Lord Beaverbrook into the matter; but I quite agree that if we feel aggrieved in this matter at all, it is our right as citizens and as a Parliament to remonstrate. Having remonstrated, and having the facts clearly placed before us, I think all will agree with me that is is rather undignified to keep nagging on the question all the time. It is a matter entirely for the British people, although we may have the right to think they are wrong. I think they are wrong in the matter, but since, after full deliberation the British Government and the British Parliament, the leaders of public opinion in Great Britain—those who have a powerful influence, or practically speaking, the controlling influence in the British Parliament, in the House of Lords, in the House of Commons and in the various departments—have made up their minds, are we to be continually asking them to recede from their position? I have no objection to it being declared that the Canadian people think the embargo is a mistake, but I do not think the matter is one which we should threaten and bluster and make a great fuss about, and make it appear that the British Government and the British Parliament are treating us in a very bad way. The matter is one which is entirely within their right. They have a right to be wrong if they want to, and I am quite willing to concede that to them.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): If I believed that the removal of the embargo would discourage the finishing of cattle in Canada, or necessarily discourage us in establishing abattoirs, I would be disposed to vote for the resolution of my hon. friend because he probably knows more about the live stock industry than any other man in this House. But I have not heard anything to convince me that the removal of the embargo would interfere in the least with the finishing of beef cattle in Canada. I had hoped that when my hon. friend was dealing with the question he would have given us some information upon it because his knowledge is probably better than that of the majority of us. I would have liked to have heard him state what the effect of the embargo has been in the matter of encouraging people to finish cattle in Canada for the English market. If he could have told us the average price paid for Canadian cattle when they reached Liverpool or Scotland, compared with the price of the best Scotch finished beef, and if he could have satisfied us that the Canadian cattle being shipped across under present conditions would bring as high a price as the best Scotch finished animals, I would have said there is a great deal in his argument. But I do not think my hon. friend can give us figures showing anything of the kind. I am rather inclined to think that the price which we receive for our finished stock is not to be for one moment compared with the highest price paid for the stock finished in Scotland. I do not think my hon. friend will for one moment claim that the price paid for Canadian animals comes anyway near the price paid for the Scottish animals. Therefore, if I am right in my supposition, it shows the maintenance of the embargo is an absolute failure for the purpose for which my hon. friend wishes it maintained—it has not had the effect which he thinks it would have.

If that be so we must consider the case from some other standpoint. I would not for one moment wish to be associated with any interference with British legislators. My hon. friend's argument might be argument advanced in opposition to the resolu-

tion placed on the Order Paper by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux); it is not argument in favour of the present resolution. If the present resolution means anything at all it amounts to an attempt to give advice to the British legislators and I think that in England it will be looked upon as such. I think it will be looked upon there as a bit of advice from this House recommending them to maintain the embargo. It seems to me that that is the only way in which it can be regarded. Therfore I fail to see anything whatever in such an argument.

Let me go back to the question of the finishing of cattle. I do not think that every part of the world is suited to the finishing of beef cattle. As a matter of fact I doubt very much if the cattle that we look upon in Canada as finished would be accepted in Liverpool as finished animals at all. I do not think they can for a moment be compared with the finished animals that the Scotchman turns out. I am advised that a great many of the Irish feeders do not finish their cattle at all, and their finished cattle are very much better than ours from Western Canada. I am advised that a very large proportion of the Irish feeders ship their cattle to Scotland for the Scotchmen to finish, because the Scotchman makes a specialty of finishing those animals which are sent from different parts of Great Britain. If that be so why not let him have a chance of finishing some of ours. We can turn out very good stock but I do not think we have ever got the habit—not even our best feeders—of finishing our cattle as they are finished there. I say that the Irishman, whom I am advised ships his cattle to Scotland to be finished, is in a very much better position to do that finishing than we are, especially those of us in the western country.

It is not the first time I have listened to lectures from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) as to how we should farm in the West. I suggest to my hon. friend that it would be better to leave the western farmers to work out their own salvation rather than that advice should come from people who do not know what they are talking about. We out there know very much better how to overcome the difficulties in our way or what should be done to meet them, we are very much better informed about that country than is my hon. friend. With all due deference to him we know some of the difficulties we have had to encounter; and any man who has been identified with feeding stock in the western country knows there are many difficulties in the way of finishing that stock as it should be finished for the British market. In time we may overcome those difficulties; but the solution will have to be worked out, it cannot be arrived at all at once. The present embargo is a great handicap to us in shipping cattle to Great Britain and so long as it continues in force that will continue to be the case. The western farmers feel very keenly that so long as that embargo remains they will be very seriously handicapped, and I submit that they know a great deal more about the situation there than my hon. friend from Ontario.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: You have had it for twenty-nine years.

Mr. THOMSON: That is true.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I mean the embargo.

Mr. THOMSON: I thought it was our farming operations you were referring to. The embargo has been in force for some time and it may be in force for some time yet. So long as it is there it will be a barrier—not merely an embargo, but a barrier to our success at stock raising in so far as we depend upon the British market. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have no other alternative than to vote against the resolution of my hon. friend. While I shall vote in that way I do not say that I would vote in favour of any resolution presented here asking for a removal of that embargo; that would require separate and very careful consideration. I certainly am opposed to any resolution such as the present one which to my mind is practically a bit of advice offered to the British Parliament that they should keep the embargo on and that we do not want it removed. With that I cannot agree.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat took, if I may say so, a somewhat peculiar position in the last few sentences which he uttered. He objects to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), on the ground that it is giving advice to the British Government and asking them to retain the embargo. He says, however, in regard to a resolution which would ask for the removal of the embargo, and which would certainly be a greater interference on our part than the present resolution, that he would give such a resolution some con-

sideration; that he would not be prepared to vote against that on the same ground as he would vote against the present one because it would meet his own views—he could not see in the other resolution the interference which he apparently sees in the resolution now before the House. That, with all due respect to the fact that my hon. friend is a lawyer and supposed to argue questions and come to a right conclusion, strikes me as rather a peculiar attitude.

I would also say a word in regard to the attitude of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), or, since this is a subject more especially concerning people who live in rural districts, the hon. member for Gaspé. Of course, on industrial questions we will refer to him as representing his other constituency. But on this question the hon. member for Gaspé has assumed a somewhat peculiar position also. I was surprised to hear him taking rather strong exception to some utterances by Lord Beaverbrook, especially because, if I read correctly the newspaper reports of what the noble lord said, I would certainly think that if he had a seat in this House he would vote for the resolution which stands in the name of the hon. member for Gaspé, as I can only infer from his utterances that Lord Beaverbrook is opposed to the embargo against Canadian cattle and wishes to have it removed. However, my hon. friend sees in the remarks of Lord Beaverbrook a meddling in British affairs. If it is considered perfectly proper for an hon. gentlemen in this House to move a resolution which certainly can only be taken as a piece of gratuitous advice to the British authorities, I would think that a man who has a seat in the British Parliament might at least be allowed to express his opinions on British policy, and that, I believe, is all that Lord Beaverbrook has done.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Gaspé has said that he does not want to be taken as interfering in British affairs or giving advice to the Old Country as to how they should regulate their policy in regard to the importation of cattle. He has expressed a belief, as have other hon. gentlemen, that this attitude on the part of the British Government in placing an embargo on cattle from Canada and the United States and other countries is not due, so far as Canada is concerned at least, to any belief on their part that our cattle are diseased. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was very emphatic in expressing that view, in which I entirely concur. If that is true, if we are convinced that the British people do not entertain the thought that our cattle are diseased, then we must look for another reason for the embargo, and that reason strikes me as being purely and simply an attempt to protect their cattle industry, that is all it amounts to. Then, if my hon. friend from Gaspé does not want to appear as interfering or giving advice to Great Britain in the matter of her embargo policy, why does not his resolution state exactly what he does want? Really what he wants to get from the British Government is a statement, duly signed, sealed and witnessed, I suppose, to the effect that they do not believe our cattle are diseased. If that is the case, then his resolution should state that, and that alone. Great Britain has a right to arrange her fiscal policy to suit herself, just as we have a similar right.

This debate, of course, has given the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) an opportunity to talk free trade again. I was expecting the hon. gentleman would get up, and I thought: What a wonderful opportunity he will have of—if I may use a common expression—lambasting the British Government for its protective policy in this instance. The hon. gentleman, however, had very little to say in condemnation of the British attitude. Still he must get off his free trade speech, and as he did not desire to say very much about the British policy, he took it out on Canada and gave us advice on what we should do in the way of developing more trade between the two countries.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I put a question to my hon. friend just with a view of elucidating this matter fully? Does not his case against Great Britain as to this embargo being a purely protective measure not fall down, somewhat at least, in view of the consideration that Great Britain imports any amount of dead meat without duty?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think it does, because Great Britain evidently believes that in keeping on this embargo she is protecting her own livestock industry. My hon. friend will not say that that embargo is being continued in order to protect British stock men from diseased cattle? Then what is the object if it is not to protect them in the raising of livestock? Undoubtedly the embargo is purely a protective measure on their part, and I think that every hon. member recognizes it as such. If Great Britain placed a duty of

$100 per head on imported Canadian cattle, no person here would raise any question at all; we would recognize her right to do so. But an import duty of $100 a head would not be any more prohibitive against our cattle than the present embargo; they would both serve exactly the same purpose, which is absolutely one of protection.

I gathered from the remarks of the hon. member for South Ontario, who is a very experienced stock man and one to whom we always listen with interest and profit, that it would be in the best interests of Canadian livestock men to finish their product here rather than ship it to England partly finished, as they would do if the embargo was taken off. In that I entirely agree with him. I am not inclined to altogether agree with him that the best place for abattoirs would be in Halifax, because if the argument holds good that in shipping the live animal from Halifax we would be shipping a lot of waste material, it would also apply in shipping stock, we will say, from Ontario to Halifax, and so the abattoirs might be better placed nearer the point where the animals are being finished. I do think, especially in view of action which the United States may take, that the Government would be well advised in establishing abattoirs in various parts of the country in order to encourage those in the livestock industry to finish their animals and ship them in the form of meat rather than on the hoof.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, may I add this? It is unfair to expect our livestock men to compete on even terms with the stock raisers of the Argentine or of the Southern States, for instance, Texas. There again I want to say—and this I pass on for the special benefit of the hon. member for Red Deer—that the Government should, if anything, raise the duty on live animals coming into this country. It is unfair to ask our farmers and stock raisers with the disadvantages of our climate, to compete on even terms with Southern States like Texas or with South American countries like the Argentine, where they have no winter conditions to contend with. This is something, it seems to me, which even my hon. friend from Red Deer, ardent free trader as he is, might do well to consider when he is preaching his free trade doctrine in this House. The hon. gentleman loses sight entirely of the climatic conditions we have to contend with when he is talking free trade whether in regard to cattle or anything else. He knows perfectly well that the farmers of this country have thousands of dollars invested in barns and stables to take care of their stock, and that they must be put to very great expense in fitting their cattle for the market. In that respect their competitors in Argentina and Texas have a very great advantage over them. These are things which should be considered in this connection.

Another thing which the Government might well consider—and I advanced this view in the House a year or two ago—is the desirability of giving Canadian flour shipped from Canadian ports to the markets of Europe a preference over wheat in the matter of ocean rates, thus inducing the milling of more wheat in this country and making available to Canadian farmers the by-products of wheat which they must have if they are to compete with those parts of the United States and those other countries which are more fortunate than we are as respects climatic conditions. All these things, it seems to me, are worthy of consideration in connection with this matter. But I most strongly deprecate this House undertaking, in connection with this resolution or with any other resolution, to tell Great Britain what she should do in handling her own affairs. Let Great Britain handle her affairs as she deems best, and we can maintain the right to do the same for ourselves. They have never undertaken to advise us in matters of legislation; very often this House has undertaken to advise Great Britain, a procedure which, I think, is not only undignified, but borders very closely on the impertinent.

Mr. J. F. REID: (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just a few observations on this resolution, which I consider to be a very important one. Should the resolution carry, it will be an admission on our part, as I read it, that our Canadian cattle are diseased. It says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it would not be in the interests of Canada should the Government of Great Britain remove the embargo upon cattle going into the United Kingdom.

It is well known that the reason why our cattle are not admitted free into Great Britain is because of the discovery of disease in them some years ago. It has been suggested that the embargo is a measure of protection on behalf of the British stock raiser. I know for a fact that Scottish stock feeders want to be able to purchase our Canadian stocker: several of them have told me that our cattle are the

best and the healthiest that they can buy. The same applies to the English farmer. But the protection is a protection for Ireland, for the Irish farmer, and, I think, Mr. Speaker, we will all agree that Ireland needs a little protection.

The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. White) has voiced the sentiments of western stock men to the effect that if something is not done to stabilize the stock industry, especially in the West, the stock-raisers will practically have to go out of business. It is all very well for our friends in Ontario, and in the East to say that we should finish the cattle in Canada before we ship them abroad, but that cannot apply to Western Canada. We have unlimited grazing lands in Western Canada that are not occupied. If this embargo was removed and we were able to ship our cattle to the Old Country, the live stock industry in the West would be stimulated. I admit that the day may come when we shall finish our cattle in the West, but in the meantime there must be some disposition of our cattle before they are finished.

Then, I think the Government should make some inquiries with regard to the building of abattoirs. I agree with the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that abattoirs should be built as nearly as possible to the districts in which the stock is raised. It is necessary to avoid excessive freight rates and wastage in the live animal, so that the nearer we get the abattoirs to the stock-raising fields, the better.

The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), in advancing the argument that our stock should be finished at home advocated the use of smaller farms and the employment of more men on the land. I just want to say in passing that if that principle were adapted, the revenue from an income tax point would be considerably decreased. I notice that the farmers of Alberta, which is not a thickly settled province, paid last year by way of income tax over $360,000. In Alberta we have a great many ranchers and a great many stock-raisers, so I think it would be unwise to encourage small holdings in that province. In Saskatchewan the farmers paid $340,000 by way of income tax—I am giving the round figures and speaking partly from memory, so that I am subject to correction. In Saskatchewan there are fewer ranchers than in Alberta. The income tax paid by the farmers of Ontario amounted for the same period to $64,000. I do not think, therefore, that it would be wise, even for the sake of obtaining the benefit which would result from finishing our live stock on the farms, to encourage small holdings. I rather think we should encourage larger holdings and stock-raising as is the practice on the western prairies. If practicable, we should ask Great Brtiain to remove the embargo, and should the Government consider it advisable to do this, I suggest that they should say to the British Government at the same time: If you will remove the embargo on our Canadian cattle, we will take off all the duties against British manufactured goods.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of speaking on this question a good many times, and though I cannot profess to be quite up to date on the subject I think I may be justified in placing a few facts before the House in reference to the conditions as they existed a few years ago.

Five years after the embargo was placed upon our Canadian cattle, there was still a strong agitation to have the embargo removed. At that time I asked the Customs Department to furnish me with a statement of the number of cattle shipped during the five years prior to the placing of the embargo and the five years following the placing of the embargo. I am sorry to say that I have not these figures before me, though I kept them for many years; probably they are still among my treasures. But it may be broadly stated that prior to the placing of the embargo an immense export trade in live cattle had been carried on from Ontario to the United Kingdom and the cattle were bringing at that time a very high price. If my memory serves me correctly, the average price obtained for Canadian cattle at the time the embargo went on was about $95 per head. As we were sending hundreds of thousands of cattle into the British market, that meant many millions of dollars for the province of Ontario alone. Immediately after the embargo was imposed, the number of cattle exported diminished very rapidly, and the price decreased just as rapidly as the number of cattle exported diminished, thus showing conclusively, to my mind, that we lost a very valuable market by an act which I always considered to be a great injustice to the Dominion. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said, that an effort was made lately to show that the embargo was not imposed on account of disease; but the fact

is that the embargo was imposed in the first place on account of disease and no other disease than pleuro-pneumonia. The diseases which the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) mentioned were not in the category at all. While Canadian cattle were free from disease, there was a possibility that United States cattle were not; I believe they were not entirely free, and that, perhaps, there came across our borders into Canada a few cattle that were affected with disease. I believe, if anybody will go to the customs and ask for the figures, he will find that they prove that, after the passing of the embargo, the number of cattle exported fell off very rapidly and the price fell just as rapidly, so that we lost both ways.

The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) is one of the highest authorities on livestock matters, and I feel like a very humble member beside him in debating any of these questions pertaining to cattle. It is only because, in years gone by, I have made a considerable study of this question that I venture to make these few remarks. Taking it for granted that the best proposition is to send the finished cattle from Canada, that is, that they should be fed on our own grain and absolutely matured in Canada before they go to the British market, I want to point this out—and I do not think it has been mentioned so far in the debate—that cattle travelling under sea conditions, herded and fed and watered as they are, are a good deal like men or women making the same voyage; they arrive in a condition, not fit to kill. I think the hon. member will realize the truth of that. I have crossed the Atlantic many times; I know what seasickness means, and I am told that cattle are just as much subject to seasickness as human beings. Therefore, when these cattle arrive at Liverpool and other markets, they are not in shape to kill; they have not been fed or watered or housed properly, and as a result they have lost a lot of flesh and the flesh that remains is not in a good condition. Anyone can understand that when an animal has been affected by seasickness for ten days or two weeks, it is not in a condition to kill, and in justice to the British people, they should not be fed on the flesh of cattle that have been killed in a seasick condition. Yet the regulations say that those animals must be slaughtered within ten days after arrival. The proposition on the face of it is not a good one.

It is said that Lord Beaverbrook is conducting a Canadian campaign, but I am not sure that he has said that it is a Canadian campaign he is conducting. I am sorry this has become a political issue in the Old Country; I hope it will not become a political issue in Canada, and perhaps the best course for us to pursue at the present time is to say very little about the matter either one way or the other. I have never known my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) to go wrong on agricultural matters; but, perhaps, he is not going to divide the House on this question and I shall not have to oppose him at present. The cattle question in Canada is to my mind one amongst a number of burning questions, and in Ontario with the Minister of Agriculture of that province going overseas in order to push the matter, it has become a more live question than usual. Whether that gentleman has any mandate from Ontario to go and push that question, I am not so clear. I think, perhaps, on the whole, as we have on the Order Paper these two resolutions, pro and con, the better idea would be to withdraw them both and let the debate go for what it is worth. For myself, I believe an injustice is being done to Canada; that it ought to be removed and that we should not be told our cattle are diseased. To the hon. member for South Ontario, I would say that it is not necessary for us to take advantage of the removal of the embargo, if it is not to our interest to do so, but we would have the privilege of taking advantage of it if there is anything to be gained.

I cannot refrain from pointing this out to my good friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) because, although he made some remarks on the cattle question, he strayed a little afield, when he said that we could never expect in this country to have the trade that we should have unless we brought back full ships as well as sent out full ships. I think that was the idea the hon. gentleman had. You may build all the ships in the world; but when you bring in more than half the goods that come into Canada, by rail, and not by ships,—and that is a policy which my hon. friend is pushing for all he is worth, namely, to bring in goods from the United States by rail—you will never have full ships crossing the Atlantic. I would support my hon. friend if he said that we should buy more British goods than American; then he would be talking; but, at present, goods are being brought in by a short rail route from the United States, much to the detriment of our railways that need the traffic, as can be seen by looking at the railway Estimates, instead of being brought in by ships to

Halifax, St. John, Quebec, and being loaded on our railways, thus furnishing a trade route throughout the whole country. Out of about $1,500,000,000 worth of goods that we have brought into Canada, nearly $1,000,000,000 have come from the United States, and, I believe, almost entirely by rail. So I say to the hon. member for Red Deer: You cannot fill ships on that basis The difficulty is not that we are not buying enough goods; we are at the present time buying more than we are selling, but we are buying them in the wrong quarter.

Mr. M. CLARK: May I remove a misapprehension my hon. friend seems to be under? I never had the least idea of taking goods from or bringing goods to the United States in ships. It is the British trade to which I was referring.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend said that the reason why Canada did not have sufficient trade was because we were not buying enough, and we were not filling our ships because we did not bring in sufficient across the water. I am pointing out that we are buying too many goods, but in the wrong quarter, the United States, when we should be buying them from the Mother Country. If we did that, we would fill our ships; we would furnish transportation for our railways, and our cattle going to and fro would be filling those ships and the railway cars with the desired freight. I think my hon. friend will see that his policy of buying more goods is not what we need.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Would not an increase in the British preference cause us to buy more from Great Britain and less from the United States? That is what my hon. friend had in mind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Possibly that might be, but we are already giving a very handsome preference to British manufacturers. We are already giving them a preference of 33⅓ per cent which, if they are able to compete, as we are often told by my hon. friend they are, ought to be sufficient to enable them to beat the Americans or the manufacturers of any other country, because British manufacturers can import their goods into Canada at one-third less than the Americans can. I do not, however, know that this has anything particular to do with the question of the embargo. I am pointing out that in my judgment it was wrongly imposed in the first instance; that strong efforts have been made by various governments to have, it removed, and that it is not a political question. It was first urged by Sir Charles Tupper, who certainly could not be accused of being unfriendly to this Government as long as he lived, or to many of the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House at the present time. He took very strong ground on this question, and ever since his day down to the present there have been spasmodic efforts to have this injustice remedied. For my part, I think it should be remedied. I think it should be openly stated by the British Government that it does not believe Canadian cattle are so diseased that they should not enter that country. If they want to protect their own breeders I say to them: Be men and put a £5 or £10 duty per head on cattle if you wish, and then let them come in. Nobody would kick at that. I am a protectionist, and I would be only too glad to see the British Government taking a protectionist step of that kind. It is not protection they are giving now; it is prohibition, and I do not believe that even some of my hon. friends opposite believe in prohibition to the utmost. But this embargo is an absolute prohibition. The British Government says: No matter what your cattle are, no matter what your price is, no matter what may be their bill of health, they cannot come into this country at any price. We in Canada, on the other hand, will take in anything from Great Britain or the United States, with very few exceptions, if the required duty is paid. But this embargo is an absolute prohibition. I do not know whether my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith) thinks I have given him any light with regard to that seasick business, but I think there is quite a bit in that, and if he thinks over it I believe he will withdraw his resolution, which has been very fully discussed. We do not want to put ourselves in the position of dictating to the British Government, one way or the other, at the present time.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): I just want to say a few words in this debate. While I have the greatest respect for my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith), whom I know to be a man who has been interested in the live stock industry for years, and who has done very much to improve the live stock business in the province of Ontario, I must differ from him on the resolution which he has submitted to the House this afternoon. The reason given, and it was given in this debate this afternoon, for the placing of an embargo upon our cattle, was that possibly disease might be brought into the

herds of the Old Land from Canada. I do not think there is any country in the world that has been so free from these diseases as Canada. The disease particularly mentioned in connection with this embargo is pleuro-pneumonia. We are told that there has been no case of pleuro-pneumonia in this country since 1886, and that the cases at that time were confined to a quarantine station. The disease did not get beyond the bounds of that station, and the animals were cremated, so there was no danger of a spread of infection from that source. It has also been stated that British cattle breeders fear that the foot and mouth disease might be introduced into Great Britain by our cattle, but there has been no outbreak of foot and mouth disease in this country since 1884, and the cases then were confined to a quarantine station; they never got beyond that. Very strict regulations were put in force by the Federal Department of Agriculture when live stock was being shipped from this country to the Old Land. Inspectors were stationed at all shipping points, and all the cattle for export had to undergo a very severe examination. Those regulations are ready to be put into force again should that trade be revived. Just to show that our Federal Department has the situation fully in hand, I would remind the House that in the last outbreak of foot and mouth disease across the line, which affected a great area, 23 states, I think, of the American Union, and cost the Americans hundreds of thousands of dollars, the quarantine regulations put into force by our department at that time prevented the disease spreading to the herds in this country. It was a very severe test that the Federal Department was put to at that time, and the result proves conclusively, I think, that there is no danger of disease from that source, because those regulations are still in force and should our cattle trade with the Old Land be revived the Federal Department could take the same measures to prevent the spread of infection from our herds to the Old Land.

My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has given a few figures on the export trade from Canada to Great Britain before the embargo was placed on our live cattle. That trade, of course, fell off, but during the last few years since the United States has been admitting our cattle free, quite a large trade has developed across the line in live cattle. Since 1914 there have been, in round figures, 200,000 cattle per year sent across the line; in some years, a few more, and in others perhaps less. Valuing these at $100 per head, the trade would amount to about $20,000,000 per year, a very valuable trade indeed.

It has been argued in this debate that it would be better for Canada to finish her store cattle at home, to feed them here, and place them on the British market in a finished condition. Canada cannot do that at the present time. On account of our wide areas, our rather extensive pasture areas, our scarcity of labour, Canada can rear and produce far more cattle than she can finish. Our present stage of development is better fitted for rearing and producing a far greater number of cattle than we can finish. On the other hand, the British farmer, who carries on operations on a far more intensive scale than we do, is in a better position to take these cattle and finish them. He will stable them, feed them high, and finish them in a short time, and have a quick turnover. He can finish more than one group in one year, whereas the Canadian farmer would require two, three or four years in order to produce and rear the cattle that he has to sell. There is no question, however, that a great number of cattle are being finished in our country, and placed on the markets of the world in a finished condition, and undoubtedly in the future the number will be larger. But under present conditions, where we have large areas of pasture, and a scarcity of labour, the Canadian farmer can produce and rear far more cattle than he can finish, and it would be of great advantage to him as well as to the British farmer to have the embargo removed, so that he could produce and rear a large number of store cattle, to be shipped over to Great Britain and finished there.

I do not at all underestimate the value of the finishing of our cattle here and placing them upon any market in that condition. That, of course, is desirable, and it is an end towards which we are working. But at the present time we have a large surplus of store cattle, and if we cannot get them out of the country we shall suffer a very great loss. I have already spoken in regard to the trade that has developed between Canada and the United States in this regard. We have heard something in the last few days concerning the Fordney Bill. Now, should this Bill or any other of a similar character be carried into effect and our trade with the

United States be cut off, there would be an immense glut of store cattle on the Canadian market, and if the British embargo were removed we should immediately have an outlet for this produce to take the place of the American market.

There is another phase of this question upon which I should like to touch. I understand, although I am not certain on this point, that the embargo applies not only to our cattle but to our sheep as well. Canada, of course, is not a great sheep-producing country, nor, on the other hand, is she a great mutton-consuming nation, and at certain seasons of the year there is a considerable glut of mutton on the Canadian market. If the embargo were removed an outlet would be provided for our live sheep and it would ensure us against these gluts that occasionally occur in this country.

There is another feature of this question which is sometimes overlooked. The British herds and flocks have been a source from which Canadian breeders have imported a great deal of stock for the improvement of their own cattle and sheep. If the embargo were removed and our live cattle were allowed to enter Great Britain free, there is no doubt whatever that the return trade that would result of pure-bred stock from the Old Land would improve our herds, particularly in regard to bulls, in which respect our herds in this country are lamentably deficient. Just in this connection I may say that since this trade has developed with the United States there have been coming into this country particularly into the Canadian West a considerable number of pure-bred bulls. If the embargo were removed I feel sure that the British breeders would compete and share in that trade, and the result would be a very valuable improvement in the herds and flocks of the livestock men of this country.

Mr. MORPHY: Do English animals come into Canada free of duty?

Mr. KENNEDY: I think the pure-bred animals come free of duty. The Old Country has been a very fertile source of pure-bred stock for Canadian breeders, and there is no question that our herds have been greatly improved by importations from their herds. We must admit that in many cases they are ahead of us in this business, and we should cultivate this return trade to as great an extent as possible. I should be sorry indeed to see the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith) carried in this House.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City, B. C.): In rising to say a few words on this resolution I desire at the outset to pay a tribute to the mover for the excellent service he has rendered the livestock interests of Canada during his years of experience as a breeder and importer in the province of Ontario. He is one of our oldest, most respected, and most capable breeders of purebred stock, being known all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He has been not only a successful exhibitor at many of our fairs, but has filled the important position of judge on many an occasion on both sides of the line. However, I feel that on this occasion I cannot quite agree with him on this embargo question. In the first place, when the embargo was imposed, the argument was advanced that Canadian cattle were affected with contagious disease,—at that time pleuro-pneumonia. The adoption of this resolution might convey the impression that we are perfectly satisfied and have been satisfied for thirty years, with this embargo, whereas, as a matter of fact, ever since the embargo was imposed the Government have from time to time been making regular efforts to have it removed.

The embargo was put on about thirty years ago on the assumption that pleuro-pneumonia had appeared in a shipment of cattle from Canada to the Old Country. I very well remember the occasion. I was then a student of veterinary science in Toronto and this matter was discussed at college on many occasions, and I remember distinctly that many veterinarians of Great Britain strongly protested against the diagnosis that was made by the official veterinary authorities on that occasion. It is about thirty-four years or more now since we last had a case of pleuro-pneumonia in Canada, and as the previous speaker informed the House, it occurred in a shipment sent over here. That shipment remained in quarantine for the regular period and the animals were destroyed and the premises disinfected. It is about thirty-six years since there was a case of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada, which occurred in exactly the same way. It also was stopped in quarantine and it got no further. But there is every proof that our cattle are free from disease. As you know, we have the privilege of shipping cattle to Great Britain for salughter at the port of entry, and during the intervening period since the imposition of the

embargo we have slaughtered no fewer than three million head of Canadian cattle on the British side, under British inspection, and not one single case of pleuropneumonia has been discovered.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. speaker, ever since the embargo was imposed our Governments have been making efforts to secure its removal, and in 1917 the then Prime Minister, (Sir Robert Borden) received a distinct promise from the Minister of Agriculture of Great Britain, that the embargo would be removed. Shortly after that two delegates were sent from Canada to Great Britain to instruct the people regarding the health of Canadian cattle and also to represent the unfairness of imposing this embargo on the ground of disease in our cattle. They did this work entirely with the approval of the Minister of Agriculture of Great Britain and clearly through official channels. They interviewed many organizations of livestock breeders, labour organizations, etc., and also took up the matter with the press of the country. They rendered a very excellent service but one that had no effect. It is now rather regrettable that this matter has assumed a political aspect and that certain men are trying to make political capital out of the embargo situation. Lord Lee clearly stated a short time ago that if he undertook to remove the embargo, or had any business with the Government of Canada with reference to the subject, it would be through the proper channel, the Federal Department of Agriculture. It is unfortunate, therefore, that this matter has been taken up in the way that it has by some of the representatives from this side, and also by some of the press, with the result, I think, that the work has been hindered to a very great extent in as much as people have been very much irritated and they have misinterpreted the intentions of those who have been carrying on that campaign.

Now with regard to our markets, is the removal of this embargo going to help the cattle industry of Canada? I may say that at the present time we cannot possibly consume the number of beef cattle produced in this country at home. The result is that we have to look for an export market. We have been shipping these cattle to the United States, but there are rumors of tariff changes over there that will prevent our cattle from going into that market if those changes are approved. I want to say here that on the fourteenth of January I had the pleasure of addressing the American National Live Stock Association assembled at El Paso, Texas. This Association represents all the range cattle breeders of the United States extending from Texas to California, from California north to Washington, and East as far as the Dakotas. Those men were unanimously in favour of imposing duties on Canadian and Mexican cattle coming into the United States, so that if that market is removed we are going to have a little difficulty—in the beginning at least—in disposing of our surplus products. If we could place those cattle on the British market we could do so to great advantage, and a nice outlet would be provided for our cattle during the period in which we are getting our farmers to become feeders of livestock.

I quite admit that it would be much more beneficial, from an economic standpoint, to finish off the cattle in this country than to ship over our chilled beef to Great Britain. Let us see for a moment what kind of luck we would have in carrying on work of that kind? I think it was the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who stated that the Government should have taken up an active policy immediately after the close of the war to get our meat on the British market in competition with the Argentine and Australia. Perhaps you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that at that time, immediately after the conclusion of the war, owing to the lack of shipping, a large number of animals had accumulated in the Argentine and also in Australia; so that at that particular period the Argentine was placing chilled beef on the British market at from eleven to fourteen cents a pound, while the Canadians were asking twenty-five cents for their article. The shipping of chilled beef in competition with the Argentine and Australia would not at the present time, I am afraid, be a very profitable work to undertake. In the first place you will perhaps be astounded, Mr. Speaker, to know that of the million cattle passing annually through our inspection abattoirs less than ten per cent are fitted for export to the British Islands in competition with the beef from the two countries I have mentioned, on account of their small size, their poor quality, and their lack of finish.

The Government has long recognized that situation and we are making every effort to induce the farmers to feed and finish their cattle. We have introduced what is known as "A carlot and smaller group policy" at our various fat stock shows. We are giving special prizes for finished animals in carlots and in smaller

groups, and we have had very excellent results. Last year at Brandon Fat Stock Show there were some three hundred cattle on exhibition and a very excellent quality of cattle they were. At some other shows we have also had good results. We also may assist in the establishment of a large fat stock show in the city of Toronto along the lines of the big International Show held in Chicago. The International Show at Chicago brings together cattle breeders and finishers from all over the continent, and from both sides of the International boundary line, so that it has done a very great deal in stimulating the finishing of beef cattle. We hope that the Toronto show when it gets started, probably next winter, will have similar effects in stimulating the finishing of Canadian cattle.

But what are we going to do with our cattle in the meantime? If the United States imposes a duty we cannot ship them there; we must have some other outlet. Let me point out that what is a finished steer on the western ranges of Canada is just about ready to go into the hands of Scotch or English feeders to be finished to suit the taste of the British market. Over there they like very much fatter beef than we use on this side, so that when these cattle have been fed on the ranges of Alberta, or wherever they are fed out in the West, they can then be shipped profitably to Great Britain and sold to the feeders there to finish.

To give you an idea of what cattle are selling for in Great Britain at the present time—and this will perhaps explain the enquiry of some person who wondered how the labour men were interested in the shipment of cattle to Great Britain—let me say that at a recent sale that took place there beef steers brought $358, beef heifers $241, calves $94 and spring dairy cows $448 per head, showing that there would be a most excellent profit in shipping cattle to the Old Country from Canada.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Will my hon. friend give the comparable prices for Canadian cattle?

Mr. TOLMIE: Finished beef steers for May delivery are quoted now in Western Canada, I understand, at about ten and a half to eleven cents per pound. Heifers would run about two cents per pound less than that. Fall calves would sell for $25 or $35, and dairy cows would run from $125 to $175 or $200 acording to quality.

There is another explanation for the very great difference in the prices paid for fresh killed beef. The Britisher, the man who has money, the middle class man, and all others, have a very keen appetite for fresh killed beef, and in that they show rather better taste, I think, than do Canadians. The prices run almost twice as much for fresh killed beef as can be obtained for chilled beef or frozen beef from overseas. So that by sending our beef cattle over there, we would not only be securing a good market for our output, but would also be catering to the tastes of the British consumer.

With regard to the objections raised by the Imperial Government to the shipment of cattle to Britain, let me say that one of their first arguments has been the possibility of getting disease from Canadian cattle. I want to say here as a veterinarian, and one who has kept in close touch with the handling of animal contagious diseases all over the world, that we are in a better shape in Canada to-day than almost any other country in the world. We have a Health of Animals Branch that is made up of men fully qualified for the work, men who not only have to be graduates of a well recognized veterinary institution, but must, in addition to that, pass a special examination before they are permitted to undertake this important work. The proof of what I am saying is the past history of contagious disease in Canada. You will remember that during recent years there have been several very serious outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States—a most infectious disease and very easily carried—and that our veterinarians here were successful in protecting us with a boundary line four thousand miles long, and not one single case of foot-and-mouth disease occurred in the Dominion during that time. This is a clear-cut answer to the claim of the British Government that disease may get in from the United States. In addition to that we have had on the western plains a disease known as dourine amongst horses, a disease that has existed there for a number of years. Not only were we able to clean that up entirely but our pathologist, Dr. Watson, who is at the head of our Pathological staff in the Health of Animals Branch, made a vaccine by which he was able to easily diagnose the disease and to use the most up-to-date methods in cleaning it up. Then again the record of our Health of Animals Branch recently made in the dipping of 120,000 head of cattle in the province of Alberta for cattle mange to clean up the disease was successful to such an extent that we were able to raise

the blanket quarantine existing over an area of more than 2,600 square miles. I think that was one of the finest performances ever accomplished by any group of veterinarians anywhere in the world.

Now, touching again on this particular point of cattle coming in from the United States. I think there would be no difficulty whatever in guarding British herds against contamination by animals from that country. It would be no trouble to permanently mark those cattle on entry so as to prevent any of them being shipped to England by taking advantage of any arrangement that might be made between Canada and Great Britain for the shipment of our cattle over there.

I feel that perhaps we have no right to make suggestions to Great Britain about her domestic affairs, but, on the other hand, I feel that they should come out in the open and remove the stigma that has been placed on Canadian cattle. This stigma has done us considerable damage. When some of our cattle shippers attempted to send cattle over to the Continent immediately after the war, I understand, one country rejected Canadian cattle because of the fact that they were refused entry into Great Britain ostensibly on account of cattle disease being prevalent in Canada. That is one of the impressions that get abroad as a result of this embargo. Let me point out further that a year and a half ago we were asked to get a special permit from Great Britain to send a shipment of pure bred Holstein cattle to British Holstein breeders, but we were not successful, although only a few years before that a shipment of pure-bred Holsteins brought in by special license from Holland. Yet in Holland foot-and-mouth disease prevails most of the time.

We are importing from Great Britain pure-bred cattle under certain restrictive regulations that have placed us absolutely on the safe side; in other words, we have never had any disease as a result of those importations, although foot-and-mouth disease prevails in England from time to time. As I said a moment ago, we have not had a case here for over thirty-six years. So arguing from these premises, I submit it would be safer for Great Britain to import cattle from this country than it would be for us to import their cattle, although, as I have shown, we have been importing British pure-bred stock for several years so successfully that we have had no disease as a result.

I have been very pleased to notice the great interest that has been taken in this very important matter, and I think that the mover of the resolution has also been gratified, and in taking my seat I would ask him to be kind enough to favourably consider its withdrawal.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, after the many very excellent addresses that we have listened to this afternoon on this subject and one which is of so much importance to our stock breeders and cattlemen I think our labours of the afternoon would be abortive if the results were of a negative nature. In my judgment it is the opinion of the majority of those who have taken part in this debate that there is a grievance, and that some appeal should be made with a view to its removal. I am sorry that I was not present until the mover of this resolution (Mr. Smith) had got about half way through his speech, and I must say that, not being an expert in this business such as he is, I raise objection to the request embodied in his resolution with a certain amount of fear and trembling.

It is true, as has been emphasized by hon. members this afternoon, that Great Britain has claimed a reason for an embargo being placed on our cattle. And from my experience and knowledge of the live stock business extending over a period almost as long as that of the previous speaker (Mr. Tolmie), who said this country has been free from both tubercular and foot and mouth disease for over thirty-six years, I think it is really desirable that something should be done to remove the stigma placed on our cattle by Great Britain. Therefore without delaying the House any longer, I would propose that the following amendment be made to the resolution:

> That all the words after the word "House" in the resolution be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "the Government of Canada should make a strong protest against the reasons assigned by the British Government that Canadian cattle are diseased as an excuse for placing an embargo on Canadian live cattle going into the United Kingdom."

I think that this amendment will embody the concensus of opinion as expressed by hon. members this afternoon, and will accomplish something more than would be possible by merely allowing the matter to rest where it is at the moment and withdraw the resolution. I have much pleasure therefore in moving this amendment.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have only

been able to follow the speech of the mover of the resolution (Mr. Smith) and the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) who sat down a few moments ago. The amendment moved by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) would seem to imply that such a protest had not been made. Surely he is aware that the history of the last thirty years is the history of protests made not only by the government in office when the embargo was first imposed, but made almost yearly since by every successive government. The Government that was in office from 1896 to 1911 took, so far as I am aware, precisely the same position as regards this embargo as the Government that is in power to-day. The record, for example, of the 1917 conference on this subject is a record of about as definite and insistent a protest as any Government is capable of making on the very grounds stated in the amendment. I am utterly unable to understand what can be the object of an amendment urging a protest when protest has been the policy of Canada for thirty years and every measure that the successive officers of the Department of Agriculture and the numbers of successive governments could devise has been resorted to to push that process to the effective limit. If any hon. member who thinks of supporting the amendment can make a suggestion as to what further can be done in the way of pressing or implementing the protest, then an amendment embodying that suggestion will be of value for the consideration of the House. I do not know what more could be done; it is on the ground of the implication embodied in the British policy that our protest has all along been lodged and is lodged to-day. It is on that ground that strong and determined action was taken at the conference to which I refer, and by reason of that ground the British Minister of Agriculture at that time was good enough to say that, at some date which I am sorry he did not specify—I believe that, in rather indefinite language, he fixed it as the termination of the war—the Government would see that this embargo was removed. The case of Canada to-day rests most strongly upon that promise, and, basing our claim on that promise and on the wrong done to this country by the implication, the Government of to-day is losing no time and sparing no effort to have the embargo removed.

Now, there is a way by which these negotiations or the continuance of this protest can be carried on. There is a proper way, consistent with the full exercise of authority of the British Government and Parliament within their own domain and consistent with the principle that there shall be no interference from outside with the exerciseing of that authority. I do not think that even for the sake of bringing about the removal of the embargo we would be justified in stepping beyond that method. We have sought through the appropriate channels, through the channels constitutionally established, to bring home to the British Government the wrong done by the implication embodied in the embargo, and nothing has been left undone in that regard. But I do not think it is a proper function of this country or of authorities within this country to launch or initiate among the British people a propaganda against the course taken by the British Government. From that action we have refrained, but we have refrained from nothing in the way of making known the facts as to Canadian cattle in order that the British people may understand that there is no justification in fact for the implication. We have not, however, gone the length of endeavouring to instigate the British people against their own Administration, of endeavouring to launch a propaganda amongst the people against the conduct of their Government. I know that were similar action taken by British authorities against the conduct of this Government, no matter how unpopular the conduct of this Government might be, such action would be resented here. Nor do I understand how we could ever in future resent corresponding action on their part if we made ourselves guilty of initiating the process. I say, therefore, that through the proper channels, and by the proper methods, we will not cease to bring home to the British Government our conviction that if they intend to protect the breeder of stock in England, or protect whatever they like to protect, they should not do so in such a manner as to carry a false implication against the livestock of Canada.

I rose, however, only to suggest to the mover of the amendment—for I had no intimation that any amendment was intended—that it is scarcely fair to ask the House to lodge a protest that is already lodged, and that it is hardly going to put this House in a position of very great dignity as respects the British Government to pass a motion now asking that we do

that which the British Government knows we have never ceased to do for thirty years.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I am sorry that I have not been able to follow the discussion of this resolution, but after hearing my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, I feel impelled to say a word or two as to why I am in favour of the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow).

The Prime Minister states that this Government has lodged protests on many occasions; that it has kept on lodging protests against that embargo. Well, what is the objection to the Parliament of Canada stating emphatically by way of resolution that we support the Government in the lodging of that protest?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No objection.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no objection, then, to my hon. friend's amendment. If it is the wish of members on both sides of the House, why not incorporate it in the form of resolution as my hon. friend suggests?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amendment does not say that. If the amendment was drawn that way, there would be no objection to it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, it might be worded as I suggest. I must express my concurrence in the view that we should not interfere with the policies of Britain. I admit quite freely that we would resent any such interference on the part of Britain with our own policies. But there is another consideration in regard to this embargo. Britain is at liberty to prohibit the entrance of our cattle into her country, but what I strongly object to is the reason given for that prohibition. If such a reason were given for similar action by any foreign country we would resent it, and we resent it when it comes from Britain, and the fact that it is done by Britain is no reason why we should not say so in this Canadian Parliament. Let them place an embargo on our Canadian cattle if they like, but we resent the reasons they are giving. Our cattle are not diseased, and it is a slander against one of the main articles of Canadian production to assign that reason for any embargo.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka) (rising).

Mr. PEDLOW: I would just like to reply briefly to—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pedlow) would certainly be out of order in replying to the remarks of the Prime Minister unless he did so with the unanimous consent of the House. The hon. member who moves a substantive motion has the right to reply, but the amendment is not a substantive motion; therefore, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) has not that right unless it is given to him by unanimous consent of the House. Do I understand that the hon. member from Muskoka desires to say a word?

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the view expressed here this afternoon, that Canada, who guards so jealously her own rights and privileges, should refrain from interfering with similar rights and privileges enjoyed by the Mother Country. I recognize that there has been a reflection upon Canada in the charge that her cattle have been diseased.

When the late Sir Charles Tupper was acting as High Commissioner in England, this question first came up. He engaged some of the best veterinary surgeons in England, and on several occasions he had Canadian cattle slaughtered when they arrived in that country and their lungs and other organs examined for tuberculosis. On every occasion the report was that Canadian cattle were perfectly free from the disease with which they had been credited. From that time on I believe every Government in this country has been bringing to the attention of the authorities in England the falseness of that accusation levied against Canadian stock breeders. I would, however, be very sorry if this Parliament went on record as in any way seeking to interfere with the rights and liberties of the Mother Country. We have not only jealously guarded our national status but we have exalted it to such a degree that not long ago Right Hon. Bonar Law announced in the House of Commons that if Canada wished complete independence, there would be no opposition from the Mother Country. How can we, in the face of such statements, interfere with what is a domestic right of the British authorities? I hope the implication that has been levied against the stock breeders and the cattle of this country can be removed, but I shall be very sorry to see this Government in order to gain that end go out of its

way to interfere with the affairs of the Mother Country. Canada has placed her case before the British authorities, and having done that she should rest her energies at that point. Further than that, we have no right to go, and I cerainly think we should not go.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has stated that the British authorities no longer take the view that Canadian cattle are diseased, but they say that it is possible for diseased cattle to come from the United States into Canada and in that way get to England. If that be the case, if the British authorities no longer take the position that this embargo was imposed on Canadian cattle because of their being diseased, it seems we are hammering a straw man very hard. But there is one ground on which I think both these resolutions should be withdrawn, and that is, that it is quite evident from the newspapers to-day that the question of embargo or no embargo is an active political question before the British electorate. It certainly has not been stated in the press that one side are saying that Canadian cattle are diseased and the other side saying that they are not diseased. The question that was raised for the British electorate to decide was this: Do you want an embargo or not? If you have no embargo, you are going to have cheaper food in Great Britain. They are not saying: you are going to have diseased cattle. The opposition to that, whatever it was, is not stated, and it is immaterial so long as the other side do not take and have not taken the position that the embargo is imposed because Canadian cattle are diseased. Therefore, there is before the British electorate to-day the issue of cheap food; it is an active political question, and it is not in the interest of the people of Canada or the Canadian Parliament to express any further opinion on this question at this time by a resolution of this House. Let the British people fight out their domestic questions as they like. The British authorities are not slandering us before the people of Great Britain to-day; we should let them follow their own course in their political matters, and let us attend to a few things we have to do here ourselves.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer): I think I am in order in speaking to the amendment, and I should like to make a suggestion to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow). I quite agree with the attitude of my hon. friend (Mr. Bristol), and I think the position, which I took myself and which I understood him to support on general grounds, apart, of course, from my incursion into fiscal matters, gained a very strong reinforcement from his drawing attention to the fact that these matters are exciting the attention of the people of Great Britain politically.

I rose, however, for the purpose of stating clearly what I understand to be Britain's position in this matter. I think it is well our people should understand it without any possibility of doubt as to the actual facts of the case. If I am wrong, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) will correct me, or my hon. friend to whose speech we all listened with the greatest possible interest. Some talk as if Great Britain were doing something specially directed against Canada on this question. The Minister of Agriculture can tell the House far better than I can of the immense value of the British herds of cattle, and how owners of British herds from time to time sell cattle at almost fabulous prices. Having regard to the value of those cattle, the British Government have for years taken the position that they will play doubly safe in regard to the health of their cattle within their shores. That is the position they took to begin with, and they take it still. If they admit, what they have to admit, that we have a very fine bill of health amongst our stock in Canada, they still have a fear about diseased cattle coming in from the United States. They play safe within their borders in regard to the health of their extremely valuable cattle, and they put on this embargo, not specially against Canada, but, as I understand the matter, against all countries in the world. Do they take live cattle in from any country except to kill them at the port of debarkation?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not without a special license.

Mr. CLARK: Not without a license do they take them from anywhere. I think it is important, with a view towards the best possible relationships and understanding between the Canadian and the British people, that the fact should be known, that this is not a special act against Canada; that it is an act that is undertaken along the line of extreme caution in the preservation of the health of their herds. In view of that fact, I very much doubt the wis-

dom of successive Governments in doing what the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) said they are doing, and that is how I view the question. He has said, as I have said before him, that in Canada we should resent very quickly and ferociously any interference with our affairs. There is no text upon which I have heard so many sermons preached in this House as that of Canadian autonomy, and this question is one of British autonomy. On that ground I would appeal to the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Pedlow) to think carefully before he presses his amendment, and I appeal to him specially on another ground. We are told that all Governments in Canada have taken a line of action which the Prime Minister tells us this Government is taking. I am sure, if there is anything that would infuse a doubt into the mind of the hon. member for Renfrew South about the wisdom of this course of protest, it would be that it is being undertaken by the present Government. I should like him to think twice before he undertakes to press an amendment before this House to put himself in wrong with the people in specially reinforcing an action of the Government against which he so cheerfully voted a want of all confidence the other day.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I would very gladly vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow), if it were founded on fact, but I think he is mistaken. He proposes to say that the Government should make a strong protest against the reason that Canadian cattle are diseased being assigned by the government of Great Britain as an excuse for placing the embargo. I do not think the British Government do assign that as a reason. They may have done so in years gone by; I am not going to dispute that, but in all recent discussion of the matter to which I have had my attention drawn, no such reason has been assigned. Quite the contrary. They admit that Canadian cattle are not diseased, and the whole argument now is that unless they have the embargo American cattle may enter Great Britain through Canada. I do not argue whether that is right or wrong, but that is their ground, and if they allege that as a ground we ought not to put on record something else. I would call the attention of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) to that. I think his resolution states as a fact that which we have no evidence of. I do not think it is a fact. I do not believe he could quote from any recent utterance of the President of the Board of Agriculture or of any other British minister in the recent discussion in the Dudley election, for example, which would warrant the statement that the British Government has used as an excuse the allegation that our cattle are diseased; and if that is not founded in fact, why should we vote for it here?

Mr. PEDLOW: Is there any official information on record either here or in the Old Country setting forth the facts that the hon. member is now trying to illustrate?

Mr. FIELDING: Would it not be in order for me to ask him if there is anything on record for what he says? We are not bound to prove a negative.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: It is common talk on the street and in the press, that disease is the reason for the embargo.

Mr. FIELDING: That is no evidence on which to base a resolution of the House of Commons. This is a serious matter. I entirely agree with my hon. friend from South Renfrew in feeling that the embargo is unfair to Canada, but here is a statement that the British Government allege as a reason for the embargo that Canadian cattle are diseased. Now is that true or not? I say that the British Government, so far as I know, do not take that ground at all, and if that be so, why should we in a solemn resolution of this Parliament allege that they have? I think that it is up to my hon. friend from South Renfrew to show the ground for his statement, and if it is well-founded, I will support him, but my impression is that he cannot find any authority for the statement he makes. Holding that view, I hope that my hon. friend will not press his amendment. It is not for me to prove the contrary; it is for my hon. friend to prove that it is a fact.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): Mr. Speaker, I do not require such written documents as evidence as some hon. members seem to require. Mr. Bennett, a former member of this House, in his speech before all the Press Delegates in Calgary, gave as a reason why Canadian cattle were prohibited from entering Great Britain—and he called it a slander on the cattle of Canada; I do not know whether he said that the British Government gave this as a reason—that it was on account of disease. That is sufficient evidence for me.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman will look at the record of the 1907 conference he will see that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is right. The British Government do not assign disease as a reason. They have abandoned that, but the implication is there because of the cause for which the embargo was originally imposed.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, it is there. They have sent abroad the statement that they were refusing our cattle because they were diseased, and here we have the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) who tells us that that statement is not true. It is a slander on our cattle, and I think we should take some action to show that we resent it. If the embargo is not being maintained for the reason that was assigned in the first place, let the British government come out and say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have done so.

Mr. BUREAU: They have?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so.

Mr. BUREAU: They should do so. If it was any other country we would protest. I do not think we should allow this stigma to rest on our cattle. It is not fair that one of our staple exports should be allowed to rest under the imputation of being diseased. The impression still prevails; it is common talk in the street, and is discussed in the press. When you travel on the railway trains you will hear everybody asking why the embargo on Canadian cattle is maintained, and the reason given is that the cattle are not fit to be consumed by English people or anybody else. I say that we should take steps to remove this stigma on our cattle, and if this is the best means, I am going to vote for the amendment. I think some of our friends are a little bit too ticklish.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not laugh. Some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken would have called the hon. member for South Renfrew disloyal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, yes. I have been through the mill, boys, and I know. We are here to transact business, and I am going to vote in favour of a resolution that will have the effect of making the British Government dispel the idea that our cattle are diseased. They have created that impression, and I think it is only right that we should say we do not like it, and feel that they should dispel it.

Mr. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): I would suggest, in view of the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, (Mr. Fielding) and as it is now ten minutes to six o'clock, that it would be well to let this resolution stand until it can be licked into such shape that everybody could vote for it. So far as I can understand, there appears to be a great difference of opinion about nothing. We do not want to make ourselves ridiculous unnecessarily. I do not claim to know very much about the subject, but I have read in the papers reports of meetings where British ministers have stated that there was no disease among our cattle in Canada, and that they were not afraid of disease being carried to the English herds. I think we should let the resolution stand in the meantime.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): In the debate it has been generally admitted that the herds of Canada are practically free from disease. My hon. friend from Red Deer, when speaking of the splendid reputation for health that British cattle enjoy, apparently forgot that frequently throughout the British Isles there is an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I must correct my hon. friend as to a matter of fact. I said nothing whatever about disease among British cattle; I spoke of their immense money value.

Mr. ROBB: In that regard there is no difference between their herds and our herds, which are also of immense money value. The people of Great Britain by implication say that our Canadian cattle are diseased. Now it would be just as logical for us in Canada to say that we would not admit British cattle because frequently there are outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the herds of Great Britain and their cattle are subject to tubercular trouble. It is a matter of record that any herds coming from the British Isles are quarantined. Sometimes the cattle are returned, and sometimes they are allowed to come in and spread this disease. I think that we in this Parliament, representing the people of Canada, would be just as well justified in putting on an embargo against British cattle on those grounds, as the British Government is justified in maintaining an embargo against our cattle

because sometimes there is disease among our herds. I agree with those who have advanced the argument that we should say to Great Britain: Very well, if you wish to keep our cattle out, you can put on a tariff; but remove this stigma from our herds.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): I think we have all listened with very great interest to the debate that has taken place this afternoon, especially as it is a question that is affecting the farmers throughout Ontario to a considerable degree at the present time; not that the farmers themselves perhaps are so deeply interested in it, but the question has been raised in the province of Ontario by the Minister of Agriculture for the province, for reasons which he can perhaps better explain than I can. However, the statement of the mover of the original resolution this afternoon was one worthy of the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), and one which clearly convinces us still further that he is eminently fitted for the important positions which he has held for many years in the livestock organizations of this province. The reply of the hon. minister was, I am sure, one that appealed to us all as a most businesslike statement. I do not think I have ever seen any statement on the question which appealed to me more than that made by the minister this afternoon, which put some phases of the matter in a way that must appeal to us very forcibly. The amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) is two-fold, and with both phases of it I heartily agree. One aspect of that amendment is its approval of the course of this Government. The hon. member moves that a protest be entered against the action of the British Government, and this is a policy which has been followed by this Government ever since it came into power, and, in fact, by every Government, I think, which has been in power in Canada since the embargo was imposed. The amendment is therefore, an approval not only of the Government that holds the reins of power to-day, but also of previous Governments. But I also interpret it as a disapproval of the policy which has been adopted by the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario. The amendment to the resolution says that this Parliament, and the Canadian people represented by this Parliament, should make a protest against the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario. That minister says: "I am going over to create an agitation in Britain among the people which will be so strong that it will compel the British Government to remove the embargo." Some of his colleagues assert that the embargo is going to be removed as a result of his visit to England; and, further than that, they say that if it is removed he is going to receive all the credit therefor. Leaving that aside for the moment, let us consider what the likely results will be of the action of the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario in going to Britain at this time and taking part in the by-elections there, where this question is being discussed by the people. I think that instead of assisting the farmers of Canada in securing the removal of the embargo, his action will embitter the British people and create a feeling of resentment among them which will not easily subside; and instead of aiding the cause which he professes to have at heart, which this Parliament is anxious to aid, and which the Government has been endeavouring to bring to a successful issue, he is going to create new difficulties for the Government, which will probably have the effect of retarding the removal of the embargo. It being six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 10, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER'S REPORTS

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Acting Solicitor General) moved:

That the reports made by the Chief Electoral Officer to the Honourable the Speaker, under section 74 of the Dominion Elections Act be printed and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto and that the same be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to consider and report thereon to this House.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNED SOLDIERS—SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire, with the consent of the House if necessary, to move the following resolution:

That a Special Committee be appointed to consider questions relating to the pensions,

insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers, and any amendments to the existing laws in relation thereto which may be proposed or considered necessary by the committee; with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its proceedings and the evidence taken, for the use of the committee, and to report from time to time; and that Rule 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

The House will remember that for at least two sessions a Special Committee has been appointed to deal with these matters, and, indeed, the administrative policy followed by this country, in relation to soldiers' re-establishment has been largely developed by these special committees. The returned men have on more than one occasion requested that a similar course be pursued this session. It may be the opinion of some hon. members that this subject has been already very thoroughly considered by Parliament, and that little, if anything, could be expected from another committee this session. Still, I believe it is the disposition of every hon. member, as I know it is the disposition of the Government, that the utmost pains be taken to see that nothing is left undone within the power of the country to take care of the just demands of those who did so much for us and for the world in the late war, and that to that end we should review all the administrative activities now under way looking to re-establishment, in order to ascertain the defects, if any exist—and there must be some—and to make recommendations as to what can be undertaken to improve upon our present methods; and generally to again go over the work done in previous sessions, so that we may all be sure that to the utmost of our power we are doing everything that can be done in the way of re-establishment. I therefore have pleasure in moving this resolution which is virtually in the terms of similar motions adopted in previous sessions.

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Special Committee appointed in conformity with the resolution agreed to by the House this day to consider questions relating to the pensions, insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers, and any amendments to the existing laws in relation thereto which may be proposed or considered necessary by the committee, consist of the following members: Messrs. Arthurs, Beland, Brien, Caldwell, Chisholm, Cooper, Copp, Cronyn, Douglas (Strathcona), Edwards, Green, McGregor, McNutt, Morphy, Nesbitt, Peck, Power, Redman, Ross, Savard, Spinney, Turgeon, White (Victoria), Wilson (Saskatoon).

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of notice this motion requires consent. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, as my name is mentioned as a member of this committee, I should like to make an inquiry with reference to it. The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) has stated that requests have come to the Government from returned soldiers for the appointment of this committee. Have any particular requests been made by returned soldiers' organizations for the granting of bonuses or other privileges or rewards of a special character? As the Prime Minister has intimated, this subject was very thoroughly gone into in the three previous sessions, particularly in the last session, and a good deal of time—very properly so—has been given to the matter. Is it the intention of the Government that the work done last session shall be gone over during this session? Of course, it will depend in some degree on the committee itself. I should like to ask further whether the request for the appointment of the committee has been made by organizations of returned men, or only by private individuals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad that the hon. member (Mr. Béland) had brought up the several subjects dealt with in his remarks. I am not certain at the moment just what written requests the Government has for the appointment of this committee. In my travels through the country, though, it was the exception rather than otherwise that I should not be met at different cities, and met always by organized bodies of returned men, and the request proffered that this committee be re-appointed. I could name cities in which I recall being met by organized returned men representing not only the Great War Veterans' Association, but other organizations as well. I am quite free to state to the House that the Great War Veterans' Association, Federal Command, are very anxious for the re-appointment of this committee. They are, of course, one of the most numerous of all the soldier organizations.

I understand the hon. member also to ask what form of assistance was generally

requested, and in that connection, what is expected to be done in relation to the bonus request. Well, many suggestions have been made, many requests have been urged, for all manner of things—improvements on present machinery, new schemes of assistance, such as loans for housing, and the like; I really would not be able to recite the number and variety of requests made. Certainly we have been asked to reconsider the Government's attitude in relation to a general bonus to returned men. I have invariably stated in answer to those requests that as respects that form of assistance, a general cash bonus to returned men, the Government had stated its policy adverse to the suggestion, and that that policy had not been changed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTAL FUNDS

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Have any of the Government departments, boards or commissions, had overdrafts at the banks or eslewhere, since the end of the last fiscal year?
2. If so, what are the names of such departments, boards or commissions, and to what amount were their accounts overdrawn in each case?
3. How do matters stand now with respect to such overdrafts?
4. Has any such department, board or commission, used funds belonging to the British or other Government since the end of the last fiscal year?
5. If so, how do the accounts now stand with respect to the funds so used?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

Departments Generally—

1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5, answered by No. 1.

Militia and Defence—

1. So far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned the answer is in the negative.

2 and 3, answered by No. 1.

4. Yes; British Post Office Funds.

5. The accounts are closed with the Militia Department.

Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada—

1. None by Board of Pension Commissioners.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. The Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, acting as agent for the Imperial Ministry of Pensions, disburses funds belonging to the Imperial British Government for that ministry on account of pensions, medical treatment, and vocational re-training granted to, or in respect of, ex-members of the Imperial Forces.

5. For the purposes mentioned above two bank accounts are operated, one with the Bank of Montreal, London, England, and the other with the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, and the balances of funds at credit at December 31st, 1920, were respectively: Bank of Montreal, London, Eng., £160,-638 .4s, .2d.; Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, Can., $135,883.08.

EXCHANGE IN CUSTOMS TRANSACTIONS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Is the Government aware that the Customs collectors are still estimating the American dollar at par, in reference to goods imported from the United States?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to instruct Customs collectors so that they appraise such goods at the current rate of exchange as has been done in the case of European currency?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. Yes.

2. Section 59 of the Customs Act provides that in computing the value for duty of the currency of country of export, the rate thereof shall be such as has been ordered and proclaimed from time to time by the Governor in Council, and the rate so ordered shall be based upon the actual value of the standard coins or currency of such country as compared with the standard dollar of Canada, in so far as such comparative values are known. There is no difference in value between the standard dollar of Canada and the standard dollar of the United States.

STEEL CONTRACT

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Has the Government put an end to a contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company for the supply of steel?
2. If so, what was the nature of that contract?
3. What was the amount of same?
4. What were the reasons which led to the annulment of that contract?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. The Government has rescinded the contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company for the supply of steel plates.

2 and 3. The contract provided for the construction by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of a modern 110 inch plate mill at Sydney and for the purchase by the Government from the company of a minimum quantity of 50,000 tons of plates per annum for five years.

4. The demand for plates, as the result of the decline in shipbuilding all over the world, practically ceased during the latter part of 1920. Consequent upon these conditions there was a marked decline in the price of plates more especially in the United States and Belgium. Had the contract been continued the Government would be obliged to market as much as possible of the quantity of plates it had agreed to purchase, in competition with those offering by Belgium and the United States, which course would doubtless entail a substantial loss to the Government. In these circumstances, the Government concluded that the public interests would be more fully protected by renouncing the contract.

S.S. CANADIAN SAPPER

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Did the steamship Canadian Sapper arrive in Halifax from St. John's, Newfoundland, on or about January 22, 1921?
2. What is her deadweight tonnage?
3. How many tons of cargo did she carry on the trip in question from St. John's to Halifax?
4. How many tons of coal per day does this ship consume?
5. What rate of wages was paid to the able bodied seamen on this ship during the said voyage?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Customs at Halifax reports the arrival of the Canadian Sapper at that port on or about January 22nd, 1921.
2. Approximately 2,800 tons.
3. The board of management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has made no report respecting the cargo carried.
4. About 18 tons per day.
5. No information in the Department, the matter being one entirely under the direction of the Board of Management.

BAIE STE. CATHERINE—TADOUSSAC SERVICE

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government through the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Post Office, received any petitions or demands for a steamer service between Baie Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac, in the County of Saguenay, under the control of the Government.
2. Has the Government considered the necessity and advisability of such a service being granted?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to grant the request contained in the said petitions?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Upon consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries it was decided that as this was a ferry service it should be supported by the Provincial Government.

TORONTO POST OFFICE

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

Were a number of single women appointed to the permanent staff in the Toronto Post Office when fifty-five returned soldiers with the necessary qualifications were overlooked? If so, why?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: Ten single women, one of whom has since resigned, were selected for permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission. They had all passed the necessary Civil Service Examination to qualify for permanent appointment, and were the senior qualified temporary clerks. Fifty-five temporary clerks were taken on for the annual leave. Five of them were stenographers, and were afterwards kept on to fill permanent vacancies on the staff. Eleven of the remaining fifty were kept on temporarily to replace permanent employees absent on account of illness, and thirty-nine were let out, their services not being required. None of the thirty-nine let out had passed the necessary Civil Service Examination to qualify for permanent appointment. No returned soldiers who possess the necessary qualifications have been overlooked.

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

Is it the intention of the Government to delay for another year the carrying out of the Bill passed last session, entitled "An Act to provide for the retirement of certain members of the Public Service"?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The subject is under consideration. An announcement will be made in due course.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to bring forward this session a Bill for the retirement and pensioning off of civil servants?
2. If so, when will it be presented?

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No decision to that end has been reached.
2. Answered by No. 1.

OIL AND GAS PERMITS AND LEASES

Mr. GRIESBACH:

1. With respect to Section (56) of the regulations for the issue of oil and gas permits and leases in the Northwest Territories of Canada, are the citizens of any other country debarred from acquiring a permit or lease under the said regulations?

2. If so, what nationals are so debarred and why?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Citizens of any country, the laws, customs and regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of the British Empire are debarred from acquiring a permit or a lease under the said regulations.

2. A list of the nationals so debarred has not yet been prepared.

MR. A. H. BLACK

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is A. H. Black an employee of the Separation and Assigned Pay Branch of the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. If so, has he had any military service in C.E.F.?
3. Is he being appointed to the permanent staff?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes.
2. Mr. Black voluntarily enlisted in the C.E.F., but was discharged as medically unfit.
3. He has been recommended for permanent appointment.

MR. H. S. DOUGLAS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Was H. S. Douglas an employee of the Separation and Assigned Pay Branch?
2. Is this Mr. H. S. Douglas now in the employ of this branch of the service?
3. If not, for what reason did Mr. Douglas leave the service?
4. Who is filling the position formerly held by Mr. Douglas?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. On account of discovery of certain irregularities.
4. Staff-Quartermaster-Sergeant H. Whitfield, Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps (a returned soldier).

Mr. A. H. ANDERSON.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is A. H. Anderson an employee of the Separation and Assigned Pay Branch of the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. If not, when did he resign or leave the service?
3. Has any one been appointed to take his place? If so, who?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

Mr. G. B. BRACKENBURY

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is G. B. Brackenbury an employee of the Separation and Assigned Pay Branch of the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. If so, on what date was he appointed?
3. Has he been recommended to be appointed to the permanent list?
4. Prior to joining the service what was his occupation?
5. Has he had any military experience?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes.
2. 22nd April, 1915.
3. Yes.
4. Machinery agent.
5. No.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS

Mr. KAY:

1. In connection with the coming census of Canada, who is to appoint the census enumerators?
2. If all enumerators have been appointed, who appointed them?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Census Commissioners subject to approval by the Dominion Statistician.
2. No enumerators have been appointed.

BELGIAN PURCHASES IN CANADA

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Were there any stipulations or conditions attached to the agreement extending a credit of $25,000,000 to the Government of Belgium which would tend to restrict the purchases to manufactured goods?
2. Of the foodstuffs purchased by Belgium in Canada, by means of this credit, amounting to the sum of $277,774, what portion of the said sum comprised manufactured articles of food?
3. Was there anything in the said agreement which would have prevented the Government of Belgium, if it so desired, to purchase in Canada by means of this credit, our Canadian hard wheat?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. The agreement of March 21, 1919, provided, as follows:

"The said credit shall be by the said Government of the Kingdom of Belgium utilized exclusively for the payment of the purchase price, free on board at Canadian ports, of goods produced in Canada, of kinds and descriptions approved by the said Government of the Dominion of Canada, and shall be, as nearly as possible, distributed in the following proportion:—

1/5 (one fifth) for foodstuffs,
1/5 (one fifth) for raw materials; and
3/5 (three fifths) for manufactured articles."

2. The foodstuffs purchased comprised the following: Bacon, $186,016.57; Cheese, $77,620.90; Butter, $3,528.00; Macaroni, $1,144.00; Salmon, $9,435.00; total, $277,744.47.

3. No.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR SUPPLIES

Mr. EULER:

1. Is it true that the Militia Department at Ottawa sold war supplies to junk dealers at such prices as $1 per pair for leather boots; 10 cents per shirt for flannel fatigue shirts; 35 cents per garment for woollen underwear; 90 cents a pair for woollen trousers; $1 per mattress for Ostermoor mattresses?

2. Has the Government investigated the charges?

3. If so, were they true?

4. If they have not been investigated, does the Government intend to do so?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: All sales made by the Militia Department have been made by authority of, and through the Purchasing Commission of Canada. No new articles have been sold at prices quoted. Much higher prices were obtained in the case of new articles surplus to requirements, which prices have been set by the Purchasing Commission of Canada. Part-worn articles have been sold also at prices fixed by the Purchasing Commission of Canada as hereunder, in accordance with percentage serviceability:

Boots, ankle, part-worn, $1.40, $1.50 and $1.75.
Shirts, flannel, 60c.
Shirts, service, 35c and 85c.
Shirts, winter, 35c and 40c.
Shirts, woollen, 35c and 40c.
Drawers, woollen, 35c and 40c.
Trousers, hospital, woollen, $1.
Mattresses, hospital, $2.50 and $4.

In addition to the above, "lots" of condemned stores (junk) have also been sold by authority of the Purchasing Commission of Canada at prices varying from 35 cents to 45 cents a pound. These last mentioned items were stores absolutely "unserviceable" and properly condemned by Boards of Survey in accordance with prevailing regulations.

PECUNIARY CLAIMS CONVENTION

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Does the Board of Arbitration, established pursuant to a convention called "Pecuniary Claims Convention" to give award upon the claims of money existing between the British Empire and the United States, among which are included the claims of Canadian hay dealers for overpaid rates of duty, still exist?

2. If so, does the Government know when the re-opening of the sittings of said board, which have been suspended since 1914, will take place?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

3. Does the Government intend to take steps toward the resumption of the hearings of said board in a near future?

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. A sitting for the delivery of awards was held at Paris on the 18th December, 1919, and the question of further sessions to deal with claims not yet disposed of is now under consideration by the Governments concerned.

3. Answered by No. 2.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if the attention of the Prime Minister has been drawn to a despatch appearing in a number of eastern papers and particularly in yesterday morning's papers of this city. The despatch reads:

Victoria, March 8.—Attorney-General J. W. DeB. Farris, during the discussion in the Legislature to-day on Premier Oliver's motion asking the Legislature to approve an address to Ottawa requesting an amendment to the Canadian Temperance Act, to prohibit importations of liquor into British Columbia, criticized the Doherty measure as a worthless one which prohibition provinces had refused to take advantage of because it was wholly unworkable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman would perhaps be in order if he would submit a question, but not in reading an article which, as far as I can understand, is not essential to the question at all.

Mr. STEVENS: I was just going to submit my question. The question I wished to ask was if, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, the statement made in the press despatch as coming from the Attorney General of British Columbia is correct, namely, that the so-called Doherty Act is a worthless measure and in the second place—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The second question I trust will be more directly in point than the first one which serves to reflect on an Act of Parliament, and therefore is not a proper question to submit, either on the Orders of the Day or on giving notice.

Mr. STEVENS: I desire to ask another question. Is it true that several provinces of Canada, having prohibitory laws, have refused to take advantage of this Act? Another question I should like to ask is—will the Prime Minister please state if, in the opinion of the Government, the present Canada Temperance Act,

known as the Doherty Act, will prevent importation of liquor into provinces to the full extent of the prohibitory laws of such provinces?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: In answer to the first question, whether the statement of the Attorney General has been brought to my attention, I can say that it was not until brought in the form of the question of to-day. In answer to the second question, whether the Act known as the Doherty Act is worthless, or invalid, I have no hesitation in saying "No". As to whether provinces have refused to avail themselves of its provisions, having adopted prohibitory measures, I would say that no province has done so, because it is a Dominion Act and goes into effect by virtue of the force of a Dominion statute, irrespective of the will of any province, once that province passes laws relating to liquor within its own domain. As to whether the Act prevents the ingress of liquor to be used contrary to the laws of the province, I say that it does; those are its terms and the validity of its terms has never been challenged.

PRIVILEGE—MR. PEDLOW

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I find on page 79 of the printed copy before me of Votes and Proceedings of yesterday that an amendment standing in my name to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. Smith) is not the amendment as moved by me yesterday. The amendment as it appears in the Votes and Proceedings reads: Shall I read it?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. PEDLOW: The correct amendment as moved by me will be found on page 762 of Hansard. Shall I read it?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like this error corrected at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter was brought to my attention a few moments before I came into the Chamber, and the hon. member is quite right in his statement of fact. As I understand it, a suggested alteration in the amendment was engrossed upon its back by the Prime Minister, and when the document was transmitted to the proper officer of the House to have it entered in the Votes and Proceedings he quite inadvertently, through incorrect instruction, put in the amended motion as prepared by the Prime Minister. The amendment as submitted by the hon. gentleman apears on page 762 of Hansard, and I will see that the proper entry is made in the Journals.

PURCHASES OF GERMAN GOODS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (Renfrew South): Is it the intention of the Government to follow the same course as that pursued by the Chancellor of Great Britain in regard to payments of purchases from Germany? I find that it is the intention of the Imperial Government to pass an enactment whereby 50 per cent of the purchase money for German goods will be paid to the British Government and 50 per cent will be paid to the seller, and the German seller will receive a voucher for the amount—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman has submitted his question. The answer, if any is to come, should come from the Government.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I have no difficulty in answering. The matter has not yet been submitted to the Government in such definite form that there is anything for consideration.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister ouf Finance inform us when the House will receive the remaining volumes of the Auditor-General's Report? According to the Statute the entire report should be placed upon the table of the House within a week of the assembling of Parliament, and with the report incomplete the volumes that have already been tabled are of little value.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) was kind enough to bring the matter of the Auditor General's report to my attention a couple of days ago, and since getting the benefit of that reminder, I have had the pleasure of tabling the first two volumes of the report. I hope to have the third volume ready for the House this week, and as soon as the work is finished on that, I shall use my utmost efforts to have the rest of the report tabled. I hope to have the complete report brought down to the House earlier than has been the usual practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My. hon. friend speaks of the "usual practice." The usual practice has come to be to bring the last volume of the report down about the end of the session. That is a practice to which we wish to take very strong exception. The law requires that the entire report shall be brought down within a week after the assembling of Parliament. My hon. friend can see that it is impossible for us to discuss the Estimates until we have the full report.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I was referring to was my anxiety to get away from that practice of almost immemorial standing which my hon. friend deplores. I think I got the complete report down earlier last year, and I am going to try and get it down still earlier this year.

THE BUDGET—APPROXIMATE DATE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Do not think the practice is of immemorial standing. I should like to submit a question to my hon. friend touching the Budget. I do not mean to express a desire that he shall at the present stage fix a date on which the Budget shall be brought down, but so much of the business of the House depends on the presentation of the Budget that it would be helpful if he would give us some information as to the approximate date he expects to bring it down. I should not like to ask my hon. friend to be definite.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): The hon. member will realize the difficulty of intimating even an approximate date at this moment. He himself has gone through the toils and trials and tribulations that a revision of the tariff entails. As soon as you get up to a certain point, you get a lot of other information, and delegations come from all over Canada. I have been busy all this morning with delegations, and will be busy with them again this afternoon. These gentlemen, of course, have the right to be heard and to have their cases considered as well as one can possibly consider them. All I can say is that there is no stint of time being given to the question, and the Budget will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

GREAT LAKES—ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TRANSPORTATION

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 8, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Keefer, for the appointment of a Special Committee on deep waterway transportation from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. DANIEL D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, subject of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) is not altogether new in this House, for we have discussed more than once most of what is included in that resolution. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I should like to express my appreciation of his having brought this matter before the House and of the very able manner in which he presented his case. His arguments were strong, and I am sure that hon. members who had the opportunity of hearing his speech were pleased with his presentation of the case. But as he dealt with the subject matter of the resolution largely from the point of view of Ontario and the West, I think it is only fair that something should be said from the other end of the navigable route which he proposes to make a more complete avenue of trade than it is at present. In Nova Scotia we appreciate very highly inland navigation as far as it goes. The river St. Lawrence up as far as Montreal, and as much further west as we can take full advantage of it, is of great benefit to the people of the province of Nova Scotia, and if this route is extended further west to Port Arthur, as the hon. member proposes, it would certainly be much more beneficial to Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces generally than it is at present.

I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the great opposition to Confederation in the Maritime Provinces, and particularly in Nova Scotia, was that by reason of the terms of Confederation, and the tariffs that were being imposed, our trade with the New England states was being shut off, and nothing appeared to be in sight to take its place. The people of the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick had at that time a very profitable trade with the New England states, and those who were opposed to Confederation contended, and with much force, that if this trade with the New England states was shut off by reason of Confederation, and no new trade routes opened in other directions, we would be getting the worst of the bargain. The building of the Intercolonial railway was therefore proposed as a remedy. We were told that it would afford an avenue for the sending of our goods to Ontario and western points. But I need not remind you, Sir, that we have

been very much disappointed in that respect. The freight rates have always been a hindrance to that trade, and now they are absolutely prohibitive. So far as our fish is concerned, I never heard of any of it being shipped west except one-half barrel of herring to Edmonton, and by the time it reached there, though its value was only $3, the freight had amounted to $8.50. That will show hon. gentlemen at once how impossible it is for us to hope for any trade with the West if we have no better means of transportation and no lower rates than the present railway communication affords. Let me say at once that I am for railways myself; if the rates were such that we could develop our trade by rail communication, I would be in favour of that means because with water transportation we are at best precluded at certain seasons of the year from the shipment of goods—traffic is suspended owing to the freezing over of the St. Lawrence. Canals are also frozen. So at certain seasons of the year there would always be a suspension of traffic owing to the waterway being unnavigable. That, of course, would not be the case with a railway; traffic would go on uninterruptedly. I need not say that in order to have a happy community and trade conditions that will be satisfactory to the different provinces, it is highly necessary that there should be reciprocity in trade between the several provinces. If we in the East get flour from Manitoba and the West, and manufactured goods from Ontario and Quebec, it is only rational to suppose that the people of the Maritime Provinces would be anxious to ship their goods west in exchange for the commodities that they buy there. If the traffic is all one way and our perishable goods cannot reach the people of the West in a fresh state, things will not be satisfactory. We therefore have a strong desire that there should be a means of getting our fish, and also our coal and lumber and whatever else we have to exchange, conveyed to the interior of the country in such a way that we shall be able to carry on a satisfactory trade.

Under present conditions it is highly desirable that we should encourage proper immigration to this country in order to swell our population. We have now only eight or eight and one-half millions of people, and we are faced with per capita responsibilities which are enormous, startling, to say the least; and it is not at all conducive to success in any attempt to bring immigrants to this or any other country when you are obliged to tell them that the per capita debt is very large, the cost of living very high, and conditions such as to require a great deal of money to be able to live comfortably. If this navigation were opened it would have a tendency, for one thing, to cheapen food. We in the province from which I come pay $16 per barrel for flour to-day, and have been paying in the neighbourhood of this sum for a number of years past. Perhaps it is a little cheaper now, but it is most extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, that in this country, where we have millions upon millions of bushels of wheat, and from year to year are told that there are large surpluses which we are not using, the poor miner, the poor lumberman, and the poor fisherman should have to pay $16 for a barrel of this staple commodity. There is something wrong somewhere when in this country, where we have such enormous production, and possibilities for further production of wheat, that we should have to pay as much for flour as in countries where wheat is not grown. I submit to the Government and to the people generally that there should be some way of surmounting this difficulty, and we should do everything in our power to bring about such a condition as would enable us with confidence to point out to prospective immigrants that at least one thing they might be certain of, and that was that there was plenty to eat for everybody in the country and that this was not an expensive place to live in. Now, if by opening of navigation between Port Arthur and the Atlantic —and I believe a great part has been opened already—we can make transportation cheaper, so that the flour from the West can reach the Maritime Provinces more easily than at present, our people would have every reason to anticipate great results.

So far as coal is concerned, let me say to the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and particularly to the Government, that one thing of which we can assure them is the fact that we have inexhaustible quantities of magnificent coal in the province of Nova Scotia. The people of Ontario have in the past been somewhat fastidious in regard to the quality of the coal they burn, and they have complained that our coal smoked, was sooty, and so forth. Well, let me say that we in Nova Scotia think we are just as good as any other people on earth,—not better, but just as good—and we find our coal quite satisfactory and conducive to comfort. It gives us all the warmth and comfort we need, and

for that reason we should have no hesitation whatever in recommending its use to the people of Ontario and other provinces further west to which it could be carried if this channel of communication were opened. As to the route which my hon. friend proposes. I am not in a position to offer very much criticism, but the sooner we get some satisfactory route the better.

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) is not here, but I notice that the other night he made a speech on this question, and I wish to compliment him, in passing, on the adroitness which he displayed on that occasion. As a verbal juggler and acrobat I think he is unrivalled in this country of ours. People marvel at the dexterity of a man who is able to keep five or six balls in the air at the same time, but I never before saw a man who could keep five or six canals in the air with such success as the Minister of Railways and Canals. He did this with wonderful skill. By the way, I am glad to see that he has now come into the House, and I want to tell him that I should like to know how he was able to keep six canals in the air at once as he did the other day. I trust that he will be prevailed upon to do something besides dazzling the eyes of the Canadian people with this art of his of keeping these things in suspense. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that in exchange for the things which the people of the West have to give us we can supply coal especially; and I think it is common knowledge also that we have inexhaustible schools of magnificent fish in Nova Scotia. It is unnecessary to tell hon. gentlemen in this House that fact, because, judging from the fish they eat in this part of the country, I would say that they know nothing whatever about good fish. This magnificent food they get only when it is spoiled. I have been eating at the restaurant here since coming to Ottawa and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I never eat fish—I simply cannot; it is so unlike the genuine article that I cannot touch it. But as I see other gentleman eat it with apparent relish it strikes me that they do so because they do not know better. Now, if this navigation were opened and our ships could come up here with this article of food, I am sure that a great development would take place in connection with this industry, such as has never been known before. You know, Mr. Speaker, as well as I do, that we are only touching the fringe of the industry. We are only at the edge of what can be produced from the fisheries in our province, and on the coast generally. I have no desire to take up more time. My heartiest approval is given to the resolution and the ideas which it contains. I again congratulate the hon. gentleman who introduced it upon bringing it before the House, and I sincerely trust that something substantial will result. The Minister of Railways and Canals made a speech the other night which I scarcely think the hon. mover might have expected as a comment on his resolution. We were told that a mere letter had been written to an official of this Government by the Minister of Railways telling him to do certain things. Well, suppose we had the answer which that official will make to the letter. What good is that? I am not aware of any arrangement between this country and the United States by which we can ask some official of this Government to make a certain report which could be binding on that country.

Hon. Mr. REID: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to correct him. He does not understand what I really intended to convey with reference to the letter. I desired to explain to the House that the Government had taken action by writing a letter to the Chairman of the International Joint Waterways Commission bringing the matter to their attention, and also that an Order in Council had been passed bringing it before the United States Government. The whole question has been placed in the hands of the International Joint Waterways Commission—composed, of course, of representatives of both countries—and they are now making an examination and will present an official report. The report will be signed by the Commissioners of both countries, but, of course, it is not binding in any way. It will be merely an official report and both governments will be in a position to take action as they see fit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understood the position set forth by the minister the other night, and it is exactly as I stated. It was a letter written by the minister to an official of this Government. It was not a letter addressed to the Commission because I took particular care to find out what kind of a communication it was. If we expect to get a report from the Waterways Commission it would be in response to a request sent to it by this Government. The letter in question being merely a communication sent to one of our own officials that official would no doubt reply over his own signature, which would mean nothing

at all. Let me tell the Minister of Railways the matter is one that should be governed by common sense rules. In a matter of an international character it is customary for delegates appointed by this Government to meet delegates appointed by the Government of the United States; in other words this Government agrees with the Government of the United States, with the assistance of the Imperial Government, as to what things are to be done by the Waterways Commission. And when, following negotiations between the Governments concerned, an agreement is reached, then our Government will submit legislation to Parliament to confirm the agreement, and a similar course will be pursued by the United States in obtaining the sanction of Congress. Then it will be possible to make some progress with the question. But the mere sending of a letter by the Minister of Railways to an official of our own is certainly a capital way of delaying the matter and deferring action; no beneficial effect will follow as far as the country is concerned. I am sorry that in all the years this Government has been in power they have done nothing with this very important question, but merely cause one letter to be written to an official, good and capable as that official may be. Let me say to the Minister of Railways that I have the highest possible appreciation of his ability as a politician; in fact there never was a better one connected with the Government. I hope the Government will hang on to him and that he will not be among those ministers whom it is intended to discard. As a man who will keep things going under the least possible pretext they will never get the like of him agaain. There is this further to be said about the present Government: They are so busy defending their own heads, defending their lives and avoiding political graves and political graveyards, that they are paying very little attention to the business of the country; all their time and all their energy is devoted to keeping clear of the undertaker. Let me say in conclusion that I have much pleasure in assisting my good friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) in dealing with this very important question.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when this resolution was introduced. By reason of my absence all I have heard of the debate has been that portion of it which was contributed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) who has just resumed his seat. I have no desire to discuss the merits of the question, as to the desirability of constructing a deep waterway system between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic via the St. Lawrence route. As I understand it, the International Commission, on which the United States and Canada are equally represented, are thoroughly investigating whether the project is feasible from a commercial standpoint, and also whether it would reduce the cost of transportation. The International Commission, I believe, have been looking into the question very carefully and have been holding meetings not only in the various sections of Canada that might be interested in the scheme, but also at various points throughout the United States. If that is the case, and I have no doubt it is, the report of that commission, containing all the evidence given before it, will no doubt be available to every member of this House and each will then be able to consider the question from an intelligent standpoint.

The resolution itself asks that a committee of members of the House be appointed to re-investigate the very question that is being inquired into by the Deep Waterways Commission. Let me point out that it is absolutely impossible for a committee to sit, take evidence, and present a report without incurring a great deal of expense even if that committee be composed of members of Parliament. The resolution also asks that the committee be allowed to sit during the recess, which will also still further increase the expense. Now the estimates that have just been submitted to Parliament call for an expenditure of $586,000,000, and the Supplementary Estimates are yet to be presented. If that is not enough to stagger the mind of any hon. member and set him wondering where we are going to get our revenues, then he must be possessed of a very vivid imagination. Personally I am absolutely opposed to appointing unnecessary commissions of any kind, especially where it will simply be duplicating an enquiry already under way. Therefore, without discussing the matter further I wish to state that I am opposed to this resolution.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): I believe that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is the only member who has said anything against the great national and international undertaking contemplated by the resolu-

4 p.m.

tion. I have closely watched the debate that has so far taken place, and there has been, with that exception, a unanimous expression of opinion in favour of this deep waterways canal and hydro-electric power development plan. Personally I believe it to be the most progressive step taken in Canada for many years. I regard this great waterway as a national asset, and the proposal to harness the forces of nature and place them at the service of mankind is one of its most desirable features. I agree with some hon. gentlemen that the estimate of the probable cost is doubtless far too small, but the territory to be benefited will be extremely large. The area of country which this great waterway will serve, not only in Canada but in the United States produces an abundance of agricultural products, oil, gas, and minerals of all kinds. I strongly believe in developing the St. Lawrence waterway system. In my opinion it will be a great adjunct to the Welland canal upon which so large an amount of money has already been expended. Let us remember that if we bring the channel up to the level of lake Ontario we have assured the wisdom of building the Welland canal.

Knowing something of hydro power development, I believe that the power which would be generated would of itself pay for the whole undertaking, as every horsepower that we did not need could be sold to the great New England centres at a handsome profit. This development, too, will also help us in the electrification of our railways, which is certain to come. Under the most scientific tests it has been demonstrated that the electrically driven locomotive is far and away superior to the steam locomotive both in tractive power and speed, to say nothing of ease of operation.

This country is exceedingly fortunate in owning three great rivers, the Nelson and Mackenzie absolutely, and the St. Lawrence jointly with the United States, although it is practically ours. I do not wish to say anything to make the United States suspicious, but it is patent that we hold the key to the great inland lakes, and we believe that our neighbours will not only help this project forward, but we will assess them on the basis of tonnage so the scheme will pay for itself. As some authorities have said, we could scrap it after a year's operations. But we of course would not do that. We believe that the Americans will pay towards the deepening of this waterway and also contribute towards its maintenance on a percentage basis. I would not for one moment defend this proposition if I thought it would mean increasing our national debt, but I fully believe that it would be good policy to proceed with this undertaking which would be to the great advantage of the country and without being a great burden on our shoulders. Think of the cheapening of food brought down from the West for the benefit of the East; and think of the corresponding benefit to the West from Nova Scotia coal being carried direct to the head of the Lakes.

Then this development should be undertaken as an indirect benefit, a stimulus to immigration, and we should see to it that in all contracts Canadian labour and Canadian material are used; and I know that we have factories that can make everything requisite for hydro power development.

Then we need cheap labour. When we go down to the vicinity of New York city and see the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in the development of elevated, surface and subway lines of railway we can only regret that we also have not a similar development. We know that all that was done with cheap labour. At the present time hydro development costs about three to four dollars where before the war it only cost one dollar. The last word in hydro-electric power to-day depends on cheap labour. But let this international arrangement be made so that the immense power to be derived from the St. Lawrence river can be developed proportionately for the United States and for Canada, for nothing will give a greater stimulus to our trade, and nothing will enthuse Canadians more than to see ocean-going boats steaming straight through to the head of the Lakes.

I believe the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) mentioned the Georgian Bay water system. I must be an optimist, for I believe in that too. But let me assure hon. members that in developing the St. Lawrence route we shall supplement the Georgian Bay project and bring its accomplishment closer. The St. Lawrence route is a necessity for ocean-going boats, while the Georgian Bay route is only suitable for small craft. Therefore, there need be no friction between these two routes, and I am just as much in favour of the Georgian Bay route when the time for it comes, as I am of this route.

A great deal has been said in this House about the high cost of transportation.

We know that it is very high and is adding to the cost of lving. Now, this hydro development will have a tendency to increase our domestic trade for we will not have to go to Pennsylvania for coal when our railways are electrified, and we know that no other country in the world is so well endowed by nature in this respect as is Canada. It makes my heart throb to think of the great potential wealth of this vast country of ours, and I am highly pleased to think that this project is working into shape which will result in the greatest possible expansion from the centre to the circumference of this great country.

I am also in favour of the Hudson Bay route. There is nothing local about me!

We have always said that we are proud of the West, and the building of this canal will help to still further develop the West. We have the finest waterways of any country in the world, and their development must result in making this great country of ours still greater and more prosperous.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Living on the chain of Great Lakes, I naturally take a very keen interest in this question, although, as a Canadian, I should be equally as interested were I not living there. There is one thing that always appeals to me in reference to this project, especially when I hear hon. members asking, as I believe I heard the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) ask a little while ago: Could it be carried out as a commercial proposition? To my mind the answer to that question is to be found in the very strong opposition to this scheme from certain parts of the United States.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? I did not say that I questioned whether the scheme could be carried out as a commercial proposition. I said that the International Commission would no doubt report on whether it was a commercial proposition or not.

Mr. PARDEE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon and withdraw my remark, but I understood him the other way. There can be no question that this scheme must be a commercial proposition, because the best minds in this country and in the United States have been brought to bear on the subject, and there would not be such strenuous opposition to it from certain interests in the United States if they did not regard it as a commercial proposition. Providence has placed this great waterway at our disposal, and it is our duty to develop it as far as we can. It is true that the cost would be great—some estimate it at $100,000,000, others at as high as $300,000,000. I do not say that at the moment Canada is in a position to embark upon an expenditure so great, but I do say that as the result of any expenditure on this account there would be direct returns to the people. To my mind, many expenditures we are making to-day might be cut off and the amounts thus saved applied to a development project of this kind. There is no question of the fact that it would bring about a reduction of freight rates and result in a very great development of electrical energy—and more electrical energy must be developed in this country in order to increase development in the way of manufacturing, the production of fuel, and so on. If these results can be accomplished by the deepening of this water system, the people of Canada will be fairly repaid for any expenditure they make on that account.

A further result from the carrying out of this project would be the development of the ports of Montreal and Quebec—and the development of these ports would result in benefit to the whole country. It has been proved on numerous occasions that small vessels which have crossed the ocean can go up to the head of the Lakes, and it obviously follows that with the deepening of our waterways and the enlargement of our canal system, larger vessels can do the same; bulk will not have to be broken so often, freight rates will go down, and a general benefit will result to the people. This is a question, therefore, that this House and successive Houses must take into their most serious consideration, with a view to seeing whether or not a way can be found to carry out this project. If a committee of this House is not appointed to take evidence, or even to review the evidence already taken by the International Joint Commission, the report of that body may be given little attention, the matter may be shelved and nothing done for some considerable time. This is a live question in many respects; as to the details I do not wish to detain the House now, but it is a question which deeply and vitally affects the interests of the whole people. I therefore have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of my hon. friend from Port Arthur.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): I am sorry that I have not heard all that has been said during the course of this debate, but I do not think there

should be any lack of unanimity among hon. members with regard to the resolution before the House. A matter of most vital importance in this country is the development of our national resources in such a way that Canada will receive the greatest possible benefit from them. The water-Powers of Canada are unquestionably among the greatest natural resources which the country possesses. They have this enormous advantage over other natural resources: so long as the earth lasts, water will last and water-powers will exist. It is therefore extremely important, and in the public interest, not only that they should be developed but also that they should be nationally owned and controlled and that the public should get the direct benefit of these vast resources.

It is absolutely necessary for Canada to take such action as will help to get her out of her present state of debt, particularly that vast load of debt which the war has put upon her. The St. Lawrence route is the greatest national resource that Canada has. It has an enormous advantage over every other public work that this country has heretofore undertaken. The development of that route, the making of a depth of thirty feet over the sills in the canals, so that ships drawing thirty feet of water may go up and down the St. Lawrence, will bring about the production of such an amount of electrical energy that the people of Canada will receive by way of rental an amount sufficient to pay the interest on the vast cost of this development. It does not seem, therefore, necessary to argue that as soon as possible a report should be obtained with regard to the matter and data put before Parliament so that intelligent action can be taken. I understand that an international commission has been dealing with the matter, and I assume that at any early day we shall have engineering and other statements which will enable us to form an intelligent idea of what can be done and what the cost will be. There is no doubt that the work would have to be undertaken internationally, because at least thirty-five states of the United States have so far placed themselves on record as being in favour of the project. The State of New York has uniformly opposed the project, but so far as Canada is concerned, the only opposition to it that I have heard has come from the city of Montreal. Well, I do not think that opposition is serious, because, when all is said and done, the great city of Montreal will undoubtedly benefit as much as the rest of Canada by this project. The only question in the minds of shipping people is whether this project should be carried out, or whether what is known as the Georgian Bay Canal route would be the better. Now, I have heard men who were the best people, so far as I could find, to express an opinion in the matter, say that it would take so long for ships to cover the long canal distance involved in the Georgian Bay route, the rate of speed being necessarily slow, that the thing would be impracticable from a shipping point of view, and that the St. Lawrence route is the natural and the best route for the shipping interests of this country. We can get the coal resources of Cape Breton up to the head of the Lakes only if we carry out this great project of canalizing the St. Lawrence; and what it would mean to the people of Canada to buy practically all their coal in their own country is something which no one can readily compute. But I venture to say that one of the most important things to the people of Eastern Canada is the obtaining of their own coal in Canada from Canadian coal mines. The completion of the project which we have been discussing to-day would put us in such a position that, at least so far as Eastern Canada is concerned, we should not have to depend upon the United States for our chief supply of coal. Moreover, the ships that bring the coal up from the Nova Scotia districts could take grain down there, and that grain could be shipped from Nova Scotia to the Old Country during the winter months.

The importance of this project is so great, in my opinion, that we should give it immediate consideration in the general interests of Canada. It would lead to the cheapening of freight rates from the great West; it would produce from four to five million horse-power right in the centre of Canada, where labour is easily obtained and transportation easily available for the manufactured goods which would be turned out in large quantities as the result of the utilization of these vast water-powers. It would enable us also, as I have said, to get supplies of coal from Nova Scotia to the head of the Lakes; to send our grain down to the eastern ports, and, generally speaking, to promote the development of our great natural resources.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the addresses that have been delivered with regard to

the resolution now before the House, and I have come to the conclusion that this is another proposal under which the people of Canada are going to be asked to expend an enormous sum of money in order to develop transportation on our inland waters. I would respectfully ask the House, before reaching a decision on the subject, to consider this question: We have already expended over $400,000,000 on deepening, buoying and lighting our rivers, building canals, dredging, deepening and lighting our harbours, for the purpose of cheapening the rates on the freight carried on those waters. What has been the result? Simply this, that the more money we spend, the higher go the rates. The rates have been doubled, trebled and quadrupled, and this Parliament has no control. The time has come when we must take a decided stand on this question, and I for one would oppose the expenditure of any large sum of money on this proposition until Parliament has absolute control over the rates that are to be charged on our inland and coastal waters. It is very nice for these gentlemen to get up one after another and say: "Oh well, we will go on and spend this enormous sum of money, three or four hundred million dollars, in carrying out this proposition, and we will give you cheaper rates." That has always been the cry—that was the cry that helped to build the canals. It is the same old cry that men are making who are coming and asking this Government to deepen, buoy and light harbours, deepen rivers and build canals. It is the same old story. We are going on spending tens of millions of dollars in building the Welland canal. What control have we over the freight rates? Absolutely none. Yet, we meet here session after session, and when a measure is brought in asking the Government to have control over these rates, we sit here and ignore that measure. I hope, before this session is closed, we shall have control at least over the rates on freight transported on our inland waters. Until such time comes, I question whether it would be wise for us to appoint another committee and go on and see how much we can spend on such a proposition as this. I am in hearty sympathy with any means of developing transportation on our great inland waterways, but I am also in this position that I for one will at least demand that we have control over those waters and over the rates, tolls, and charges that are made by the vesselmen who operate on those waters.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the attention of the House at any great length, but I think it is my duty to express my views on the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer). I am certainly in favour of all that can be done towards the development of the country, but my opinion is that the motion which is now before the House has no other object than that of preventing the Georgian Bay canal from being built, and this, from my point of view, would be much more in the interests of the country, than would be my hon. friend's proposal. I listened the other day to the remarks made in the House, and from these I infer that if this resolution were adopted, the United States would benefit by the Canadian money which we would spend. I must say that I am surprised at the new position taken by my hon. friends on the Government side of the House, they who, in 1911, were against any trade with the Americans and who now wish to let the latter take advantage of a Canadian undertaking. I think it would be more reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to make only such expenditure as would be fully helpful to Canada, and I have always understood that the Georgian Bay canal would be built entirely and exclusively for Canada's benefit. I am astonished at such readiness to spend the large amount which would be required if a committee were appointed to report on the deepening of the St. Lawrence river, when we already have the reports made on the Georgian Bay canal, by most competent engineers, amongst whom, Mr. Sanford Evans; these reports have never been submitted to the House for consideration.

On behalf of my constituents who are interested in the building of the canal, I certainly will object to the hon. member's motion, as also to all the outlay which it would entail. I therefore request that the House adopt the necessary measures, so that the Georgian Bay canal may be built as soon as possible; this undertaking is of special interest to Canada and it would contribute largely to the development of the country.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, this is a project which is not only of national interest, but of international interest, and when a question of developing the great natural resources of Canada arises, every Canadian

is apt immediately to favour any such development on any occasion, at any time and for whatever purpose it may be intended. During the last twenty-five years many projects have been put forward in Canada; projects which to-day are calling for the serious attention of our people, projects that have not always received, perhaps, the attention they deserve; projects which have been neglected in their development and which have placed Canada to-day in a position which calls for the thoughtful attention of every business man and every tiller of the soil. For the first time in my Parliamentary life, I am not able to agree with my esteemed friend, the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), who views this project with great equanimity, and who speaks of the great prospects for the development of trade between Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces and the western provinces.

This project, as I have said, is not only national, but international,—and this is the serious point of the question which must cause every Canadian to halt in his decision in order to see what may be the effect upon the nation at large, and not merely a portion of the country which may be more directly affected by the construction of any proposed public work. This project will be for the great benefit of Canada or it will be to the great detriment of Canada. And with our great expanse of country stretching for thousands of miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and when we know that our great desire is to make Canada a nation, with every portion of the country as one in its aspirations, the East for the West and the West for the East, I consider that, instead of entering upon such a project as lightly, as I am afraid some of our Canadians are entering upon it, we should pause for a moment and consider its effect, national as well as commercial, facilities which will keep the West and the East together first of all, in order to keep Canada within the Empire, a nation worthy of the name.

It is this commercial dismemberment that attracts my attention today. I was not in the House when my hon. friend from Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) presented his resolution, but I have read his speech in Hansard and I know that he presented his case in the best possible colours and in the best language that could be used. I have also read the remarks of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan), who hopes that by this new route the products of the West will be carried to the ports of the East. Those ports were placed there by the hand of Providence, not especially for the development of the Maritime provinces, but for the benefit of the western provinces—ports which will be able to take care of all possible development in the West for centuries to come, and will help to build up a united Canada in every possible direction.

This waterway project is an international one, and we know we are in a false position at the present time on account of our traffic going to the United States instead of over Canadian railways. Had the proper attention been given to that great project initiated not so many years ago by the veteran leader of Canada for fifteen years, had the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec and St. John and Halifax been looked after as it should have been, Canada would not be confronted to-day with the problem of high freight rates. This problem of freight rates is on our hands because that great project has been neglected by the Government, and it was the only project that could unite Canada East and Canada West by transportation facilities. The products of the Prairie Provinces at the present time are taken to the city of Winnipeg, and then go to a foreign country through United States channels. Our national railways have immense deficits to-day, and next year we will have a deficit of $100,000,000. As a Canadian I believe that the people of this country will appreciate the necessities of the moment, but I do not think they will endorse this project of opening new channels of transportation and further neglecting the one that, if properly handled, would have made Canada a better nation than it is to-day. I sympathize with the Minister of Railways in having to present to Parliament the deficit existing on the National roads to-day, but I say that if the Government that took office in 1911 had been inspired with goodwill towards the Transcontinental and given its attention to the development of the road from Winnipeg to the Maritime provinces, we would not be confronted with the situation that exists to-day. At this time we should consider the best way out of our present difficulties rather than the project my hon. friend from Port Arthur and Kenora proposes, which, however much it might benefit Canada, would be of greater advantage still to the United States. It could not be otherwise, in view of the means the Ameri-

can nation possesses compared with ours. All the traffic of the American West and the Canadian West would go through American channels, just the same as it has done in the past. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will contradict me when I say that the deficits on our national railways to-day are due to the fact that we do not use them. I think everybody in the House will agree that we have commanded only forty per cent of the export trade of the West, while the other sixty per cent has gone through United States channels. What we should have done to stop the deficits was, not so much to increase the rates as to get business for the roads instead of allowing that business to go to the United States. Had we commanded ninety-five or one hundred per cent of the traffic from the West in the last five or six years, we would have scarcely any deficits at all on our railways to-day. The problem that should engage our attention to-day is how to secure for our National railways the traffic that originates in Canada, and every possible step should be taken by the Department of Railways and Canals, by the Government, and by this Parliament, to see that every bushel of grain from Winnipeg should be directed along the Transcontinental to Quebec and the harbours of the Maritime provinces. This would mean a saving of from ten to fifteen cents a bushel to the producers of the prairie provinces. That route saves 214 miles of transportation between Winnipeg and Quebec, and equally to St. John and Halifax. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) is very much concerned over the amount of coal he has to use over the road, especially during the winter season. I would tell him that with proper usage of the Transcontinental, he could save ten to fifteen per cent of his coal on the journey from Winnipeg to Quebec. The road was especially built for heavy loads and long hauls, except the last few miles, which this Government degraded with the object, no doubt, of saying that the road was not up to standard. I think every sensible man is convinced that the road as a whole cannot be surpassed, and it is the only link we have to bring the products of the west to the east, and to transport to the west the products of the east and those that come from across the sea. Nature is there, and the road is there. No one will deny that if you can save a haul of 215 miles on a certain road, it must be cheaper than a longer route. It is simply a matter of judgment, but it calls for the attention of every one in authority, and for patriotic effort on the part of the Government and Parliament. I think that before going further into transportation problems it would be well for us to undertake, the proper equipment of our railways, so that we might make the fullest use of them, for they are in need of amelioration. The Transcontinental from Winnipeg to Quebec—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is quite justified in saying that no expenditure should be incurred for waterway transportation until our railroads are more fully utilized. Up to that point I did not feel it my duty to interrupt the hon. member, but I must point out that he cannot, on this motion, discuss in detail the administration of the railways of Canada.

Mr. TURGEON: No one, Mr. Speaker, is more anxious to obey your rulings than the member for Gloucester. But there is such a close connection between the project under consideration and the question of railways that it is rather difficult for a member who feels strongly that something should be done to improve railway transportation in Canada, not to transgress the ruling you have just made. However, I shall attempt to bring by remarks to a close as speedily as possible.

Let me say that the Georgian Bay canal enlists my sympathy to a greater extent than the deepening of the Lakes, because it is a purely Canadian route. Now, I hope that my hon. and genial friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) will consider this subject in all its bearings and urge upon the House nothing that will not be in the best interests of the whole country. I should not like to see this country embark on any scheme that might not be commercially wise, nor commendable from the standpoint of patriotism. While I do not say that the proposal before the House is one that does not deserve consideration, I do say that it is one which the people of Canada can well afford to let stand in abeyance until we have placed our railways in a better position and have been able to reduce freight rates through the better operation of the roads. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is considering the improvement of our railways, and until this is done I do not think other things should be attempted. I cannot support the motion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I fear I shall be open to the same criticism

which the previous speaker encountered by discussing the railway question when a canal proposition is under consideration. But that hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) has brought before the House an important fact, namely, that we have an immense expenditure in this country in connection with our railways and that we are now seeking to improve our railway system by consolidations. While I have a good deal of sympathy with the idea of improving our transportation by waterway, by better canalization of the lakes and rivers, I say that the urgent need in this country to-day in regard to transportation is the immediate consolidation of the railways, to the end that freight rates may be reduced, as proposed by the hon. member who has just spoken. I hope that before this debate is over, indeed within the next two or three weeks, we shall have an announcement from the Government that they do intend, almost immediately, to consolidate our railway systems and so bring the relief to transportation which is loudly called for at the present time by farmers of the West and by residents of all portions of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: What does consolidation mean?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It means what it ought to mean,—great economy, great efficiency, and other desirable things of that kind, not to mention lower freight rates.

Mr. FIELDING: Consolidation of what roads?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The roads we have taken over but which we have not yet consolidated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the House will immediately realize that the speaker was more or less justified in ruling that the administration of our railways should not be widely discussed upon this resolution. I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks as far as possible to the question of waterways development.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, but my hon. friend opposite tried to lead me aside.

Mr. FIELDING: No, no.

Mr. MACLEAN: He tried to make me wander from the subject. I take it that the subject before the House is this, that we are trying to improve our waterway transportation, and it is a very expensive proposition. The canalization involved, harbour improvements, the building of ships of one kind and another, must appeal to hon. gentlemen as matters that would entail considerable expenditures. And in these times, when the country has such an enormous debt and has so many obligations to meet, if we cannot at present improve our transportation by way of this expensive proposition we can at least do something to reduce transportation charges by the improvement of our railway service, an improvement that is due and ought to be carried out almost immediately. The criticism in the country to-day is that we are under enormous expenses in connection with our railways, and that we have great deficits; and, therefore, if we cannot just for the moment go into the expensive proposition of deeper channels, new canals, improved harbours, and so forth, the Government and this parliament ought to do something immediately in the direction of reducing freight charges in Canada by the amalgamation and the co-ordination of the railroads which we now have, for their diversified administration as well as the duplications that exist represent a great waste of money. I might say on behalf of the people of Ontario that we have every sympathy with the proposal to deepen waterways and also the proposal to increase power development, which would come from the deepening of our rivers and canals. I agree with what has been said to-day as to the enormous electrical energy that could be developed in connection with these deeper waterways, and while it would not mean an entire settlement of the proposition, the Government could take up any day the first great development, namely, that between Montreal and the lower end of Lake Ontario, and in that way we should have a great source of power and be able to bring sea-going vessels into Lake Ontario. Now, if this scheme is a good one, and if you can bring ships right up Lake Ontario, you have proved the whole case. But if that preliminary part of the scheme fails, there is no need to go on. The thing that should be undertaken now, and perhaps we can do it by reason of the great demand for electrical energy, is, by co-operation on the part of the Government with the United States, to carry out an improvement at the lower end of the St. Lawrence and thus allow steamships to get to Lake Ontario. If that proved successful we should be justified in going further. These are questions connected with transportation that notwithstanding our great commitments,

must be dealt with. They ought to be dealt with now, and now to my mind is the time to press for some kind of co-operation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in the direction of deeping our waterways system.

Mr. SAMUEL WILLIAM JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I think the discussion during the past day or two on the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) indicates as clearly as could possibly be indicated that a general election is impending. Within the last thirty or thirty-five years, which is as far as I can remember, when we have had discussion on the Georgian Bay canal in the House and in the newspapers of the government of the day, that was invariably followed by a general election. Engineers were located in different parts of the country, mostly in doubtful constituencies, with mysterious looking tripods and other instruments for the purpose of influencing the electorate. To use a rather slang expression the government used to "get away with it." But to-day it seems to me that that old trick is played out. My hon. friend from Port Arthur coming from a region which perhaps is a little more backward than the constituencies farther east from which some of us come, probably thinks that the people of that district can be induced to vote for the Government on representations such as those made by the member supporting the Government. Otherwise I cannot see why such a resolution as this should be introduced at this juncture following the bringing down of the Estimates which indicate that we have to provide for expenditures of something in the region of $600,000,000. That was more than twice what the national debt of Canada was seven or eight years ago. To-day we have to provide for $600,000,000, notwithstanding that my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) told us blandly that before the war $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 meant a great deal. Now, said he, we have got accustomed to spending such vast sums it does not mean as much as it did at that time. Well, that is a curious kind of reasoning. Before we spent that two billions of dollars we had it, and we could have spent it very much better than we can now because we have not got it. But notwithstanding that these two gentlemen from the Twin cities—who think in pairs and hunt in pairs—for reasons best known to themselves are advocating the expenditure of enormous sums of money in the face of the crushing debt the interest upon which we have to meet. Physicians tell us, Mr. Speaker, that the first symptoms of paresis, a form of insanity well known, is the hallucination of the patient that he is possessed of illimitable sums of money, he proceeds to squander it in a reckless way and in due course he is examined mentally and is sent to an asylum. Now if the Government does not take care some person will have to examine them mentally and see that they are put in a place where they cannot lavishly spend the money of the people of this country. The scheme, so far as I can see, is one of the wildest that has been brought before the House—having regard to all the circumstances—since I have had the honour of being a member of it. In face of the fact that we are overbuilt in the matter of railways and will not be able to catch up for the next twenty-five or thirty years, in the face of the fact that the Estimates already brought down contain a vote of $140,000,000 to provide for these railways—and I understand that during the recess an Order in Council for an expenditure of something like $77,000,000 was obtained by the Government for the purpose of keeping these railways running—I say in the face of that, it is a foolhardy thing on the part of any member to get up and advocate a matter of this kind even in an academic way. We ought to be brought to our senses in the matter of expenditure of money; and representing as I do the city of Montreal, which contains within its borders something like ten per cent of the entire population of Canada, I cannot allow this resolution to be placed before the House without getting up and most strenuously objecting to it.

5 p.m.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): I do not want to be considered as knocking this scheme at all. In my opinion there is considerable merit in the project that is outlined in the resolution but, I think, there are other conditions that we must first take into consideration. In my opinion the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) hit the nail squarely on the head in the few remarks that he made which had reference to the control of the shipping on our Great Lakes. I do not know whether the conditions that exist at the present time in that regard are generally known or not. It is very well known to the grain trade however; and I do not think we are confronted with a bigger combine anywhere on the North American con-

tinent than the one we have to deal with in the shipment of our grain across the Great Lakes. The difficulty is not merely in connection with the freight charges; but a combination exists in connection with insurance and boat space that you cannot possibly get away from. You have got to secure your insurance in connection with your boat space or you do not get your boat space at all; and the rates that you are paying run from twenty-five to thirty per cent more than an individual could get insurance for providing he could secure boat space. Now, that is a condition that should not exist. If the Government are aware of that, I think they are somewhat dilatory in the performance of their duty in not at least attempting to remedy such a situation. Surely we should not be compelled to pay that excessive insurance we are compelled to pay by having to take insurance in conjunction with the boat space. That the two requirements should go together is bad enough; but when it becomes a case of paying twenty-five or thirty-five per cent more than you could obtain your insurance for otherwise if you could secure your boat space, then I think it is time for drastic, and very drastic action to be taken. We quite realize that the question of transportation, in so far as the West is concerned, is a very important one, very important; and water transportation should be of the utmost importance providing that we have control. But, as the member for East Lambton said, why should we continue expending millions and millions of dollars every year, as we are now doing and get absolutely no benefit from it. Rates are going up, and up, and up, and to-day they are about three times what they were a few years ago. A year ago they were about four times what they formerly were. Now, Sir, this combine not only goes to the extent of compelling you to take insurance but they absolutely refuse to move. Why, I have it on good authority that the combine in question even held up the Canada Wheat Board for days and days before they would accept shipment because they could not get the conditions that they asked for. When a combine will hold up a Board that has the Government behind it, what treatment is an individual likely to receive from an organization of that nature. In so far as the West is concerned it is not to-day a matter of water transportation. As regards getting our grain out the facilities are there. They take the grain and take it much faster than the railroads can get it to the lakes. There has never been a time that I know of that the terminal elevators have ever been full during navigation, or anywhere near full. It has generally been the case that only a very small percentage of the space at the head of the lakes has been occupied by grain when navigation closed. We lost in the West this year through lack of railway transportation far more than we could hope to gain even if we had this increased service and control over the rates. It was quite a common instance for seven, eight, ten and twelve cents, and in fact up as high as fifteen cents a bushel, more to be paid for grain where you had assurance that you could get it forwarded to the head of the Lakes at once as against taking a chance of having it forwarded one, two, three or even four months later.

The House may not be aware of all the features of the grain grade. It is not the price paid for grain, that is, cash grain in store or on track, that governs the price paid to the individual delivering on the railroad. The price he is paid for his grain is the price at which some one will purchase from you for future delivery. That delivery may be one, two, or three months hence. It is not contingent on the cash price at all, and if you were delivering grain to an elevator on a line railway where the buyer knows he is not going to get it out for, say, three months, then he has to pay the price that some one will pay him for that grain for delivery three months hence. That accounts for the discrepency. It is not the fault of the grain man at all. He is the victim of circumstances and can only pay the price that he can sell that grain for at the time he can make delivery of it. The contention has been made that the sooner the grain is got out of the country the better. That applies particularly to the interior. Get your grain out from the interior if you can, but immediately you get it to the head of the Lakes you have the Government guarantee of its quality and you have no difficulty in financing. But to my mind it is questionable whether it is advisable to throw all your grain on the European markets in one or two months, as the advocates of this scheme recommend. We have not had any trouble in getting our grain from the head of the Lakes; our trouble has been to get it to the head of the Lakes. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be wise to withhold further action on this project for some little time. If there is any money to spend, so far as the West

is concerned, I think railway improvements would be of much more value to us at the present time than increased water transportation.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Keefer) who, I presume, will close the debate, rather than to offer any argument. I notice that his resolution calls for the appointment of a committee to make an investigation as to the benefits to be derived from such a scheme. I think we all know pretty well what the benefits will be, we know they will be great, but what we are more interested in just now is the cost, and it seems to me that if my hon. friend would add that to the scope of the investigation he would be enormously increasing the benefit to be derived from it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would direct the attention of the House to the circumstance that the mover will close the debate, and therefore, if any other hon. members desire to speak they should do so now.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take any part in this debate, but in view of the way in which work is duplicated by various departments of the Government, and of the bad example set in that regard by Parliament itself, I want to say a few words. Let me begin by congratulating the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) for the position he took the other evening in regard to this motion, when he pointed out that not only the work that it is proposed to have done by the terms of this resolution but very much more extensive work is at the present time being done by the International Joint Waterways Commission. For that reason the Minister of Railways and Canals urged upon the hon. gentleman who presented this motion, and supported it in a very interesting speech, the propriety of withdrawing it instead of pressing it forward at the present time. No more timely and wholesome advice than that could possibly be given in view of the financial condition of the country and of the burdens that rest upon it, some of which are outlined in the Estimates that have already been presented to the House. As I said a moment ago, it was not my intention to intervene in this debate, but as the discussion has wandered so far afield and so many opinions, interesting and otherwise, have been vouchsafed regarding transportation generally and the carriage of water-borne goods, I may be permitted, Sir, without infringing any of the rules of the House, to follow for a few minutes the bad example set by some of my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber. For that reason, I desire to allude very briefly to that feature of the discussion which compared the benefits of the extension and deepening of the St. Lawrence channel with that of the Ottawa and its tributaries which were referred to as the Georgian Bay canal project. The Georgian Bay canal project has been very fully gone into by a committee of engineers, appointed with the sanction of Parliament and under the direction of a previous government. Investigation was carried on for some years, and in the end a very comprehensive report was made. That investigation and report cost this country a very large amount of money, and it would be just as unreasonable I submit, at this date, to propose that that work be done over again by another committee as it is to propose that a special committee of this House should be appointed to ascertain certain things which, if they have not already been ascertained, will be ascertained in a very short time by the members of the International Joint Waterways Commission. By reason of the fact that the report made by the Georgian Bay Canal Commission may not be familiar to hon. members who at the present time occupy seats in this House, and in view of certain statements in regard to it that have been made in the course of this debate, I would like, for a few moments to direct the attention of the House to some of the findings of the board of eminent engineers which was appointed to investigate that project. In the first place they reported as a result of their investigation:

> That a 22-foot waterway for the largest lake boats (600 ft. x 60 ft. x 20 ft. draft) can be established for one hundred million dollars in ten years, and that the annual maintenance will be approximately $900,000, including the operation of storage reservoirs for the better distribution of the flood waters of the Ottawa river.

Then a further finding was set forth in a subsequent paragraph as follows:

> That sufficient water may be stored within its own and adjacent watersheds to operate a summit level above Lake Nipissing. That to use the Lake Nipissing level as a summit would increase the cost at least $10,000,000 and introduce 12 additional miles of canal cutting.

A still further finding in the same report was in these words:

That the probable time taken by a lake freight boat of 12-mile maximum speed, without delays at locks or in meeting other boats, from French River harbour to Montreal would be 70 hours. That the season of navigation will average 210 days from May to November.

And later on in the report it was stated:

That with a storage system as planned, and the tributary basins thereto required for the navigation project, a reliable water-power supply is secured at various dams amounting to 1,000,000 horse-power, which can be developed for about $50 per horse-power.

And finally, there was the following declaration in that report:

That no international waters are affected.

That feature, Sir—the one I have last mentioned—was one that commended the report to a great many people in this country, and it was a feature which was alluded to the other evening by my friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), and I think, by my friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) in the course of their admirable addresses on this resolution.

Now, let me point out further, Sir, that a great portion of the water-power which this committee found could be developed, is located within easy transmission distance of the territory that would be served from the St. Lawrence. In the first place we have at the Little Chaudière and Déschênes at Ottawa, 45,000 horse-power; at Hawkesbury, 65 miles east of Ottawa, 71,000 horse-power; at Point Fortune, 75 miles east of Ottawa, 148,000 horse-power; at the Chats, 30 miles west of Ottawa, 113,000 horse-power; at the Chenaux, 50 miles west of Ottawa, 68,000 horse-power; at Calumet, 63 miles west of Ottawa, 56,000 horse-power; at Rocher Fendu No. 1 and Rocher Fendu No. 2, 65 miles west of Ottawa, 78,000 horse-power; at Paquette Alumette, 85 miles west of Ottawa, 25,000 horse-power; at Des Joachims, 140 miles west of Ottawa, 60,000 horse-power; at Rocher Capitaine, 160 miles west of Ottawa, 80,000 horse-power; at Deux Rivières, 170 miles west of Ottawa, 38,000 horse-power—or a total in the group I have just mentioned of 782,000 horse-power. In addition to these there are several smaller groups of water-powers, aggregating, according to reliable engineers, about 1,500,000 horse-power. Now, the point I want to make in connection with this group of powers is this: any one of these can be developed for a comparatively small sum of money and would supply the area to be supplied by the development of power on the St. Lawrence, while, on the other hand, according to eminent engineers, the work on the St. Lawrence would involve the development of four or five blocks of 1,000,000 horse-power each at an expense that is absolutely staggering. That is apparent from the fact that a complete waterway of 30 feet could not be secured on the St. Lawrence for even one ocean going vessel until four or five such power developments had been made. And even if one such block of horse-power were developed, it would merely serve a territory which could be reached by these smaller powers on the Ottawa river and its tributaries.

In this connection some very interesting evidence was given before the International Joint Commission at one of the sessions held last fall, I think it was, in the city of New York, in pursuance of the instructions contained in the letter from the Government to the chairman of the International Joint Commission which was read in this House the other evening by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid). At that meeting one of the most eminent engineering firms in America stated that the cost of developing the St. Lawrence river at one point alone would be $550,000,000, exclusive of the cost of all the shore works and the damages for flooding. Moreover, according to the Minister of Railways—indeed, I think also according to my friend, the member for Port Arthur, who introduced this resolution—there are four or five other such points on the St. Lawrence where the development would be in quantity such as the one I have mentioned and that would cost approximately $550,000,000 in each case.

So that, Mr. Speaker, having regard to the point first raised in this debate by the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and emphasized by subsequent speakers, it is preposterous at the present time to talk of any such expenditure as would be involved in a scheme of this kind.

However, it is quite true that the resolution of my hon. friend does not propose that this work be proceeded with; it merely proposes an investigation to see what benefits would be derived if such a development were carried out. But as has been pointed out by previous speakers, the appointment of such a committee, with power to sit during the recess, examine witnesses, travel about from place to place and conduct a general roaming inquiry, would of itself involve the expenditure of a sum of money which this Parliament, if it retains its sober senses, would under no circum-

stances think of authorizing. For that reason, Sir, and without going into the merits of these rival schemes, but having given the House some statistics for the purposes of comparison, I desire to express my entire concurrence with the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways that all good purposes would be served, at the present time in any event, by the withdrawal of this motion.

Mr. F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I think that the object of this motion has been well attained in the full discussion that has taken place thereon. I do not intend to reply to all the different arguments that have been advanced or to refer to all the points that have been raised during the course of the debate; I shall simply touch upon two or three of them. In a general way I might say that with the exception of the remarks of the member for the Cartier division of Montreal (Mr. Jacobs), the whole of the discussion has been favourable to the carrying out of the project, provided certain contingencies were concurrent. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, however, labels the project a foolhardy proposition. I am glad to know that he is not backed up by his city in that respect. I had the pleasure of attending the sitting of the International Joint Commission in Montreal, upon which occasion the city of Montreal took a much wider and wiser view of the matter, one based upon the general benefit which would accrue to the country as the result of the carrying out of this project. The remarks of the member for the Cartier division of Montreal were very much like the views expressed in Buffalo and in New York in opposition to the scheme —and I cannot help feeling that there was a certain amount of selfish interest in the opposition that came from those quarters. Be that as it may, the city of Montreal took a broad view at the public hearing held by the Commission, believing that the carrying out of the project would result in benefit to Montreal as well as to Canada generally. Montreal is able to look beyond its mountain to the West and to realize what the general benefit will be to Canada as well as to herself. I may add that it was not necessary to call in the doctor to examine any of their heads, because they took a sane view of the matter.

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend says that the city of Montreal said this and said that. Who was "the city of Montreal"?

Mr. KEEFER: Different organizations were represented, including the Board of Trade. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) extended a welcome on behalf of the city itself and made the remarks to which I refer with respect to the attitude of the city of Montreal. The only ones who were opposed to it, so far as I heard, were some shipping interests that did not want to have any shipping go past Montreal. The general trend of opinion in that city, however, was in favour of it.

The objection has been raised that any committee appointed under this resolution, would, in its operations, interfere with the work being carried on in regard to this matter by the International Joint Commission. That never was intended, and I stated so in my opening remarks. The idea in view is that when the Commission make their report, when they submit their findings or recommendations and tender the evidence which they heard, a committee of this House will be available to receive that report and look into it and see that it is distributed among members of the House instead of being consigned to the waste paper basket, as might otherwise be the case. The remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) in that respect were quite apropos. It was never intended—although the resolution is so worded, I must confess—that this committee should attempt to hear evidence on the subject while the International Joint Commission were doing the same work.

The other objection I have heard stated is that the carrying out of this project might interfere with our Canadian National railway receipts; that we have a large amount invested in our railways and must do nothing to interfere with their revenues. Well, in a sense that is a good argument, though it is not sound argument if we are asked to continue to have people pay extravagant freight rates when they could get their goods forwarded for one-tenth of the rail freight cost. But the point I want to make is that those who object to the proposal on this ground have entirely missed the point of the problem —that this is a water proposition, a proposal for the improvement of water routes, and therefore involving a decrease of water rates only and having no affect upon railway receipts. Everybody will admit that at no time when a water route is available will a person ship by rail, because the cost of shipping by rail is many times as much as by water

You can bring wheat down from Port Colborne by water for 5 cents, whereas, it costs much more by rail. Nobody would think of shipping by rail in the summer time, so that this project does not compete against railway transportation. It does, however, reduce the cost, as has been stated, of water-borne transportation during the summer months by the amount which has been stated and which has not been controverted. I have here letters from presidents of United States railways, stating that the improvement and development of this scheme will increase their receipts. Why? To-day practically everything is being taken down to New York and Boston and shipped out from those ports, and the result is that the cars are tied up. The cry is "No cars." There is a loss on those cars, a loss of earning power. They are held waiting for return cargoes, or they come back empty a long distance to the West. They all pile in at the eastern seaboard at a certain time, at the close of the year; and these gentlemen point out that, if they had several seaports, especially at a shorter distance, to which the railways could haul their cars, as they do to Port Arthur and Fort William in the summer time, they would avoid that unnecessary cost and loss. They point out that by this process you open up 2,000 miles of additional ocean navigation, and you have many additional ports to which the railways can haul freight and quickly return for more. As regards our Canadian railways, the latter advantage is not so applicable; but the point is this: In the summer time you do not see the wheat brought by rail around the north shore of Lake Superior on any of the three transcontinental railways. In the winter time this question cannot affect the railways, because the water route is not open; there is no competition. Whatever the railway is and whatever the receipts are, those receipts during the winter will come in. I cannot, therefore, see the force of the objection that this is in any way going to decrease the receipts of our national railways, but I can see how it is going to increase their receipts. At the present time, many products of the North West would come out if they could profitably rise over the top of the rates, unnecessarily high by water. Lower the rates and those products will come out and be hauled down to the head of the Great Lakes and our railways will then get those additional receipts. Therefore, I say that this work when completed will increase the receipts of our national transcontinental railways. In the winter time very little wheat is hauled by rail around the shores of Lake Superior. During the war quite a quantity was brought down at a considerable cost, but the experience is that, on account of the locomotives being able to haul only half the number of cars and the additional loss of time, it is not a profitable business to be hauling unnecessarily in the winter time around Lake Superior. If this project is carried out, the receipts of our railways will be increased and the quantity of products coming out from the West will also be increased. You will increase in every respect the volume of the trade of the railways, and that is what is desired. We shall then not have so much the cry: "Where are the cars? Where are the new cars that have been asked for in this House?" They will be out in the West doing their work instead of lying idle at the seaboard. And furthermore, much can be saved in additional rolling stock now required to be produced. It is, therefore, a sound policy for Canada, notwithstanding a large expenditure for railways, as quickly as she can to get this canal built so as to increase the receipts of her railways and save capital expenditures that would otherwise be required.

It has been stated that, with the enormous debt that we have upon our shoulders, this is no time to contemplate making any new expenditures. My friend the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), for whom I have a great respect, jocularly said that this project had been brought forward at a time when there was the prospect of an election. Two years ago Canada sent two Cabinet Ministers to Washington in an endeavour to get this matter referred to the International Waterways Commission. The present Prime Minister and the late Hon. Mr. Sifton, went there along with some officials, but nothing was done. But when the Western States arose in their strength and in their own interest on account of the produce of the farmers being unnecessarily taxed by high freight rates, demanded of Washington, that this matter be referred to the International Waterways Commission, then the matter was so referred. Two years ago a communication came from the United States, when no election was in sight. Canada dealt with that communication and suggested that engineers from both countries be appointed to prepare the proper and necessary questions of reference to the International Joint Commission. Each

country appointed an engineer; those engineers met and framed the questions that were frequently transmitted by the letter read by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid). Orders in Council were then passed authorizing the reference, and in that way the whole matter was, by Canada and by the United States, referred to the International Commission to investigate, and we shall soon have that report. But it is very surprising, listening to some of the remarks made in this House, to realize what an utter lack of information there is upon this important subject, and it was with the sole object of getting this matter from this International Commission by its report to the attention of the members through a committee, that this motion has been made.

Another objection has been made—"Oh there is an alternative route, the Georgian bay." There are two routes to the West, and I am not going to argue particularly in favour of one or the other. As the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) said, as long as we can get transportation through without breaking bulk to the head of the lakes, so that the products will not be charged as high as at present in getting them to the market, we are content; it makes no difference whether it is by the Georgian bay route or by this other route. But I remember the criticism of the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), which was to the effect that this project is, perhaps, not advisable. He did not say that it was not; but he went on to say that freight rates depend upon the return cargoes, and you must have the return cargoes. It is for that reason that I was endeavouring to accentuate the point that there were return cargoes, I refered in opening this matter to the boats going in and out of Manchester to take cargoes in and bring cargoes out. In this case, when this canal is opened up, there would be many cities from which cargoes could be had, such as Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) said that I said nothing of the Canadian cities. I beg his pardon. I mentioned, "and the Ontario ports". We shall have all those places on the American side and on the Canadian side. Ontario is surrounded on the south by water; it is her boundary all the way until you get practically to Manitoba, and all the busy cities and towns of Ontario will have freight to send out and be able to receive freight from overseas. There is your return cargo to and from Canada; but the point is this, in answer to the hon. member for Marquette —he will also have his return cargo which is to-day going to and being received by the seaports of New York and Boston. Why? Where do these goods go to? To New York? No, they go to Chicago, Indianapolis, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Detroit, Wisconsin, Indiana. Now we will have ocean tramp steamers coming into those upper lakes on account of that class of business and there will be no difficulty at all, after having brought their cargo in and discharging, in their making the short journey either to Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur, or Fort William, and loading up with grain or any other agricultural products. Because of that we will have these return cargoes, and therefore it is that those who have given the matter the most consideration realize that the immediate construction of this waterway would be in the national interests. There is the further fact that we have spent millions on the Welland canal, which will be useless unless it is connected up with the Port of Montreal.

There are other reasons that could be urged by those who have studied the question of the Georgian Bay and the St. Lawrence. The St. Lawrence is primarily a navigation proposition. Secondly, it is a power proposition. The St. Lawrence river is the most remarkable river in the world so far as navigation is concerned. No other river in the world has such a steady constant flow. The St. Lawrence never varies in one year more than 1·2 feet. Nature has built immense reservoirs and dams like our inland lakes, which would have cost an enormous sum for man to build. The waters flowing from the different rivers, the Kaministiqua, the Nipigon, the White river, the Michipicoten, etc., settle down in the lakes to a clear blue water, not carrying any sediment. These settling works have already been constructed. The river never varies in the springtime. Compare that with the Ottawa river. We must stop that rise and fall of 20 feet every year; then when we have done that, we will be able to say it may become a ship canal; it is a ship canal we are after, not a barge canal. Experience teaches us that ships will take short canals for long water stretches, but that they will not take long canals for the opposite. I cannot understand why hon. members representing the constituencies along the Ottawa river, especially those representing the city of Ottawa, are not in favour of this project. There will only be five locks in the St. Lawrence. Two of these locks must be

built as part of the Georgian Bay or Ottawa river system, to get into the lake St. Louis. Then you would be within six feet of the level of the lake of Two Mountains, which is an enlargement of the Ottawa river, which river here flows into lake St. Louis, which in turn is an enlargement of the St. Lawrence river. Then you could carry on with the Georgian Bay system, from these two locks already then built. I would have thought that any person desiring to see Ottawa become a seaport, to see the Ottawa river developed, to see even the Georgian Bay canal built, would feel that in so doing they were getting two-fifths of the benefit of the St. Lawrence system for their own canal. Those are the facts. I cannot understand any opposition to this project once it is properly understood.

If the International Joint Waterways Commission are dealing only with the St. Lawrence, let this whole question be referred to a committee of the House, and if the other scheme is preferable the House can throw this one out if it sees fit, and take on the other. But let us get the facts, and disseminate them, and then we will know what to do.

As to the question of cost as I said at the outset, we are hard up, we cannot afford to spend money; but if we are spending money at the present time and do not know it we should take that wasteful expenditure by the throat, and that is what we would be doing in this case. I made the assertion in the opening of my remarks, and I still maintain that it is true, that the United States and Canada are losing hundreds of millions of dollars by not having this canal built. Mr. Julius H. Barnes, formerly president of the United States Grain Corporation, has shown that on the 4,000,000,000 grain product of the United States and Canada the producers are losing $200,000,000 annually, and that statement has not been controverted. Add to that the loss on the package freight, and—leaving aside the question of electric power—this project will pay on navigation and navigation alone. If that be so, why should we not pay annually sinking fund, and interest on the capital invested, particularly if it is only one-tenth of the amount that is wasted every year. We would not tolerate that waste if we knew it. Let us get the facts, and I am sure the people of this country will say: Hard-up as we are, we do not want to pay for this waste in freight rates, but would rather pay it straight to the Federal treasury and have something for it.

With reference to the cost of development of power, the statement made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) was, I believe, the statement of a New York engineer who was the consulting engineer of the water-power interests. That was the opposition we had in Montreal—the water-power interests. They are not anxious to see the further development of water-powers on the St. Lawrence river, and their policy was to make the cost as great as possible, but let me remind my hon. friend from Russell, who I am sure is aware of it, that the Parliament of Canada heretofore has had a proposition before it from gentlemen of New York State offering to build the canal at that point if they were given the power at the point of which he speaks. They would build the canal locks free of cost to either country if they were handed over the power—this power that we are told now was to cost at this one point, $550,000,000. That proposition nearly got through this House. It got through the New York State legislature. Then application was made to the courts of the United States to quash the whole incorporation of the American Company on the ground that it was ultra viras, that no private company could be given the rights of navigation by the state. This place where $550,000,000 was to be spent for power, we could have had built without it costing Canada anything, if we had seen fit. I do not know just what the $550,000,000 represents, whether it means complete water-power development, machinery and everything else. I dare say it does. I have been told that when you start in and develop water-power, your development cost is, say, $1, for the mere dams and so forth; but for your plant, your houses, your necessary machinery, the living quarters for the men who live there, moving pictures and so on, the cost is $100 to every $1. Probably that $550,000,000 includes all those items.

What I say is that as Canadians we should get to understand this question, just as our cousins to the south now understand it. The only opposition they have over there is the selfish opposition of part of New York State, and of the Buffalo and Erie Canal interests. The people over there now see the benefit of this canal, and let us try to see what benefit there is in it for us also. I have no objection to seeing also what the cost is. Let us

know exactly what it will cost. The hon. member for Quebec said, let us also refer to the committee at the same time the question of getting the grain to Quebec as well as to Montreal all rail. Be it so. He will find that by rail it is ten times the cost it would be by water. Let all these questions be referred to the committee; let us get the facts, and then we can act intelligently. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) was good enough to say that if I withdrew this resolution he would undertake to see that this whole question was referred to one of the standing committees of the House. A committee which I did not know existed at the time I drafted the resolution, namely, the Committee on Forests, Waterways and Water-powers. I should be glad to see the matter go before that committee. There is nothing much that can be done until we have the evidence and the report from the International Joint Commission as a basis to work upon. The report should be presented about the second Tuesday in April next, and under the circumstances I gladly avail myself of the undertaking of the Minister of Railways and withdraw the motion on this understanding.

Motion withdrawn.

THE CATTLE EMBARGO

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Smith, that in the opinion of this House it would not be in the interests of Canada should the Government of Great Britain remove the embargo upon cattle going into the United Kingdom, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Pedlow.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock yesterday I moved the adjournment of this debate, and it is rather a coincidence that I should now be tempted again at six o'clock to move its further adjournment. However, I shall not do so, although it is practically time for recess. I shall conclude the remarks which I was addressing to the House yesterday. I was speaking at the time of adjournment on the visit of the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario to Britain in connection with the removal of the embargo, and had expressed the opinion that that visit, instead of assisting in the endeavour to secure its removal, would on the contrary have a prejudicial effect by creating a feeling of resentment on the part of the British people against this country by reason of the interference of a provincial minister in a matter purely within the decision of the British people. That my opinion is well founded is obvious from the following comment which I shall quote from the London "Morning Post" as reported in the press:

> The London Morning Post says: "Mr. Doherty will associate himself with political action here, a proceeding so obviously improper that we can only suppose that the Minister for Ontario has not understood to what he is being committed."

I think we shall all agree that the "Morning Post" has sized up that minister very accurately. Mr. Doherty has said that he is in Great Britain to-day, not as the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario but in his capacity as a private citizen of Canada. He is evidently endeavouring to play the dual role of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. When he is in Ontario he is the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, and when he goes to Great Britain on a message relating to agriculture he is a private citizen. I do not think that it will tend to predispose the British people in favour of the removal of this embargo, when a private citizen of Canada goes there to give them counsel gratuitously as to what they ought to do. This has been made a political question. The Labour people have taken it up and are using the removal of the embargo as an argument against the government of Great Britain. What is the reason they give for its removal? Is it because they are anxious to assist the British agriculturists? Not at all. Is it because they want to assist Canadian exporters? By no means. What they want is cheap meat, and it does seem to me that this is not a very strong reason why the Canadian people should desire the removal of the embargo. If the embargo were removed in accordance with the wishes of the Labour people of Britain, it would be removed not only from Canadian cattle but from cattle coming from Argentine and Australia, and it would be hopeless for the Canadian people to think of competing in the British market with the cattle from those countries. The Canadian farmer is in a much better position to-day than he would be in with the removal of the embargo from the cattle of all countries, because, being nearer Great Britain than any of those cattle-producing countries, he can ship his cattle there alive much more freely and expeditiously and to better advantage than the farmers of Australia or the Argentine. We therefore have a sort of preference in the British market in that respect. I

am afraid that the only reputation which the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario will gain in the Old Country will be one that will not be very favourable. He will go down in British history, I fear, by the appellation of "Meddlesome Manning," meddling with things with which he has no business and no concern, and ignoring the proper channel through which this question should be taken up, namely, the Federal Government. I was struck with the statement yesterday of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) to the effect that of a million cattle annually passing inspection at our abattoirs less than ten per cent are fitted for export to the British Islands to compete there with the cattle of Australia and Argentine. If that is so, then I think it should be a stimulus to the Canadian farmer to improve his cattle still further. It may be difficult for the farmers of the West to do this, but certainly the farmers of Ontario should be urged, and urged very strongly, to finish their cattle properly so that they can send them in a condition that will secure the approval of the British people. What we need in the livestock industry in Ontario is more intense feeding. That seems to be the principle which the British farmer has followed for years, and it is a good one for the Ontario farmer to emulate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to move an amendment to the amendment to the following effect:

That all the words after the word "that" in the original motion, and all the words of the proposed amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "This House approves and supports the policy of the Government and of previous Governments of Canada in protesting against the implication of disease in Canadian cattle by reason of the maintenance of the embargo thereon by the British Government."

This Government has done all that it possibly can to secure the removal of the embargo. It received a promise from the British Minister of Agriculture in 1917 that the embargo would be removed, and if that promise has not been carried out it is not the fault of the Government. Seconded by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best, I beg to move the amendment to the amendment which I have just read.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): I do not intend to deal at any great length with this subject at the present time for the reason that I was not quite ready to do so to-night owing to an understanding I had that it should not be discussed until Monday's sitting, which would have given me more leisure to make further investigation into the matter. There is now before the House the resolution of the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), the amendment moved by myself, and the sub-amendment of the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). During the time that has elapsed, and during the discussion that has ensued, since I placed my amendment before the House, there seems to have arisen in the minds of some hon. gentlemen a misapprehension as to my motives and as to the aims of my amendment. Let me say distinctly at the outset, Sir, and so that there may be no room whatever left for any misunderstanding, that there was no intention on my part to dictate to the Imperial Government as to the course they should pursue in domestic affairs, and I do not think that any person reading my amendment could come to that conclusion. I moved that amendment at almost the conclusion of the debate on the resolution, and it seemed to me that it would be rather unfortunate, after so much discussion on an important subject of this kind, if the resolution should be withdrawn without apparently accomplishing anything beyond affording hon. members an opportunity to express their opinions. I therefore briefly outlined my reasons for taking the course I did, and moved my amendment, which reads as follows:

That all the words after the word "House" in the resolution be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "The Government of Canada should make a strong protest against the reasons assigned by the British Government that Canadian cattle are diseased as an excuse for placing an embargo on Canadian live cattle going into the United Kingdom".

I do not think that amendment warrants the conclusion that some hon. gentlemen seem to have reached. It certainly was not my intention either to interfere in the pending elections in the Old Country, or to attempt to dictate to the Imperial Government as to what course they should pursue in domestic affairs. But, Sir, we have a grievance that we should voice; and the fact that we have no right to interefere in Imperial affairs does not debar us from protesting to the Imperial Government, if we have a grievance, just as we would protest to the authorities of any other country, had we cause to do so. I do not think that we in Canada should hesitate—

in fact I do not think the Imperial Government expects us to do so—to express our disapproval of Imperial action on this question. As a matter of fact, during the whole period covering the years that have passed from 1892 down to the present time, successive Canadian Governments have protested against the unfairness of this embargo on our cattle. In the brief interval since yesterday I have hurriedly read the records and find that government after government have protested against, not the embargo only but the unfairness of the reasons assigned or implied for its imposition. As a matter of fact, there is no room for concluding that, in the early stages at least, the reasons for the embargo were merely implied; they wer specifically stated. I read that many efforts were made during all these years. And what has been accomplished, Mr. Speaker? As far as I can learn, practically nothing. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister says that a promise was at last extracted from the British Government. But for what purpose? Simply that this embargo would be removed after the war. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if in his judgment we are still at war? I know that the great country to the south of us claim that they are still at war with Germany; and certainly their refusal to repeal certain war-time provisions against the enemy would lead to that conclusion. But so far as Canada is concerned the war ceased on July 9, 1919, and since then the Imperial authorities, one would think, have had ample time to implement their promise.

Now, Sir, I have been challenged by some hon. members, among them my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), to adduce facts in support of my resolution, and that hon. gentleman has stated that if I can produce the data on which I base the conclusions arrived at in my amendment to the resolution he will support me. Therefore I should like to call the attention of the House to some extracts from Sessional Papers, Vol. XXVI, published in 1893. I find away back in that year two unfortunate cows were the beginning of all this trouble, and that from that date down to the present time various governments, both Conservative and Liberal—and I suppose Unionist, too, when it had time to spare for work of that kind—have been dealing with the subject, but without much result. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) informed us the other day that even as late as a year ago an attempt had been made by the Government to have this embargo removed, but practically nothing was accomplished. I find in a Sessional Paper, dated London, October 24, 1892, the following cablegram:

> Two animals, one a cow, ex steamer "Monkseaton" or "Huronia" at Dundee and Fifeshire slaughtered suspicion pleuro-pneumonia. Post-mortem indication very similar pleuro but no decision yet arrived at. Have seen authorities and pointed out impossibility disease being pleuro. Make immediate inquiry where all animals came from. Most important to prove no contact with American cattle and no disease in locality stock came from.
>
> (Signed) TUPPER.

From that time on a voluminous correspondence ensued, and Sir Charles Tupper refers again to these unfortunate cows. He writes:

> I cannot help thinking it a pity, in any circumstances, that the two "old worn-out" cows, to which Dr. McEachran refers as having been shipped by the "Huronia", should ever have been allowed to come over, and I am strongly of the opinion that we should follow the practice of the Danes, who rigorously keep back any animal that is likely to cause suspicion, or require to be examined on landing in this country. We cannot be too careful, in view of the difficulties, trouble, expense and anxiety which any case like that at present under consideration causes, and I shall be glad if you will give the matter your attention.
>
> I remain, yours faithfully,
>
> CHARLES TUPPER.

Nothing apparently was accomplished, although protests continued to be made by the Dominion Government. In that respect, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I was not finding fault with the Government for not attempting to get the embargo removed, but I was rather impatient at their failure to produce something of value as the result of their efforts. The Edinburgh Scotsman of 5th November, 1892, published the following:

> The urgent representations of the great bodies of English agriculturalists have prevailed at the board of agriculture, and Canada is to be deprived of the privilege she has up till now enjoyed of free trade with this country in live cattle. Mr. Herbert Gardner has, at any rate, waited to hear both sides before coming to this decision. The Canadian authorities have, I believe, been most diligent in their efforts to rebut the suspicion cast upon the Dominion cattle.

The week following that an influential deputation waited upon the president of the British Board of Agriculture in London. The Duke of Westminster in introducing the deputation said:

> Mr. Gardner would not have been surprised that they had requested to have this interview with him, on account of the very deep and well founded alarm that had been spread all over

the country from the fact of the importation of cattle from Canada into Scotland; from the fact of their distribution over the country; and from the fact of there having been an outbreak of contagious pleuro-pneumonia which occurred not very long after the landing and inspection of these animals, he believed, at Dundee.

That is another instance in which the Imperial authorities are on record as stating the reasons for which this embargo was placed on Canadian cattle. There is no mistaking that statement, that the embargo was placed on Canadian cattle because of disease. Further on I read an extract from Mr. Gardner's reply to this delegation, as follows:

We do this with the deepest regret. I may say, personally that after the most anxious investigation of the facts,—after a most lengthened and patient consideration of the matter in all its bearings, we have come to the conclusion that these facts are inconsistent with the reasonable security contemplated by the law, and that we absolutely have no alternative but to withdraw the privilege of the free importation which Canada—

Mark the word "Canada."

—has enjoyed in the past.

Many speakers during the discussion have emphasized as a fact that the Imperial authorities had made a general ruling against all countries and that there was no specific ruling against Canada. I think the quotations I have cited should clear away that impression, if it does really exist in the minds of any hon. members to-night. This continues:

—and I may say that an order to that effect is already signed.

That order was as follows:

Notwithstanding anything in the Animals Order of 1886, unless and until the board of agriculture otherwise order, chapter 32, (foreign animals not subject to slaughter or quarantine) of the said order shall not apply to cattle brought from Her Majesty's possessions in North America, and such cattle shall be subject to the provisions of part 1 (slaughter at port of landing) of the fifth schedule of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1888, and to the provisions of chapter 30 (foreign animals subject to slaughter) of the said Animals Order of 1886.

Now, that schedule reads as follows—and I would like to place it on Hansard so that there will be no misunderstanding in the matter:

The Third Schedule: Foreign animals. Part 1. Slaughter at Port of Landing.

1. The animals shall be landed only at a part of a port defined for that purpose by order of the Board of Agriculture, to be called a foreign animals wharf.

2. The animals shall be landed in such manner, at such times, and subject to such supervision and control as the Commissioners of Customs direct.

3. The animals shall not be moved alive out of the wharf.

I think I have quoted sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to show that there is record of the fact that there is an embargo on cattle from Canada—a specific ruling on the subject, and I have yet to find any ruling which rescinds that decision. If I have overlooked anything of that kind I should be pleased if hon. members would correct me, but if they find that I am right, they should support the amendment to the resolution.

It often occurs, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of this House change their minds. On May, 6, 1895, the then member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) moved the following resolution in this House with regard to the embargo on Canadian cattle:

That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government should engage the services of one or more competent British veterinary surgeons to examine into and report upon the health of Canadian cattle herds, with a view to obtaining such evidence as will convince the British Government that no danger of infection will be incurred by the admission of Canadian cattle into Great Britain without slaughter at the port of debarkation.

Apparently the hon. member has changed his views in the meantime, because he now wants the British authorities to continue the embargo. That is where he and I differ on the subject. I agree with his contention that it would be in the interests of cattle breeders and cattle raisers in this country if they shipped their cattle out of the country in a finished state. If they did, they would be able to use the grains of the country for the feeding of their cattle, and instead of shipping out what is practically the raw material of that industry, they would be shipping out the finished product.

I was rather amused at the positions taken during the discussion by some hon. members in regard to this matter of embargo. While they were afraid to do anything that would offend the Imperial authorities, afraid to dictate to the Imperial Government, afraid even to protest against the unfairness of the position that Canadian cattle are placed in, they were willing, some of them, particularly the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that the Canadian Government should place a duty on cattle coming in from the United States. That would seem to be a very extraordinary action on the part of Canada, in view of the fact that our cattle go into the United States duty free. The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was willing that the Imperial authorities should place a duty on Canadian cattle of ten per cent to take

the place of the embargo, but he would not attempt to suggest to the British authorities that they should remove the embargo. He would admit the unfairness of the situation, but he would not enter a protest against the action of the Imperial authorities with regard to Canadian cattle.

The Minister of Agricuture—and this is in itself evidence of the fact that Canada is being unfairly dealt with—has called attention to the fact that while Holland is allowed to send into Great Britain pure bred Holsteins—under special license, of course—Canadians are not allowed that privilege. I wanted to find out the reason for that, and an examination of the report of the Commissioners of the Agricultural Department of Great Britain, 1893-94, volume 23, proved to be interesting in that regard. It is a report as to the conditions of cattle in Belgium, a country adjacent to Holland. I find that in 1892 there were 940 cases of pleuro-pneumonia in Belgium and 38,250 cases of foot-and-mouth disease —in a country so small compared with Canada that you could lose it in one of our Great Lakes. If the Imperial authorities are prepared to extend consideration to these countries, I do not see why Canadians should not make a determined effort now to bring about the removal of an embargo against Canadian cattle, particularly in view of the promise made in 1917 that the embargo would be removed after the war. The war has long since come to a conclusion; a great deal of history has been made in the meantime, and there is no reason why this condition should obtain. The Imperial authorities admit that there is no disease in our Canadian cattle. The Minister of Agriculture said yesterday that there would be no difficulty in keeping diseased cattle from coming into Canada from the United States. That being the case, there should be no difficulty in complying with the requirements in that regard and keeping diseased cattle from the United States from being shipped to Great Britain through Canadian ports.

I find in the appendix to the report of the British Agricultural Commission the following with regard to Canada:

> It had always been felt that with so extended a line of frontier there must be a risk of United States cattle finding their way across the border, and now that pleuro-pneumonia had been found to exist in cattle only recently landed from Canada, the Board decided that they had no alternative but to place the Canadian cattle in the same position as those from the United States. Their exemption from slaughter under part IV of the Third Schedule to the Act of 1878 was therefore withdrawn.
>
> During the year 1892 we received from Canada 98,228 cattle, 15,747 sheep, and 1,235 swine. All these animals were admitted free into the interior of the country.

That was in 1892. Now, if that is the only thing that stands in the way of our obtaining the consideration desired; if that is the only thing required to be done by the Canadian Government in order that the request of the Imperial authorities in the matter shall be complied with, I submit that the sooner we are in a position to inform the British authorities that the requirements have been complied with and to demand a fulfilment of the promise made in 1917, the better it will be for this country, because this is a matter that affects a very important industry.

I find, Sir, that there is very little difference in substance between my amendment to the resolution and the sub-amendmend that has been offered. This embodies to a large extent the idea I had in mind, and in view of the fact that it asks the House to approve and support the policy of this Government and previous Governments—you will notice that it approves the policy not only of this Government, but of previous Governments—I have no hesitation whatever in accepting this sub-amendment to my amendment. But while I accept the sub-amendment, and while I approve and support the policy of the Government, I want the Government to understand that I support their policy only in regard to this particular transaction. I want to qualify my support of their policy to that extent, and if they behave themselves properly, in future, it is hard to say what may occur. This is, however, an instalment on account, and with this expressed reservation on the subject, I have much pleasure in accepting this sub-amendment to my amendment to the resolution.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) is, as I heard it read, in the terms suggested by myself yesterday to be substituted for that of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow). But I understood my hon. friend to take exception to that as not being his amendment, and consequently the sub-amendment became necessary. Therefore, as I understand the matter now, it is the sub-amendment that is before the House.

The only word that I rise to add on this occasion is that I do not think this subject should be seized upon to endeavour to create in Canada a feeling against Great Britain. The hon. member for Red Deer

(Mr. Clark) put the whole subject in a very concise and, as I thought, fair and proper way in the speech he made yesterday. His words, associated with those of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) expressed what I think ought to be the attitude of Parliament towards this question at this time. It would be quite wrong for Parliament to affirm that the British Government assign, as a reason for the maintenance of this embargo, disease amongst Canadian cattle. The British Government, when the embargo was put on some thirty years ago, did so, assigning as a reason then, just as quoted by the hon. member for South Renfrew, that there was suspicion of disease in respect of at least one animal—it may be that my hon. friend is correct in describing the case as that of "two unfortunate cows" —in a Canadian shipment, which animal, I understand, had actually come from the United States. It is a fact that now they assign, as at least one of the grounds, if not the only one, for the maintenance of the embargo, the fear that, although our herds to-day are free and have, for many years, been free of disease, nevertheless, contagion may come to their stock through Canada from importations from the United States or otherwise, or from disease subsequently recurring within the herds of Canada. They do not at all assert, nor even venture to suspect, that the herds of this country to-day are not wholly free from disease. Consequently, it would be very unfair on the part of this Parliament to pass an amendment embodying an assertion on our part of something that was not strictly a fact.

But inasmuch as the original embargo arose from suspicion of disease, if not disease on the part of an animal that came with a Canadian herd, the continuance of an embargo, arising from that source, we have claimed, constitutes an implication against Canadian stock. I must say that there are many who think—and from this opinion I am not free myself—that the continuation of this policy in Great Britain is really a measure of protection established by the British Government for the benefit of cattle raisers in the old land. It is not the only measure that has protective effect which the British Government now enforces, to which they have had resort in recent years, and it has often occurred to me that the public opinion that they have created there—and possibly it is better described as a public prejudice—against protective duties, is at the bottom of the disposition on the part of the Government and Parliament there to resort to other means to get the same result. Consequently, we feel that as they are able to get that result by other means, those other means if any, should be adopted, and they should not continue an embargo that arose from a cause that they know has now passed away.

If they feel that, as was expressed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), they should continue the embargo for the reason that they want to be doubly sure that there will be no recurrence of disease or no admission of diseased cattle to Canada and, consequently, transmission of the contagion to British cattle, then they should take such appropriate action as will remove the original imputation that has all along attended this embargo and place their policy upon another basis. I think I have expressed with some care and, I believe, exactly, the position that governments in Canada have taken for some time, and this finds expression as well in the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). It seems to me that the passing of that sub-amendment is consonant with the historic policy of Canada, with the dignity of Canada and also with the continuous practice of this country to respect the rights of the British Parliament within their own domain. Therefore, I hope the House will accept, as it stands, the sub-amendment, and if possible, that there will be no division of opinion upon it.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, the sub-amendment is a vote of confidence in the present Government and in preceding Governments for having protested against this embargo. I am not aware that anybody has attacked the attitude of the present Government or of any preceding Government on that point. Therefore, I do not think the present Government or the preceding government, of which I had the honour to be a member, needs any whitewashing of that kind; but I do not think it does any harm and I have no objection to offer to it.

Mr. PROULX: Will this sub-amendment be communicated to the Imperial Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I will see that the resolution as passed by Parliament is duly transmitted to the High Commissioner, as it is through his office that the representations of this country have been made.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): I just wish to say that the reason why I second and shall support the sub-amendment is this: I believe that the present Government and all former governments in the last 20 or 25 years have tried to do all they could to have the cattle embargo removed. The reason I am opposed to the original resolution is that I think we have no right to dictate to the British Government what shall be done in the matter of the embargo; it is their business, not ours. The reason I am opposed to the amendment is because the British Government, as I think every hon. member is aware, are not claiming that there is disease among our cattle at the present time. While the embargo was put on for that reason in the first place, I fully agree with my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that we have no authority whatever for saying that the British Government claim now that there is disease among our cattle. We cannot go by newspaper reports and by what people say. I believe that the newspapers and the amendment to the resolution are simply doing harm to our cattle, because the amendment practically says that the British Government is keeping the embargo on because there is disease among our cattle. I repeat, we have no right to dictate to the British Government what laws they shall make, and I do not want the British Government or the government of any other country to dictate to us. I certainly shall not vote to dictate to them.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): I do not see that very much is to be gained either by the amendment or by the sub-amendment. There is one thing, however, that I wish to say to the Prime Minister, and to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and that is, there is no record of the British Government ever having changed the stand they took on the question of pleuro-pneumonia. They gave as a reason for putting on the embargo, that there was disease among our cattle, and that reason is of record. Now if there is a change in their attitude, that also should be a matter of record with some government of this country, and until the Prime Minister or some other member of the Government can show that the British Government have receded from the stand they took some twenty or more years ago, and that that change of attitude is a matter of record in this country, there is no use talking about it any more. To say that there has been a change of attitude on the part of the British Government without being able to produce any evidence to that effect, is as futile as it would be for me to stand up in court and say: Such and such is the decision of the courts on the records, but a case has been decided somewhere that has not been reported, and I ask your lordships to follow that unreported case. Of course, their lordships would tell me at once that they could pay no attention to that unreported case, but would have to follow the reports of the law as they found them. I submit to the Government, and particularly to the Minister of Agriculture, that we have no record that the British Government have changed their minds, and until they have reversed what they unjustly said about our stock, we cannot very well say that the matter has been fully cleared up.

I think there is very litle difference, Mr. Speaker, between the amendment and the sub-amendment. I am sorry that even in these little things there must be fault found and that the Government has apparently reached the conclusion that no good thing can come out of Nazareth at all. They would not suggest to my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) that he change a word or two in his amendment, but if there was any credit to be gained from action in this matter, his resolution had to be wiped out entirely and one introduced from the other side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I suggested yesterday, and even sent across the floor, this very amendment, but when it appeared to-day as the amendment of the hon. member for South Renfrew, he repudiated it.

Mr. McKENZIE: The amendment was not made. My right hon. friend is not fair. What got into the report and into the records was a bungle and a mistake. As I understand it, and as will appear by Hansard to-morrow, the thing was simply written on the back of some paper, and the officer of the House who was taking this thing down just took it as if it was all right. The fact of the matter is simply this. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) was afraid that the hon. member for South Renfrew would get some kudos out of this thing, so he had to come forward with an amendment of his own. The idea in both is exactly the same; the difference is only a word or two one way or the other, and if we get any results from our action in this matter, I

say that the hon. member for South Renfrew is entitled to the whole credit.

Mr. PEDLOW: If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct a mis-statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would rule that the hon. member has the right to correct a mis-statement if one has been made.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood the Prime Minister a few moments ago to make the statement that the amendment apparently to be accepted by the House was sent across the floor of the House yesterday evening. If by that he meant that the amendment was sent to myself, his statement is not correct. The Prime Minister, I am sure, does not wish to be unfair. He may have been under the impression that it was delivered to me, but the first time I saw the amendment in its present form was to-night after the House rose at six o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I might say that I had the privilege of occupying the Chair at the time, and I remember distinctly that the amendment was sent across the floor of the House, but it was only sent as far as the front benches on the Opposition side, and read by some hon. member sitting there. I am quite sure it did not reach the hon. member for South Renfrew.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I merely rise to protest against the statement that has been repeatedly made during this debate that there is an embargo against Canadian cattle entering the ports of Great Britain. The embargo is not against Canadian cattle, but against cattle from all countries. The word "Canada" does not appear in it at all, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite and some hon. members on this side of the House have discussed the embargo as though it were an enactment of the British Government directed particularly against Canadian cattle. When it was first imposed that was the case. In November, 1902, the British Board of Agriculture had the right to prohibit the importation into Great Britain of cattle from any country providing disease was suspected to exist in the herds of that country. In 1904 the Acts of the British Parliament were consolidated, and what was then known as the Diseases of Animals Act came into effect. In 1896, on the 20th of July, the Act that is at present in force in Great Britain came into operation, and that Act applies to all countries. The exception that is to-day being taken might well have been justified with regard to British legislation from November, 1902, up to July 20th, 1906, but no exception can be taken to the action of the British Government in passing the Act of 1896 as directed solely against Canadian cattle, and I was surprised to find in the press again to-day a reference by one of the provincial Prime Ministers of this country to the matter. We have now three, if not four, of them on record protesting against the embargo on Canadian cattle which has been imposed by the British Government. In order to clear the minds of some of those who apparently are labouring under a misapprehension, I will read section 26 of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894. The Board of Agriculture were given certain authority under this Act. Section 26 reads:

> In relation to foreign animals other than those the landing whereof is for the time being prohibited by order of the Board of Agriculture—

This is the class we were in at that time. Canadian cattle were prohibited in November, 1902, from entry into the interior and were compelled to be slaughtered at the port of landing.

> —and other than those brought from the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man, if and so long as the Board are satisfied with respect to any country out of the United Kingdom or any specified part of such country that the laws thereof relating to the importation and exportation of animals, and to the prevention of the introduction or spreading of disease, and the general sanitary condition of animals therein, are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of diseased animals, the Board, by order, shall allow animals or any specified kind of animals, brought from that country or such part to be landed without being subject to the provisions of the Third Schedule to this Act as to slaughter or quarantine, and may for that purpose alter or add to those provisions as the case may require.
>
> Provided that the admission of such animals sall be subject to such regulations as to the route by which the animals are conveyed to this country, quarantine or otherwise, as the Board of Agriculture may by order direct.

The Board of Agriculture were given a certain latitude to exercise their own judgment in matters of this kind. But as I have already pointed out, on the 20th of July, 1896, the British Government passed an Act, which reads:

> An Act to amend the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894 (20th July, 1896). Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same; as follows:
>
> 1. (1) For section twenty-four of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, shall be substituted the following section, namely;

Now, I would ask the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) to pay particular attention to this provision, which covers cattle such as were taken in from Holland for exhibition purposes.

The provisions set forth in part 1 (slaughter at port of landing) of the Third Schedule to this Act shall apply to all foreign animals other than—

(a) foreign animals the landing of which is for the time being prohibited by order of the Board of Agriculture; and

(b) foreign animals intended for exhibition or other exceptional purposes,—

The very class of cattle alluded to by the hon. member for South Renfrew.

—and the landing of which is allowed for the time being by the Board, subject to the provisions of Part 2 (quarantine) of the Third Schedule to this Act.

(2) Section twenty-six of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, is hereby repealed.

Now, this is the law in Great Britain, and the name of Canada is nowhere to be found in it; is not even considered in the matter. The Act is one to protect the herds of Great Britain from the possibility of the introduction of disease, and it has been consistently maintained by the British Government from that day to the present; and the governments of this country, both present and past, have been continually taking this matter up, as they were justified in doing. I have no doubt that they did everything possible to induce the British Government to consider the matter favourably from our standpoint, and in fact I know that such has been the case. In view of this fact, therefore, I think it is very unfair and, indeed, undignified on the part of any individual or Provincial Government of this country to do anything or take any action that would have the effect of embarrassing the Government of Great Britain at the present time. From the character of the agitation that is now on foot, and the meetings that are being held, it is obvious what the object is. Do you believe that this agitation to have the embargo removed is due to any consideration for the welfare of this country? Is it due to an honest desire to free our cattle from a supposed stigma? If that were the case I think that different methods would be adopted and the matter would be properly urged upon the British authorities. But we had the spectacle of the Minister of Finance of Ontario addressing a meeting in Western Ontario less than two weeks ago, when he pointed out what was likely to happen, and said that if the embargo were lifted the full credit would go to the Hon. Manning Doherty. The Provincial Minister of Agriculture. He endeavours to forestall a possible event in the future and to appropriate to a member of the Ontario Government the full credit therefor. I think that the attitude of those hon. gentlemen who are even now anticipating the removal of the embargo and trying to claim in advance full credit for it shows exactly what their whole object is. Now, I do not desire to prolong this discussion. I expressed myself yesterday on the subject, and I rise on this occasion only to remove the impression, if it still remains in the minds of any hon. gentleman, that the British authorities have an embargo on the cattle of this country exclusively on account of disease in our herds. In 1902 an embargo was placed on Canadian cattle because of the belief that there was disease, but since 1896 an embargo has rested on all cattle from foreign countries, and it has been purely a protective policy on the part of the Government of Great Britain, not only to protect the livestock interests of that country but also to safeguard them from the introduction of disease into their herds from other countries.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): The hon. member who has taken his seat (Mr. Sutherland) seems to see a difference between the attitude of the British Government before and after 1896. I understand that the British Government at the present time does not say that Canadian cattle are diseased. They say in effect: Your means of quarantine, your quarantine organization at the border, is so far from perfect that a stray sick animal from the United States can get in, and that is the reason this law has to apply to you as well as to other parts of the world. I think it has been shown us in the very excellent speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) that our quarantine organization is of the best, when of three million animals slaughtered in the Old Country not one showed the diseases complained of. Now, I should like this matter to be treated not as a party question. The Government is doing right, as other governments have done in the past, in protesting against the implication that our cattle are diseased, and if we can hold up their hands in that regard as the united representatives of a united people, who do not want this slander to be perpetuated on any ground whatsoever, whether against our cattle or against our quarantine organization, then I say that we should make our action as non-partisan

as possible and should speak with a united voice against this wrong. I am not going to speak at any length, but I have the honour to represent in this House one of the most purely agricultural counties in the whole Dominion of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: —a county which is renowned for its splendid cattle. There is no better butter made in the world than in the hills of the Eastern Townships.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Let me repeat that statement. I am always moderate in all my statements, and this is not by any means extravagant. There is no better butter made than in my county. I shall make no comparisons to hurt any one's feelings and so I leave it at that. I think we should speak in a united manner on this question and support the hands of the Government, who are only following the good precedent established by previous governments in urging that this embargo upon cattle coming from this country, where no disease exists and where the quarantine organization is as good as it is, shall be removed.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX: (Prescott): My hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) objects to the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario taking part in the protest against the embargo. Well, I think that the Government should invite the various provincial governments to help them in their endeavour to have the embargo removed. Even if the embargo does not rest on Canadian cattle only, but on the cattle of all countries, the fact remains that our cattle are under that disadvantage. It has been said that the embargo is not directed against Canadian cattle in particular but is also enforced against cattle coming from other countries. Nevertheless, we have been asking the British Government for many years to remove it but without success. If we now obtain the co-operation of the various Provincial Governments in Canada we will stand a better chance of succeeding. The other day the Legislature of Quebec passed a resolution in favour of the removal of the embargo, and I think the Legislature of Alberta adopted a similar course. The Ontario Government is also taking an active part in the movement to have the embargo removed. The Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario, a very active and very capable man, is at present interesting himself to that end. He may perhaps carry the agitation into Great Britain itself, but we know that all these obstacles to trade are only removed after a strong agitation; and I would have no objection to the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario conducting a little agitation along the desired lines if it is felt to be necessary. If the embargo is removed I have not the least objection to giving some of the credit to the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, as well as to the Ministers of Agriculture for the other provinces. I think the Federal Government should invite the co-operation of the various Provincial Governments, and that a united demand should go from Canada insisting on the removal of this embargo. If that were done I think there would be a greater chance of the embargo being lifted and thus removing an injustice which has existed for so many years. The Prime Minister said it seemed to him, and I must admit the same idea has occurred to me, that the embargo is retained more as a safeguard against the introduction of disease. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) and my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) have proved to our entire satisfaction that the disease complained of does not exist among Canadian herds. Under all the circumstances if the embargo is removed I will accord a certain amount of credit to the Federal Government, and I would be ready likewise to give credit to some of the Provincial Governments.

Sub-amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, as I have a motion on the Order Paper bearing on the question of the embargo on Canadian cattle and as the vote just taken meets with my views, I would ask permission to drop the motion standing in my name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the resolution proposed by the hon. member is reached it will be dropped.

TREATY BETWEEN FRANCE AND CANADA

On the Order for the motion calling for a copy of the new Treaty of Commerce between France and Canada—Mr. Archambault.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask that the motion stand, and that it continue to stand, should I not be here when it is called, until such time as the Govern-

ment feel justified in bringing the Treaty down.

Mr. FIELDING: Does that mean that the Treaty is not completed?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I inquired of the Minister of Trade and Commerce two or three days ago and I gathered from him that France, the other party to the Treaty, had not advanced far enough with the ratification of the Treaty to warrant us in bringing it down.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

On the order for the motion calling for:

A copy of all letters, reports exchanged between engineers and officers of the Canadian National Railways concerning the demolition of the round house at St. Foy, opposite the Quebec bridge, the removal from that place of a mechanical staff to a place called Charny on the other side of the St. Lawrence river; the proposed demolition of the station on the main line of the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec bridge.—Mr. Parent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I ask that this motion stand. It appears to call for correspondence between officers of the Canadian National Railways and some other people about some Canadian National railway business. The Government would not have that correspondence.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Government have not the information I presume they could obtain it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government could not get it any more than the hon. member could.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The resolution stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

For a copy of the Order in Council of July 9, 1920, appointing the Honourable Sir Thomas White as an arbitrator to value the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, any subsequent Orders in Council having reference to this matter, and for all correspondence between the Government and the Honourable Sir Thomas White respecting such appointment.—Mr. Mackenzie King.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS, P.Q.

On the Order for the following proposed resolution—

That, in the opinion of this House, an up-to-date semi-weekly steamer's service should be established under Government control, between the various harbours of Magdalen Islands, P.Q., and the mainland.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Dropped. My reason for dropping this resolution is that since I gave notice of it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has provided the Magdalen Islands with an excellent service.

On the Order "Notices of Motion:"

Mr. ROBB: Before you leave the Notices of Motion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention and to the attention of the House that they are not numbered the same in the English and French editions, which leads to confusion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will call the attention of the proper officer to that fact and the necessary correction will be made in the Votes and Proceedings tomorrow.

CANADIAN NATIONALS DEFINITION ACT

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) for the second reading of Bill No. 17, to define Canadian nationals, adjourned from March 8.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that this debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. McMASTER: I merely adjourned the debate, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting over an impasse, and not with any intention of contributing to it until I had listened with the same attention as I always do to the extensive remarks—

Mr. BUREAU: The more extensive remarks.

Mr. McMASTER: —to the more extensive remarks of the right hon. Minister of Justice.

Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that this Bill is a reprint of the original Bill as proposed to be amended in Committee of the whole House. Mr. Doherty moves to amend clause one by striking out all the words after the word "persons" in the first line and substituting the following words:

—shall be deemed to be Canadian nationals, viz:—

(a) Any British subject who is a Canadian citizen within the meaning of the Immigration Act, Chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1910, as heretofore amended.

(b) The wife of any such citizen.

(c) Any person born out of Canada whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth.

Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. BUREAU: May I call the attention of the committee to the French version of the Bill? If I understood the explanation of the Minister of Justice, this "Canadian national" was originally baptized in French at the League of Nations, and then was translated into English. I see that the English version was first used before this House and then translated into French, and that translation does not correspond with the original term which was born at the League of Nations. Of course, this is a matter that cannot very well be left to the translators, as, if so, it generally brings confusion later on. In order that the English version which I have in my hand should correspond with the French version, I would first ask the Minister of Justice if he would not consider it advisable that section one instead of reading "The following persons shall be deemed to be," should read, "The following persons shall be Canadian nationals"? For, after all, we make them Canadian nationals, and we do not want to have anything equivocal about their status. Therefore in the latter form it would correspond with the French version, "Sont réputées ressortissantes du Canada les personnes suivantes, savoir."

Mr. DOHERTY: I would have no objection to accepting the modification. I may explain that instead of declaring that certain persons are British subjects, or that certain persons are Canadian nationals —which, I am prepared to admit, seems to be the more natural and more direct expression—it seems for a very long time past to have been the practice to say that certain persons "shall be deemed to be" etc. In the draft as it was originally before the House the words "the following persons are Canadian nationals" were used. I see no objection to accepting the definition, if the hon. gentleman thinks it is important. I believe the meaning is absolutely the same. But if we are going to modify it, I would rather say "the following persons are Canadian nationals," than "the following persons shall be Canadians nationals."

Mr. BUREAU: That is better.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg therefore to move that section one, as now before the committee, be amended by substituting the word "are" for the words "shall be deemed to be."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doherty moves to amend section one, as proposed to be amended, by striking out the words "shall be deemed to be" and replacing them by the word "are." Shall the sub-amendment carry?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think we might just as well deal with the French version at the same time.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move to amend subsection one in the French version by substituting the words "sont ressortissantes" for the words "sont réputées ressortissantes."

M. le PRESIDENT: M. Doherty propose que la première clause du Bill 17, version française, soit amendée en remplaçant les mots "sont réputées ressortissantes" par les mots "sont ressortissantes."

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to further amend that same section by striking out the words "les personnes suivantes, savoir:" so the section would read: "Sont ressortissants du Canada."

Mr. FIELDING: Is there such a thing now as a Canadian national? Is it right to say, "the following persons are Canadian nationals," or do we not by this Bill make them so? It is a very fine distinction; I merely call the hon. gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that both things are true. There does exist to-day such a thing as a Canadian national; if there does not, then all those who are proud of the fact that they are Canadians have been attaching to themselves a designation that means nothing. It is equally true that this Act, speaking the day it is passed, declares the fact to exist that certain persons are Canadian nationals. The moment this Bill is passed—whether by virtue of this law or by virtue of any anterior thing is immaterial—these people are Canadian nationals.

Mr. McMASTER: The present tense is used in the expectation that the Bill will pass. If the Bill does not pass, then anything provided in it is of no avail. I take it, therefore, looking at the matter from the purely legal aspect, that it is correct to use the present tense.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman is quite right. The Bill speaks the moment it is passed; until that moment it says nothing.

Mr. MORPHY: If there is no such thing as a Canadian national, how can it be said, as set forth in subsection (c) of sec-

tion 1, that any person born out of Canada "whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth," shall be a Canadian national?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that the verb "was" as used there has in mind the fact that we are speaking of a person who will be born in the future. The reference is to any person whose father "was" a Canadian national when that person was born.

Mr. MORPHY: But there is no such thing as a Canadian national.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman does not suppose there are going to be no children born in the future; that our Canadian nationals are all going to be barren?

Mr. McMASTER: Some of them are barons.

Mr. DOHERTY: But not barren. I am really puzzled to know how to make it any clearer. Perhaps my hon. friend will suggest a method.

Mr. CANNON: Prior to the introduction of this Bill was there any correspondence on the subject between the Canadian Government and the British Government?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that this Bill is a very important one in that it gives to Canadian citizens what might be called a separate status from that of a British subject. Has the Government in any way, shape or form conferred with the British authorities, formally or informally, with regard to this measure?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension if he thinks that this Bill modifies to the extent of one iota the status of any of us as British subjects. It did not seem to the Government necessary to ask the permission of the British Government—which, I am sure, would not have had the slightest objection—how we ought to define a Canadian, still leaving that Canadian as a British subject just where he was before. I do not see how the hon. gentleman could regard that as necessary.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Will this Bill involve any change in the classification of the census returns?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that there has been in the past any heading in the census returns specifying people as being or not being Canadian nationals.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): But do we specify Canadians now?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not the census returns before me, but I am under the impression that people are classified according to the origin of their ancestors. I am not quite certain whether there is a column which classifies people as Canadians.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Then it is high time we had some definition of that kind. In our documents we do not recognize a man as a Canadian; he is distributed here and there and all over.

Mr. COPP: That is for election purposes.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Perhaps so; I have nothing to say on that. But our statutes, our documents and our official returns seem to go out of the way to avoid defining a Canadian. I had thought that this was the beginning of legislation in that direction.

Mr. DOHERTY: I hope it is.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I hope we shall soon have legislation of that kind so that it will be established here, in our documents and otherwise, as well as among all other nations, that there is such a thing as a Canadian. I do not ask for any amendment just now in that direction, but I hope that the Minister of Justice and the Government generally will do what they can to see that a Canadian is at least recognized on his own statute book; for he has not been so recognized in the past. When I say that I speak for the people of all the provinces. A recognition in our statutes, public documents, etc., of what a Canadian is, would be a further step towards the unification of the people of this country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I endorse the view of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). It is because I think it is a step in that direction that I heartily support the Bill. I was sorry I was not here when the second reading was moved.

Mr. MORPHY: The Minister spoke about trying to make clear subsection (c) of section 1, which provides that any person born out of Canada "whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth" shall be deemed to be a Canadian national. That language imports the idea that there was such a thing as a Canadian national prior to the passing of this Bill. I take it from the minister that there is no such thing until this Bill is passed, so that a boy or girl born ten years

ago or five days ago could not say that his or her father was a Canadian national at the time of that child's birth, because there was no such thing then. If this is intended to apply after the Bill is passed and assented to, I see two things. The provision that "Any person born out of Canada whose father is a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth," will apply to the future; it does not cover the past. Therefore, the clause is worthy of a little consideration, when we are taking what I conceive to be a rather important step in defining Canadian nationality. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe), in their desire, which I apprehend is the desire of the whole House, so to define Canadian nationality that it will appear in everything Canadian from this time forward.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I am not a lawyer, but I say that the original draft of the Bill was more to the point and to the argument we are now making, that is, if the words "shall be deemed to be" are in the Bill. I have seen in the Statutes, especially in past practice, a good many clauses where that term is constantly used. If we are creating a new thing and making a new departure here to-day, beginning to establish and recognize at this late hour a Canadian national, the most emphatic way of asserting it is to put in those very words: "shall be deemed to be." I will not press that for the moment on the Minister of Justice; but I think, when he consults his law officers and the practice heretofore in our statute books, he will find that the term "shall be deemed to be" as it was first read in this chamber this evening, is not only more explicit, but announces the beginning of a new condition of affairs, and we are now beginning to define what a Canadian national is. It will be another landmark in the creation of Canadian nationality.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think the Minister of Justice has quite caught the point raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy). Let me state a case. Twenty years ago a British subject residing in Ontario moved his family across to the United States, and a year later a son was born to them. That son to-day is nineteen years of age. Does he become a Canadian national under this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. FIELDING: The minister thinks he does.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am quite sure.

Mr. FIELDING: The clause reads:

> Any person born out of Canada whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth.

That person was born nineteen years ago. The hon. member for North Perth says—and I agree with him there—that there was then no such thing as a Canadian national, and, therefore, that does not bring the son nineteen years of age to-day and residing in Buffalo, within this Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Does my hon. friend contend that the original drafting would convey the intention he wishes to see conveyed?

Mr. FIELDING: I rather thought the expression "shall be deemed to be" was a better one, but that was objected to, and apparently with good reasons. My objection goes to the root of the whole business. I think it is nonsense.

Mr. DOHERTY: I rose hoping to be in agreement with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), but unfortunately his last statement makes that impossible. I am disposed to think, as suggested by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), that the definition as it is in the Bill, is not wide enough to cover a person born before the passing of this measure, but I think we can find a form of words that will produce that result by letting the present clause stand as it is, but by adding to it in this way.

> (c) Any person born out of Canada whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth, or with regard to a person born before the passing of this Act whose father at the time of such person's birth possessed all the qualifications of a Canadian national as defined in this Act.

I think that will make the matter clear.

Mr. EULER: I am not a lawyer like most of the gentlemen who have spoken on the Bill, and I realize that perhaps I am rather bold in attempting to point out what seems to me to be a lack of consistency between subsection (a) of section 1 on the one hand and subsections (b) and (c). Subsection (a) reads:

> The following persons shall be deemed to be Canadian nationals, viz:—(a) any British subject who is a Canadian citizen within the meaning of the Immigration Act, chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1910, as heretofore amended.

In looking up the Immigration Act, chapter 27, section 2, I find the last paragraph of subsection (f) reads:

Provided that for the purpose of this Act a woman who has not been landed in Canada shall not be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship by virtue of her husband being a Canadian citizen; neither shall a child, who has not been landed in Canada be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship through its father or mother being a Canadian citizen.

That seems to exclude certain women and certain men, and yet subsection (b) of the Bill states specifically that the wife of any such citizen shall be deemed to be a Canadian national, and subsection (c) reads:

Any person born out of Canada whose father was a Canadian national at the time of that person's birth.

There is an inconsistency there. If we interpret according to subsection (a) and the Immigration Act, certain women and certain men would not be included, and yet subsection (b) makes no exception whatever; it says simply "the wife of any such citizen." I do not know whether the point is well taken or not.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are here defining Canadian nationals. The Immigration Act was defining a Canadian citizen. The first subsection in this Bill makes everybody who is a Canadian citizen a Canadian national, and the two other subsections deal with people who are not necessarily Canadian citizens. With regard to the wife, it seemed to us proper that the wife of a Canadian national should be a Canadian national. In the Immigration Act there is a special and particular reason for not recognizing necessarily as a Canadian citizen the wife of a person who is a Canadian citizen, and the purpose of making a distinction there was to prevent a woman who never had been in Canada, and who perhaps might be subject to some objection from the immigration point of view, from coming into Canada merely because her husband had succeeded in meeting all the requirements and had become a Canadian citizen. The Immigration Act is dealing with immigration, and the term "Canadian citizen" has in that Act a meaning only with regard to immigration. We have, however, taken everybody who is a Canadian citizen under that Act and recognized him or her as a Canadian national, because that Act put upon the definition of a Canadian citizen every restriction that was thought necessary with regard to people coming into this country. If in the Immigration Act the wife of a Canadian citizen as such, without any other condition, had become a Canadian citizen we need not have said anything about her in this Act; but we are doing so because we do not see the necessity of maintaining with regard to a Canadian national the same distinction which from the immigration point of view it was thought desirable to make in the case of a person who never was in Canada.

With regard to the Canadian citizen suppose a man came into this country and acquired Canadian citizenship under the Immigration Act and then went out and married the most notorious prostitute, a woman of the worst of habits. It would not be thought desirable, would it, that because she had married that Canadian citizen, she should be entitled to come right into our country? She will not be entitled to come right into our country and therefore in this Act it does not seem necessary to make the same distinction with regard to a Canadian national. Though under this Act she may be entitled to call herself a Canadian national, under the Immigration Act she would not be entitled to come into Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: In view of the point raised by my hon. friend from North Waterloo, and the explanation given by the Minister of Justice, may I suggest to him that a good deal of confusion with regard to the interpretation of this section might be avoided if no part of that interpretation was dependent upon the language of some other statute? If, instead of this reference in subsection (a) to another Act, a definition were given in the subsection without reference to any other Act, there would be less danger of confusion, because the other Act upon which the interpretation of this subsection depends may be amended from time to time, and consequently the definition in this Act will be affected by such amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member will notice that in referring to the definition we refer to "a Canadian citizen within the meaning of The Immigration Act, chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1910, as heretofore amended." We say, "as heretofore amended." We are fixing it now. It is not going to follow that because somebody amends the Immigration Act in the future, that that amendment will affect this Act.

With regard to the other part of it, what seemed to us was this: We get a definition in the Immigration Act as it stands that is satisfactory. What would be gained by copying that definition into this statute? I think that there is some value in connecting your legislation, but all that we were concerned with in this Act,

once we had come to the conclusion that the definition of a Canadian citizen in the Immigration Act was satisfactory as far as it went, was to provide for people, if there were any, who we thought ought to be Canadian nationals, though they did not come within the definition of a Canadian citizen as contained in the Immigration Act, and those two classes are the people dealt with in (b) and (c). The Immigration Act, peculiarly enough, does not say anywhere that the wife of a Canadian citizen, even after she has come into Canada, and is accepted, is by the fact of her being the wife of a Canadian citizen, a Canadian citizen herself, but it does enact as though it thought that if she were landed in Canada the mere fact that her husband was a Canadian citizen would make her one. It does enact negativing her right to be a Canadian citizen merely because her husband is one, unless she has been landed in Canada. That, I think, is a very wise provision from the point of view of immigration. It protects us from the coming in of improper people merely because they happen to be the wives of perfectly proper people perhaps. It did not seem to us in dealing with the definition of a Canadian national generally, where there was no question of the country being practically affected, that it was necessary to get down to as fine a definition as that. We thought we might safely follow what is a general rule in all legislation I have seen with regard to nationality, namely, that the wife of the man has the nationality he has.

Mr. EULER: I quite understand that it is possible for a person to be a Canadian national, and yet not be a Canadian citizen, but it seemed to me there was some conflict in the various subsections.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is an intentional difference.

Mr. EULER: Is it fair to assume, then, that sub-sections (b) and (c) are inserted in order to over-ride the disqualification that would otherwise exist by virtue of subsection (a) of the Immigration Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. The Immigration Act stands absolutely untouched, and as regards immigration will continue absolutely to govern. Our reference to it is only for the purpose of bringing in as Canadian nationals everybody who is a Canadian citizen under the Immigration Act. It does not make anybody a Canadian citizen who under the Immigration Act is not a Canadian citizen. It does not remove any disability, as, for instance, in the case of the wife, the disability resulting from the fact that she has not been landed in Canada. The Immigration Act stands as the law, absolutely untouched. All that this Act is doing is defining what is a Canadian national.

Mr. VIEN: Will the right hon. gentleman read the definition in the Immigration Act?

Mr. McMASTER: Before the minister does so, I should like to say just a word. Would it not be well for the minister to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Russell (Mr Murphy)? We are going to be asked in this statute to make reference to another statute that may be changed from year to year. The minister has pointed out that this statute will not change from year to year, and he is quite right, but in order to find out what this statute says, we will have to turn in years to come, not to the Immigration Act that we are familiar with at that future date, but to the Immigration Act as it exists today. We will have to trace the changes in the Immigration Act up to this day, and then stop there. I wish the minister to realize that most of the questions that have come from this side of the House are in the tone of helpful and instructive criticism; I think I am speaking for a great number on this side of the House when I say that we are glad to see anything that points to a definite acceptance of our status of nationality; of course, in this vale of tears I never expect to reach the condition where everybody will agree with what I say, but I put it to the minister, as this Act may be consulted frequently from time to time, would it not be better to have that other Act put in full in this clause, in order that it may be a sort of handbook for us in the future?

Mr. DOHERTY: I will answer first the question of my hon. friend from Lotbiniere. Sub-section (f) of section 2 of the Immigration Act says:

(2) A British subject who has Canadian domicile; or,

(3) A person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile:

Provided that for the purpose of this Act a woman who has not been landed in Canada shall not be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship by virture of her husband being a Canadian citizen; neither shall a child who has not been landed in Canada be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship through its father or mother being a Canadian citizen.

That is the definition broadly. But there are definitions of Canadian domicile which of course have to be read into that definition, because we have to deal with a British subject who has Canadian domicile. Now, I did not repeat that definition because it would have involved in this Bill not only the reproduction of those few lines from the Immigration Act, but also the definitions in that Act, first, of domicile, and then of Canadian domicile and, I think, even of how Canadian domicile is lost, because Canadian citizenship goes with it; and under our definition Canadian nationalism would go with it if nationalism or citizenship does not depend on birth but merely on domicile. It would be possible to copy this into this Act.

Mr. VIEN: What is the difference between domicile, as defined by that Act, and Canadian domicile?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that the definition in the Act is exactly the definition which, generally speaking, would by law define domicile. So far as I can see, the definition there was intended perhaps to avoid the difficulties with regard to intention which arise when you have at common law to determine the question of the change of domicile. I think the purpose of making this particular definition of domicile was to get rid of that question of determining that there was an intention to change domicile: As I think every lawyer knows, it is one of the most puzzling things when you are thrown on the common or everyday law for the purpose of determining change of domicile.

Mr. VIEN: How would they overcome the difficulty by the definition?

Mr. DOHERTY: Whether they succeeded I do not say, but domicile in the definitions means:

> The place in which a person has his home, or in which he resides, or to which he returns as his place of permanent abode, and does not mean the place where he resides for some special or temporary purpose.

I may be mistaken, but I think that if you did not have that section a man might have his home in Canada, which might be the place to which he returned, but he might never have given up his domicile of origin and might be still domiciled in France or England. I do not want to get into the niceties of the matter.

Mr. VIEN: I fail to see how the definition as given in the Immigration Act overcomes the question of intention, which has to be proven in every case. If he has not left his domicile in England his real domicile will of course be there, because he cannot have two.

Mr. DOHERTY: Under that definition, though his domicile, to all intents and purposes, may be in England he will, under our Immigration Act, have a Canadian domicile. I would rather not be led into what I am satisfied might be an interminable discussion of the intricacies of the question of how you determine at common law when a man has changed his domicile. I have had occasion to go into the question in a number of cases, and I think it was a wise provision in the statute here not to require, in order to enable a man to say that he had Canadian domicile that allowed him to come back into this country, that he should be able to establish positively, according to the ordinary law, that his domicile of origin had actually ceased to be his domicile and that his actual and real domicile was here. At all events, whatever may have been the wisdom of it, the definition is there.

Mr. VIEN: You are in effect reproducing it in this Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. The view as expressed in this Bill is that if it is a good enough domicile to entitle a man to come into this country and to go back and forth freely under the Immigration Act, it is good enough to entitle him, on the one hand, to be treated as a Canadian national and, on the other hand, to subject him to the obligations of a Canadian national. It must be borne in mind that while it looms large in our eyes as a very great privilege to be a Canadian national, that privilege carries with it certain duties, and we are interested not only in seeing that those entitled to this great privilege may be able to demonstrate it, but that it is made clear just who are subject to our legislation as applicable exclusively to Canadian nationals; and that will come to have a greater importance when, as I anticipate, we have had passed the amendment removing doubts as to the extraterritoriality of our legislation. The practical question is, what is the balance of convenience —because I do not understand that we differ as to the substance of the matter— to recopy into this Act all these definitions of domicile, etc., or to content ourselves with stereotyping them now as being for all time, at least until we amend the law, the test as to who is a Canadian national? Now, it is true that a man will have to go

to the Immigration Act to-day to ascertain what domicile is. But might I point out that until our present Act which we are passing is modified he will have to go back to the Canadian Nationalization Act of to-day to find what a Canadian national is? I do not really appreciate as greatly as my hon. friends do the difficulty of having to refer from one statute to another, both being cotemporaneous. The Act appeared to me to be really more simple and clear by putting it into the shape in which it was, but if hon. gentlemen think it a matter of importance, I am willing to consider the suggestion that we might improve things by recopying this statute. It is very usual to legislate by reference to other existing statutes rather than to repeat the provisions referred to.

Mr. VIEN: I think that the reasons given by the right hon. gentleman should prompt us to ask that the question put by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) be further considered and answered. The right hon. gentleman has told us that he wanted to avoid two things; first, a discussion as to the definition given in the Immigration Act of the word "domicile"; secondly, the repetition of that definition because it meant three definitions—the first that of "Canadian citizen," the second "domicile" and the third, "Canadian domicile." In the explanation which the minister has given I find a reason that should justify us in insisting upon a definition of the word "domicile." I have the definition as given by the minister, but I contend that if in the Immigration Act the word " domicile" may be so defined, it will not preclude a person from becoming a Canadian citizen, even if he has not left his domicile in England. I contend, Sir, that we should define what a Canadian national is and we should attach to the definition of "domicile" such restrictions as would permit nobody to be a Canadian national if he has kept his domicile in England or elsewhere. Suppose, for instance, that a gentleman comes from Holland. According to the definition of the word " domicile" in the Immigration Act he is not necessarily bound to prove that he has left his domicile in Holland. He could become a Canadian citizen without that, provided he complies with the wording of the Immigration Act which is, as the right hon. gentleman clearly stated and explained a minute ago, that he has a principal place of domicile where he returns to.

Mr. DOHERTY: May I point out to the hon. gentleman that if his theory is right we will inevitably get into a long discussion as to what technically may be a "domicile."

Mr. VIEN: It may be necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is almost inevitable with regard to every man who wants to be a Canadian national, is that you may have the greatest difficulty in the world in establishing his domicile. More particularly will that be difficult in the case of his children. Surely the hon. gentleman would be satisfied—

Mr. VIEN: No, not after the explanation given by the hon. gentleman a minute ago.

Mr. DOHERTY: Because I told the hon. gentleman in substance that theoretically a man's domicile may be somewhere else he will not be satisfied though the man has practically done all the things which satisfied the requirements of the Immigration Act. The purpose of that definition is to get rid of the difficulty of proving a thing exceedingly difficult to prove. Now, will the hon. gentleman look for a moment at the other side of this picture. It will be acknowledged that in many and many an instance there will be an interest in claiming that the man is a Canadian national. Are we going to have people coming into this country, and domiciled under all the conditions prescribed under all the conditions prescribed in the Immigration Act, free to say to us: "Oh, I am not a Canadian national; I am not governed by those laws that apply to Canadian nationals." I sympathize with the hon. gentleman in the high value, the immense value, that he attaches to being a Canadian citizen—we are all proud of our Canadian nationality—but while I fully join with my hon. friend in that sentiment he must remember also that in many and many a case it will be the interest of this country to establish the fact that a man who is living in Canada—and getting all the advantages and benefits that he enjoys if he complies with the definition of a domicile—should be subjected to every law that applies to a Canadian national.

Mr. VIEN: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but the explanation given does not convince me at all. I think that we should not allow a person residing in Canada to claim to be a Canadian national if he has a domicile elsewhere. That the Immigration Act does not compel a person to prove his intent to abandon his domicile elsewhere before becoming a Canadian citizen is an unfortunate thing in my opinion. I am not responsible for what was done in

1910 or for the amendments made to that Act; but if I had been a member of the House at that time I would have objected to a definition which would allow a person to become a Canadian citizen without at first giving up the domicile that he had in any other country, be it France, Belgium, England or elsewhere. It is impossible to obtain national unity in this country, it is impossible to create that Canadianism which the right hon. gentleman claims to have fostered for the last few years, without exacting from every person who wishes to become a Canadian citizen the abandonment of any domicile he may have in any other country.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman know that in order to become a British subject and to be naturalized under the laws of this country there is absolutely no requirement to abandon domicile? All that is required to become a British subject is that you should reside in this country for five years. The question of domicile is not raised at all; there is no requirement of any kind of domicile. We have gone further in our definition of Canadian citizenship than is necessary to be naturalized as a British subject. The hon. gentleman would create for our Canadian nationalism, and the acquisition of it, conditions that no other country has dreamed of requiring. What I want to point out to the hon. gentleman again is that the cases involved will be few and far between—very, very few—where the man who has complied with the requirements of our Immigration Act has not really got his domicile in Canada. But the purpose of that definition is to avoid the necessity, once you get all these outstanding facts—which in nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand cases will mean that the man actually has his domicile here—establishing under the common law the change of intention as regards domicile. When I say "one in a thousand" it would probably be only in one case in ten thousand that the domicile of a man who had complied with all the requirements would not be in Canada. The purpse is to get rid of the difficulty of proving what is in a man's mind as to the seat of his principal establishment and to get rid of the rule under common law that a man always through his life has his domicile of origin unless you prove affirmatively not merely that he came away from there and lived elsewhere, but that he had the intention of changing his domicile.

Mr. VIEN: Does not the right hon. gentleman believe that it is a good thing?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have difficulty in thinking of anything that could be worse. There is nothing sacred about the common law domicile. If we get people to come here and make Canada their place of abode, whether they are British subjects to begin with or become naturalized as such, I cannot conceive that it would be a misfortune that they should be Canadian nationals during all that time because perhaps they have in the back of their heads the idea that some time they will go back to be buried, we will say, in the country they came from. At common law that is what you have got to negative. You have got to prove in some way what the man's intention was in addition to everything he did. Of course, what he did is valuable evidence of what he intended. If the hon. gentleman's suggestion were carried out, so far as it would modify this law it would make it unworkable and would not prevent any misunderstanding.

Mr. VIEN: We are trying to define Canadian nationals—ressortissants du Canada. I would object to any definition which would cover persons who do not live in Canada with the intention of making this country their home permanently—

Mr. DOHERTY: We require him to make it his home.

Mr. VIEN: There is no similarity between the case of a British subject and the case of a Canadian national. A British subject may be such whether he lived in Australia, in India, or in South Africa.

Mr. DOHERTY: Or whether he lived in France.

Mr. VIEN: It does not matter at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: Exactly, Why should it matter here?

Mr. VIEN: That is why I say there is no similarity between the principle of becoming a British subject, as mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, and what we purpose to do by this law; that is to say, to create Canadian nationals. I would not like to say that all British subjects will become Canadian nationals, because the minister must bear in mind that it gives some advantage for those persons who are about to be defined by the Act to be able to claim they are Canadian nationals, it also implies a responsibility. Therefore, I would not like the Act to define as Canadian nat-

ionals persons who do not intend to make Canada their principal place of permanent abode. In the second place, Sir, I beg strongly to support the motion of my hon. friend from Brome. No matter what the definition may be, it will be much clearer and much handier for reference purposes that these three definitions be given here. For that reason I would ask that the expressions "Canadian citizen," "domicile" and "Canadian domicile" be repeated in this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. CAHILL: Is a British subject under all conditions permitted to come into Canada under the Immigration Act; and, if so what is a British subject under the Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: There are certain classes of British subjects who may be excluded from Canada. That is precisely the advantage of being a Canadian citizen. All British subjects are not entitled de pleno simply because they are British subjects to come into Canada; they are likely to be excluded if they come under any of the excluding sections of the Canadian Act. When the hon. gentleman asks me what is a British subject, I would inform him that he would find enumerated in the British National Act the kinds of people who are British subjects. For instance, everybody born within the realm is a British subject; everybody born outside the realm but of a father who is a British subject is a British subject; and everybody naturalized under the laws of the United Kingdom or under the laws of Canada becomes by such naturalization a British subject. A British subject is a man who owes allegiance to, and who is entitled to protection as a subject of the British Crown. Our Canadian national will be that kind of British subject who is in a special manner subject to and owes obedience to Canadian laws as administered through Parliament and the Government and ultimately His Majesty, he being King of these Dominions just as he is King of Great Britain and the entire Empire.

As regards the suggestion that I should insert this definition in the Bill, I cannot attach to it the importance that the hon. gentleman does. However, I would be willing to consider referring to this definition as fully developed in the schedule and printed in those sections in the schedule. I am sorry that I cannot follow the reasoning of the hon. gentleman with regard to the question of domicile although I recognize the strength of his conviction on the subject. As to the mere form, I do think it would make a very awkward Act if you deemed it necessary to take definitions out of another Act to which you refer and recopy them into an Act intended only to give a definition and I confess I do not see the advantage of it. It would be almost as reasonable to say that when you amend an article of the Civil Code of Quebec you must begin by going back and reproducing the code; that every time there is any connection between any two laws you must reproduce both of them in the same statute. I confess that I cannot see the importance of taking such a course. We have at all times to refer from one statute to another and, as I pointed out a little while ago, supposing it is tweny-five years hence, this Act will have been amended by that time or it will not have been. If it has not been, you will have to go right back to this date to find the definition. But if you did, what would the hardship be?

Mr. VIEN: The hardship would be this: you will have to cover a period of ten years to find out what amendments have been made.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, is it such an appalling thing to have to look at statutes going back a period of ten years? Surely in my hon. friend's own experience the cases are few in which he does not have to look at more than one statute. The Immigration Act as it stands to-day is printed in one book, and it would be very easy to look up.

Mr. CANNON: At the opening of the discussion the right hon. gentleman explained that this Bill is a consequence of our being a separate and distinct member of the League of Nations. The British Empire is also a member of the League of Nations; will the British Empire have British Empire nationals, while at the same time, Australia, Canada, India, and South Africa have nationals of their own? If so, what will be the legal difference between a British Empire national and a Canadian national?

Mr. DOHERTY: The description of the British Empire as a distinct member of the League has always been interpreted as meaning the United Kingdom with the Crown colonies and dependencies.

Mr. CANNON: Excluding the dominions?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. I may say that there has been serious criticism of the adoption of that form. It was urged at the

time that the United Kingdom with the Crown colonies and dependencies should have been one member, and we should have been the others, all together going to make up the British Empire. We were not able to get it put that way, in words.

Mr. VIEN: Why?

Mr. DOHERTY: Really I cannot tell you why; no reason was given that I could possibly grasp. I do not know how far it is proper that I should publicly discuss things that took place in discussion in a small committee; perhaps it is not proper that I should go into the details. But while we could not get our view recognized in words, we have it recognized in practice. The British Empire is spoken of as one member of the League, but in the practical operation it is the United Kingdom that is that particular member, and we of the dominions had our membership and our representation and our say on a footing of equality with the gentlemen who represented the United Kingdom. I think that when the proper opporutnity comes we should urge that that misnomer be corrected, and when we do so we shall probably be able to make the reasonableness of our contention apparent. Perhaps it will be permissible for me to say that in officialdom, which counts for a great deal on the other side, you find an aversion to calling things by their right names. They have a love for hanging on to an old name, even when the thing itself has ceased to exist. Possibly after a thing has been gone for years, even for centuries, the name will still be there.

Mr. VIEN: Has it not occurred in Canada also?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: Particularly in the naming of political parties.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. I have always been struck with the extent to which the name "Liberal" is a misnomer, as applied to so many hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. Certainly my hon. friend has hit upon an apt illustration.

Mr. VIEN: And the word "Tory."

Mr. DOHERTY: And how utterly inapplicable the word "Tory" is to some people over here.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): When I was in Paris about ten years ago I sought to have myself registered as a Canadian in one of the Departments of the French Government. That designation was refused and I was inscribed simply as a British subject. That, of course, was quite satisfactory to me, but I would like to know whether as a result of this legislation a man may in future claim to be inscribed on any public document as a Canadian?

Mr. DOHERTY: I certainly think he would be entitled to; indeed, I thought he was in the past. On any occasion when I have been travelling and have been asked what my nationality was, I have said: "Canadian"—and it went right down. At the League of Nations we from Canada were never known as anything else—and we were not anything else—than the Canadian representatives, and we sat at the table in the position officially designated "Canadian Delegation." As I had occasion to say the other day, time develops many things. Perhaps it is some years since my hon. friend was in Paris.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I was there in 1910.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, that is ten years ago—and we are getting along.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the purpose of the Bill to establish clearly who is a Canadian national as distinguished from nationals of France or of other countries?

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, we can only make laws that are laws in Canada. When the country defines what its nationals or its subjects or its citizens are, it does not make a law that binds an outside country. But it puts before the world its contention; in the first place, it makes them such in its own country, where its law has force, and then it puts before the world who it is that it claims as its subjects. It can do nothing more.

Mr. VIEN: And a subject may be claimed by two countries?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly, just to-day we have innumerable cases of dual nationality. In the recent war there were many instances of young men who had been born in Canada of French fathers. Those young men were Canadians, British subjects, undoubtedly, but in France they were French citizens, and we saw many of them go back to join the colours in France, recognizing their position as French citizens. It is one of the things that is inseparable from nationality that, as each country makes its own laws, you always have the possibility of dual nationalities; I do not think

you can get rid of them until you have some system of treaties or conventions.

Mr. CANNON: What will be the exact new privileges or rights conferred on Canadian nationals, in accordance with this law?

Mr. DOHERTY: This law confers no rights whatever upon Canadian nationals. It defines what a Canadian national is.

Mr. CANNON: What is the object of the law?

Mr. DOHERTY: If there never had been a League of Nations, and if, therefore, we never had any rights to exercise there, I would have thought the Canadian Parliament, in view, amongst other things, of what the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said a little while ago and in view of what the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has said, would have welcomed a Bill defining this.

Mr. CANNON: We all do.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, the hon. gentleman asks me what rights this Bill is going to confer. This Bill is not going to give anybody any rights. This Bill makes a definition. Let me give one instance, and it is only one. The nationals of every country that is a member of the League have, to begin with, a right to representation in the Assembly. We want to exercise those rights. We have a right to nominate Canadian nationals as aspirants for appointment to the permanent Court of Internationl Justice and, if we get a majority, to elect them. If we have litigation with any other country brought before that permanent Court, and there happens to be sitting upon that permanent Court a national for our adversary, then we have a right to say: "We want a national of ours to sit there too to balance the thing up," because they do not proceed by recusing the judge who is a national of one of the parties; their method of evening the matter up is to say to the other party: "You may have a judge of your nationality." All these things turn upon our nationality. Supposing some one says to us: "Is this gentleman a Canadian national?" What is a Canadian national? What is a British subject? This is what the Parliament of Canada is defining to be a Canadian national. If, after the passing of this legislation, I declare that I am a Canadian national, and anybody disputes that, I will turn to the Statute and say: "I fulfil all those conditions." For years back, why do you find in the laws of Great Britain, or in France, or of any other civilized country, the definition of their citizen or subject or national? Surely we have the same interest as all other countries have to form a clear-cut idea of who it is that is entitled, not only to rights in the outside world, but to claim for himself the honourable and distinctive title of Canadian national. We want to define that.

Mr. VIEN: I understand the minister is going to introduce a schedule containing a definition.

Mr. DOHERTY: I said that I was going to consider that. I must say that I have not been able to consider it very much since, but the more I consider it, the less it impresses me as a necessary thing. I shall, however, be glad to consider whether it would be desirable to do that or not.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose the principle of this Bill is conceded by its receiving its second reading. It is fortunate for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that he is a member of a Tory Government when introducing and advocating and carrying through Parliament legislation of this kind. I can recall very well conditions in this House when, if a Minister of Justice in a Liberal administration would introduce anything that would look like severance from the mother country and cutting away the sacred ties between ourselves and the mother land, woe betide us because we would hear from the stalwart gentleman from Ontario whom I see looking at me from the other side.

Mr. DOHERTY: This does not.

Mr. McKENZIE: But it seems to be all right for this Minister of Justice to be a Nationalist. A Nationalist in this country has a significant meaning, and our Tory friend do not like to be told that they are in league with the Nationalists; that they are in league with a Nationalist who used to make openings in the British flag.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are Nationalists and Nationalists.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now it is all right to put us all in the same class and say that we are all Nationalists. The Bourassa sect and everybody that followed him are all right now. We have found that we have come to them, and we are all Nationalists. I do not think the good loyal people of Ontario will like the idea that we have forsaken Canadian citizenship

with all that that term meant, and that we are now Nationalists, if we take our definition of a Nationalist from what Mr. Bourassa and those behind him were preaching. In 1867, only four provinces of Canada entered Confederation; they each had their status before Confederation; but when they became Canada, they got that status from an Imperial Act of Parliament, and in that Imperial Act they are called the "Dominion of Canada." By what right does this Parliament change the name from the "Dominion of Canada" to the "Nation of Canada"? We have no right, instead of calling ourselves the "Dominion of Canada" to call ourselves the "Nation of Canada." That means a change in the British North America Act, and after this Act passes, wherever the name "Dominion of Canada" occurs in the British North America Act, we shall have to substitute for it the "Nation of Canada" or the "Kingdom of Canada." There is no "Nation of Canada," and no person can say for one moment that there is. Before you can have a Nationalist, you must have a nation. As far as I am concerned, to be a Canadian citizen and a British subject is good enough for me, and I do not find it necessary, even with all its beauty and wealth of language and fine definition, to go to France for any definition of what I am. I am a Canadian.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are trying to give you a home-made definition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am a Canadian and a British subject and particularly proud of being a subject of the British Empire and under the folds of the British flag. For that reason, I submit to the minister that I do not think we have any right to use the word "national," nor have we any business to declare ourselves a nation except by some convention with the Mother Country. If it is agreed to by convention that all the Dominions shall be called nations, and so forth, I shall have no fault to find; but it is going too far for this Parliament to declare that we are no longer a Dominion of Canada, but a nation with all the responsibilities that that word implies. We must be either one thing or the other. If we are a nation,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: —we have a right to declare war. Will my hon. friends who are saying, "hear, hear" say that we have a right to declare war, or to pass in this House legislation that would be a cause of war between Great Britain and any other country? They will have to say that we could not. But if people are satisfied with the empty shell and are content to think they are a nation when they are not, I suppose we should not deprive them of the privilege of playing with the idea; but there is no such thing. It is always unwise to live under false pretences, and I see no advantage whatever in trying prematurely to get away from our present status to be a nation when we are really not. I think the whole of this legislation is a useless bungle of words.

Mr. PARENT: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I want to point out to the committee before the hon. member speaks that a discussion on the principle of the Bill is certainly not now in order. The Bill was held over at the request of the Opposition owing to the fact that it was not printed, and in order that the principle might be discussed upon the second reading. It is certainly not in order for hon. members to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the Chairman has any reference to me he is sending coals to Newcastle. I was in this House many years before the hon. gentleman, and I know the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman will then possibly remember that among the rules of the House is one that the ruling of the Chair cannot be questioned, and that it can only be appealed from. I hope that the other hon. members of the committee will adhere to the ruling.

Mr. PARENT: It was not my intention to make a speech at all. I simply wanted to call the attention of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) to a state of affairs which I have noticed while travelling from New York to Montreal. I was just wondering whether it would not be possible to have the form of questions submitted to immigrants and Canadian passengers coming into this country printed in both the French and English languages. That will be a good job for the Printing Bureau if the hon. gentleman wants to see that both languages in this country receive equal consideration.

Mr. CALDER: That involves a question that is scarcely pertinent to the provisions of this Bill. There is something in the suggestion made by the hon. member but at the same time we must remember there are a great many people in Canada other

than the French-speaking people. The number of people entering Canada from France during the last 10 or 15 years has been comparatively small compared with the numbers arriving from other countries, and if it is desirable to have these forms printed in some language other than English, it certainly would be desirable to have them printed in these other languages as well. I am aware, of course, of the argument for having public documents printed in the two official languages, but that is not applied all along the line.

Mr. McMASTER: I think I ought to point out very respectfully to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization that the French language is on a very different footing in this country from the other languages to which he alludes. The first part of my hon. friend's remarks would almost lead an impartial observer to the conclusion that he had forgotten that fact. I am sure that he cannot have done so, but if by any possibility he has, I take in all kindness this opportunity of reminding him of it. As far as official documents are concerned, the hon. member (Mr. Parent) is only asking what I would imagine the constitution of the country accorded him.

Mr. VIEN: There is something more to be said in that direction in answer to my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. The question put by my hon. frend (Mr. Parent) was in reference to Canadian nationals who travel—they are not necessarily immigrants—and who when coming into Canada after a journey to the United States are obliged to answer a questionnaire. A great number of those who travel from New York, Boston, and other American cities to Canada would not understand the questions if they were put to them in English. Very often these people are Canadian nationals coming back to their country. May I ask when we shall know the decision of the right hon. the Minister of Justice as to the schedule?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have promised to consider it. I would like to have the Bill go through, and if I should come to the conclusion that it was desirable to add the schedule, I would have the Bill sent back into committee. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would be kind enough to think it over too, because I know of only one reason for accepting his suggestion, and that is his strong feeling on the subject; I have a great respect for that. Perhaps we might make an honourable compromise in that way. If the Bill goes through committee, I would seriously consider the suggestion, and perhaps he will do so too; perhaps we shall both come to the conclusion that the schedule is not necessary, or perhaps we shall both come to the conclusion that it is.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask the right hon. the Minister of Justice if in his capacity as minister he would recommend to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization that the forms submitted to Canadian nationals travelling from other countries to Canada be printed in both the French and English languages?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think they ought to have the questions put to them in one or the other of the official languages which they understand, which, of course, in my own case and the case of many hon. gentlemen on the other side will involve the necessity of printing them in both languages, as we happen to have the good fortune to understand both. I think that was the sense in which the Minister of Immigration and Colonization spoke. I do not suppose the suggestion is that when you are face to face with a Russian who does not speak either French or English, you should put the questions to him in both French and English before you go out to get a Russian interpreter and try and put the questions in some language he does understand. My hon. friends, I think, know without my saying it that I have every sympathy for their feeling with regard to their language. For myself I never see any ground to make comparisons between the French language and any other language than the English in this country. I never see the possibility of putting the French language on a par with any foreign language in this country. To that extent I go, but I think all will agree that there can be no object in dumping before a Russian who understands neither French nor English a list of questions in French any more than there would be in putting them in English.

Mr. PARENT: If such a man comes here he knows the situation?

Mr. DOHERTY: Do not let the hon. gentleman suppose I am putting the French and Russian languages on a par, but the French and English. When you get people who understand neither, I would think there was not much object in talking to them in either.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doherty moves to amend clause 1 as printed in the Bill by substituting the word "are" for the words "shall be deemed to be," and adding the following words, "or with regard to any person born before the passing of this Act whose father at the time of such birth possessed all the qualifications of a Canadian national as defined in this Act."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: I move to add to the Bill as Clause 2 the following:

2. (a) Any person who by reason of his having been born in Canada is a Canadian national, but who at his birth or during his minority became under the law of the United Kingdom or of any of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire, a national also of that Kingdom or Dominion, and is still such a national, and,

(b) any person who though born out of Canada is a Canadian national; may, if of full age and not under disability, make a declaration renouncing his Canadian nationality and on making such declaration shall cease to be a Canadian national.

Mr. FIELDING: Where has this declaration to be made? The Act is silent on that point.

Mr. DOHERTY: It may perhaps be desirable to specify the place. If I fall into error in that regard it is simply in following the identical analagous provision contained in the British Nationality Act and also the Act of this country. No particular formality was required for the declaration of alienage as between the nationals of different parts of the Empire. The principle laid down in the British Act with regard to a British subject who, under the circumstances mentioned there, renounces his British citizenship, was followed, and I think the section, with the words mutatis mutandis, was copied directly from that Act.

Mr. FIELDING: What do you understand it to mean as it stands now? The declaration is to be made under what circumstances, at what point, in what form, and before whom?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I say, the Act does not subject that declaration to formality. It might be well that it should. If we did that, however, we should be making a new departure. A declaration without prescribed formalities has been deemed sufficient under the existing legislation.

Mr. VIEN: It may be a verbal declaration.

Mr. DOHERTY: I realize there is a value in the suggestion that there should be a definite form, and I shall be prepared to ascertain what is the proper form in which the declaration should be put.

Mr. CANNON: Last year in the course of the discussion of the Electoral Act, my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Euler) raised certain questions as to amendments which he desired to have introduced into the law, and at that time it was declared by the Government that certain arrangements had been come to between the Imperial authorities and the overseas Dominions as to having a uniform law of nationality or citizenship.

Mr. DOHERTY: Not citizenship.

Mr. CANNON: I meant to say naturalization. The right hon. gentleman who was Prime Minister at the time (Sir Robert Borden), said if I remember rightly, that no amendment could be introduced or assented to unless the Imperial authorities were consulted. We had that official declaration in the House last year. Does this new legislation interfere in any way with the arrangements made at that time and still existing between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Government?

Mr. DOHERTY: This legislation does not touch the question of naturalization at all. It leaves it absolutely where it was before any one talked about this Bill, or where it would be if this Bill were never passed. As to the arrangements which the hon. gentleman speaks about, it might be well to have the circumstances in regard thereto stated clearly. There is no more arrangement that we must do as the Imperial Parliament wants on the subject of naturalization, than there is that the Imperial Parliament must do what we want. The arrangement that was come to was that, because there was something that this Parliament could give which no one else could give, and because there was something else that the British Parliament could give which neither we nor any one else could give, we would make this agreement, that so long as our laws were identical, our naturalizations, which of their own force did not apply in the United Kingdom, would by reason of this arrangement be effective there, and vice versa, so long as our laws were identical we would recognize the home naturalization laws as effective in this country. To that extent there is an understanding. It is as desirable that our naturalization should be effective throughout the Empire as it is that the naturalization of the United Kingdom should be effective here; and be-

cause constitutionally the Parliament of the United Kingdom could not naturalize a man in Canada we agreed that it was necessary to have this arrangement, just as because we could not naturalize a man in the United Kingdom it became necessary to secure a similar undertaking on their part. The agreement was one on a footing of perfect equality.

Mr. CANNON: Is it possible for a man to be a Canadian national in Canada, that is, a Canadian citizen, and not be a British subject in any other part of the British Empire?

Mr. DOHERTY: A man to be a Canadian national must be a British subject.

Mr. CANNON: In Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: Can he be a Canadian national and a British subject in Canada and not be a British subject in another part of the British Empire?

Mr. DOHERTY: If he has the good fortune to be naturalized under Canadian law he is a naturalized British subject in Canada and will be a naturalized British subject in the United Kingdom. He may not be one in Australia or in New Zealand, because they have not as yet passed the necessary legislation, and that is unfortunate. But I see no inconsistency in a man's being a Canadian national though he is not a British subject in Australia.

Mr. CANNON: What would be the case of a man who was born in the United States, naturalized a British subject under Canadian law, and now lives in England? Is he a Canadian national?

Mr. DOHERTY: If a man was born in the United States and now lives in England, having been naturalized in Canada—if these are all the facts and you have nothing else to suggest—he would not be a Canadian national because he was not born in Canada. When he was naturalized in Canada he was made a British subject, but in addition to being a British subject, if not born in Canada, he must have acquired a Canadian domicile.

Mr. POWER: There is, I presume, a law defining a United Kingdom national?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not that I know of.

Mr. POWER: The Bill refers to a national "of that kingdom." I presume that refers to the United Kingdom. So there is such a thing as a United Kingdom national.

Mr. DOHERTY: I know of no Act defining one. There are lots of things that are law though they are not in Acts, and if there be no Act or law now there may be one in the future. But I think there would be a little difficulty in ascertaining who were "ressortissants" of the United Kingdom.

Mr. POWER: Am I to understand that Canada is the first of the self-governing colonies to have nationals of its own?

Mr. McMASTER: So much the better.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think they all have but we are the first, so far as I know, to make the definition.

Mr. McMASTER: Why should we not be.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that is our proper place, first in the line and first all the time.

Mr. POWER: What would be the position of a gentleman in West Africa who lives under a mandatory power? What kind of a national would he be?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think it would take a very wise man indeed—wiser than I can pretend to be—to define the position of the inhabitants of countries who are under mandatories. I have not had the advantage of seeing the terms of the mandates, I do not know that they are settled, and I am afraid I will have to say that I cannot answer the question; I do not know anybody that could just now.

Mr. VIEN: The Minister has spoken of an agreement which was come to, probably at the Imperial Conference in England, as to the identity of our laws on naturalization. What was the nature of that agreement? Was it written and where can it be found?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman will find it in the Canadian Statute dealing with naturalization. He will likewise find it in the statute of the United Kingdom dealing with the same subject.

Mr. VIEN: That is an enactment; my question had reference to the agreement.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps "agreement" is not a proper word. I might say this to the hon. gentleman: The agreement, so far as we can talk about an agreement, was reached at the Imperial Conference at which Sir Wilfrid Laurier represented Canada.

Mr. VIEN: What year please?

Mr. DOHERTY: In 1911. Now what was agreed there was that it was desirable that we should have a common naturalization, and that the way to do that was to pass similar laws of naturalization in both countries. Then we passed similar laws, and out of that there arose the necessity of our keeping our laws similar. It was not peculiar to our Parliament that it was said: We cannot very well deal with the question because we have no understanding that the United Kingdom will deal with it and we want to keep our laws similar. If the hon. gentleman will look at the debate on the Naturalization Act in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom he will find numerous suggestions with respect to which the Minister in charge of the Bill said: "I think that is a good suggestion but you see we have not consulted with the Dominions and we want to avoid getting our laws different." It was not a question of the United Kingdom telling us what we must do any more than a question of our telling them what they must do. It was a question of two peoples who wanted to keep their action in line to attain a common purpose. Therefore, on their side they tried to communicate with us before final action and we tried to communicate with them. But the origin of the understanding that was come to that a general naturalization was desirable and that the way to do it was by uniform legislation is to be found—although it had been talked about earlier—in the Imperial Conference of 1911. The hon. gentleman will see there what in substance is the understanding that was come to which was carried out by the British Act of 1914 and the Canadian Act of 1914.

Mr. VIEN: I understand then that it was an agreement reached by all those self-governing Dominions that took part in the Conference in 1911?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: I understand further that Canada and the United Kingdom are the only two parties that have acted in conformity to that agreement?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, that is my latest understanding.

Mr. VIEN: Has any information been received by the Government as to the reasons why, after the period of ten years which has elapsed since 1911, the other self-governing Dominions did not act in accordance with the agreement that was reached at the Conference?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. I cannot possibly tell the hon. gentleman. I may tell him this: By way of carrying out the understanding or agreement, and when I say "agreement," I do not want to be misunderstood—

Mr. VIEN: It was a resolution of the Conference.

Mr. DOHERTY: Everybody came to an agreement that if it was a desirable thing to have a naturalization that would go all over the Empire the best way to do it was by uniform legislation. I do not say that anyone sat down and said "I will do it," but that was what was agreed to be the best thing to do. Carrying that out the British authorities drafted an Act which they claimed carried out the understanding, or which purported to do so. That Act was circulated throughout the Dominions and they were all asked if it was acceptable to them. All of them except Canada said that it was acceptable. Now I do not want to indulge in anything in the nature of criticism at all, but the draft had come to this country shortly before the change of Government. I do not think it had been considered by the Government that preceded the Borden administration. When we came into office we found it there and we said: "No, that never was the understanding of the agreement and we will not submit to it." That was an Act which purported to make the United Kingdom Naturalization Act effective in Canada, so that by virtue of their legislation people would find themselves entitled to have their naturalization recognized in Canada. We took the position that we would not submit to that; that whoever was to be recognized in Canada as properly naturalized must be so under the enactment of the Canadian Parliament. It took us two years and a trip to England to get that acknowledged. Finally, it was acknowledged and now our legislation stands. The position we took was the validity of a naturalization in Canada must be accepted because it complies with all the provisions of the law of the Parliament of Canada, and not as resting on any other law. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Naturalization Act he will see that was carried out.

Mr. EULER: It certainly was my impression that when two years ago the question of the naturalization of certain aliens, introduced by myself, was before the House the then Prime Minister and the

Acting Solicitor General (now Minister of Militia) stated that the Canadian Parliament was not competent to grant naturalization acording to its own wishes because it conflicted with the wishes of the British Parliament or with the terms of the British Act. I am very strongly of the impresion that was so stated in the House of Commons by the then Prime Minister and also by the then Solicitor General. We remained under that impression in the session of 1919 and it was accentuated during the session of 1920. It was only at the last moment, when the Act was changed, that the admission was made that there never was ground for stating in this Parliament that the British Government was trying to dictate to us in any shape or form, that we always had that power. We were delayed for two years because members of the ministry, including the then Prime Minister, were under a wrong impression as to the law.

Mr. DOHERTY: I suppose it will be conceded that this discussion is not very relevant to the Bill we are now discussing.

Mr. EULER: But I would like a statement from the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be very pleased if I can to remove the misapprehension which is in the mind of the hon. member. I am quite sure that there is a misapprehension there but I am not certain that I can succeed in removing it. What was stated by the Prime Minister of the time of which the hon. gentleman speaks, and also by the Solicitor General, was just what I pointed out a little while ago—that in order to maintain the Empire-wide quality of our naturalization the Parliament of the United Kingdom must see to it that its law was the same as ours, and we on our side must see to it that our law was the same as theirs. It was not for lack of authority, but it was because the Imperial Parliament had passed certain provisions and there was a mistaken impression that those provisions had been embodied by the draftsman in that portion of the Act which it was necessary should be identical with the British Act. It was in that the mistake consisted. The clauses referred to were not included in that portion of the Act which was required to be identical. I may say that as it happened—and I am not saying this to glorify myself—when I took up the statute and read it two things became apparent to me. That there had been a mistake; but from the form in which the statute was drafted in was not at all to be wondered that the draftsman had fallen into confusion. Let me tender my congratulations to the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). I know it makes him so happy, and I would hate to detract from his happiness. I admit that we made a mistake. Oh, joy, that there was once a Government composed of members of this party that made a mistake! I hope that through the years to come the hon. gentleman will be able to hug that delightful thought to his bosom, and I feel some happiness in so far as I have contributed to the mistake which has brought that very great happiness to the hon. gentleman. Now I would like to get back to our Bill if I might.

Mr. EULER: Just one moment. The minister perhaps takes almost as much pleasure out of the last part of his oration as he hoped I was taking.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is impossible.

Mr. EULER: My object in making the statement I did a few moments ago was possibly because of misapprehension of what the minister had said. I understand him to say that this Government could not have enacted naturalization legislation without reference to the British law, and that it took this Government two years to induce the British Government to change its attitude. If that is not what he said I misunderstood him.

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly you did.

Mr. EULER: I know that the mistake, which never should have occurred and which gives him so much pleasure to dwell upon, was not the fault of the minister himself but some one else's entirely.

Mr. DOHERTY: From what the hon. gentleman says I must have conveyed an entirely erroneous impression. We must be fair to everybody. The mistake was exactly the mistake I referred to in taking the Act up here. As the hon. gentleman will have occasion sometimes to refer to that Act he will find that it is divided into two parts.

Mr. EULER: I know all about that.

Mr. DOHERTY: Part two of the Act is essentially the part to keep identical. When the British Parliament came to amend the Act they made certain amendments to part two by inserting certain words in the section here and there, and I think in some

places they substituted sections; then they enacted three additional sections, making new substantive dispositions, and finally they put a clause at the end to say—I do not recall it at the present moment, but it was one that would convey to one the impression at first glance that all of these preceding amendments were amendments to part two; but when you looked at them closely you could see that that was not correct, and that the last two or three dispositions were perfectly distinct and not intended to amend part two. To be perfectly fair to the British Government, they never pretended that those articles did amend part two; the mistake was on this side entirely. In fact, it is apparent very early in the correspondence that not only had the British Government not fallen into error, but that when they found the discussion that was going on here they took occasion to cable calling our attention to the fact that we were making a mistake. So the hon. gentleman must not have any idea that it was any attempt at imposition of authority on the part of the British Government. We make mistakes sometimes. I made one the other day and was admonished by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and it is always a delight to him when he is able to talk of our blunders.

Mr. McKENZIE: He would be talking all the time.

Mr. VIEN: I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that when the Government undertake to enact naturalization laws they confer with the British Government so as to obtain some similarity between their laws and ours. Is that conference taking place also with the other self-governing dominions so as to try and obtain that similarity with their laws?

Mr. DOHERTY: The practice has been to transfer suggestions to the other dominions. For instance, if the British Government made suggestions to us they would make them to the other self-governing dominions too, and if we transmitted suggestions to the British Government that Government would submit them to the Parliaments of the other self-governing dominions. Why the other self-governing dominions have not acted I have no reason of knowing.

Mr. VIEN: As to that—

An hon. MEMBER: Let us get to bed.

Mr. VIEN: Everybody who wants to go to bed is free to go.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. VIEN: Was the proposed Bill discussed at the League of Nations?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. VIEN: Was it suggested at the Peace Conference?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. VIEN: And was it discussed as between Canada and the United Kingdom?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. VIEN: It is purely on the initiative of Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: And without any understanding that any other part of the British Empire will take the same action?

Mr. DOHERTY: Exactly; we have no understanding as to whether any other part of the British Empire will think proper to define its nationals or not, and with all respect I think it is none of our business. Equally so, I like to believe that other parts of the Empire fully recognize that this is no concern of theirs. We are defining our own Canadian nationals. Some other of the self-governing dominions may deem it wise to define their nationals—Australia, for instance—but Australia will do exactly what she likes about it. I do not think the Canadian Parliament would feel that we had to go and ask anybody else's leave to define who we are. It is for us to recognize who is a Canadian and who is not.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that after this Bill is passed Canada will, at future meetings of the League, always be represented by a Canadian national.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should think so.

Mr. CANNON: Or might Canada be in the same position as South Africa was at the last meeting of the League, when she was represented by Lord Robert Cecil? In view of the passage of this Bill will it no longer be possible for the Government to delegate their powers, for instance, to someone else of his standing?

Mr. DOHERTY: I should not like to answer for what may happen in the future —when, for instance, my hon. friend be-

comes a member of the Canadian Government. I should think, however, that any Canadian Government would always be able to find Canadian nationals competent to represent Canada in the Assembly of the League of Nations. I do not want to enter upon any discussion of what General Smuts thought it proper to do in regard to South Africa; that is a matter for South Africans to settle. All hon. gentlemen will agree that on some odd occasion it might happen, when there was nothing important to be done and ornamental representation only was required, you might ask somebody on the spot to be good enough to act as Canada's representative.

Mr. McMASTER: I hope the minister does not infer that the people in the British Isles or in any other part of the Empire would be more ornamental than Canadian nationals?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not more ornamental, but, you see, "quand on n'a pas ce qu'on aime, on aime ce qu'on a." When you do not have a simon-pure Canadian national, then, if occasion requires, you might utilize somebody who was not quite so good-looking.

Mr. VIEN: It has been found difficult so far to get a Canadian national to represent us at Washington; it may be difficult to get a Canadian national to represent us at the League of Nations.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman should not pile all our troubles on us at the one moment. When he sees whom we shall select, he will agree that the waiting was worth while.

Mr. CANNON: Especially if, as the press reports suggest, my hon. friend himself is appointed to the position.

Mr. VIEN: Will the right hon. gentleman tell us what has been the cause of the delay?

M. DOHERTY: Waiting for the numerous suggestions that we gather in day by day and night by night. It would have been a pity if opportunity had not been given for the valuable advice that that wait has given rise to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that the British flag is the only flag recognized on Canadian ships by foreign nations. Will the adoption of this measure bring about any change in that respect?

Mr. DOHERTY: It will not affect our ships in the slightest; we will keep on land for the time being.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Then our flag will still not be recognized in any foreign country?

Mr. DOHERTY: When we get a flag I suppose we wil attend to its recognition.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member knows well that on the Canadian merchant ships we fly the red ensign the same as the British ships, except that we have the Canadian coat-of-arms on it.

Mr. VIEN: Is it recognized abroad?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: Internationally?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I believe so.

Mr. VIEN: I understand that a few years ago our Canadian flag—a British ensign with the Canadian coat-of-arms—was hauled down in the harbour of New York or Boston because it was not internationally recognized. Has this status been changed?

Mr. COPP: After this Bill passes will it be possible for a person to be a Canadian national and also a national of some other overseas dominion or the United Kingdom?

Mr. DOHERTY: So long as a person who is a Canadian national did not, even though he became a national of some other dominion, make the declaration contemplated in the Bill, he would continue to be a Canadian national. If a British subject in the United States had a son born to him, that son would be a British subject and an American citizen. I mentioned instances earlier in the evening of men born in this country who were both British subjects and French citizens. I know of no way of avoiding that unless we come to some convention in the matter. It might be desirable at some time that some convention in that regard should be arrived at between the dominions and the Mother Country. We have a provision here to enable a man to choose which one he will adhere to if he should happen to find himself in that position.

Mr. COPP: But if he is a national of Canada and also of another dominion or the United Kingdom and does not choose to make any declaration, which must he take?

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill does not undertake to say what his relationship is to any other country. According to the law of this country, if he was born, say, in Canada, and makes no declaration, he will continue to be a Canadian national.

Mr. COPP: He can exercise all the privileges of being a Canadian national, irrespective of whether he is also a national of another country?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, just as a man born in Canada, though his father, being a Frenchman, was a French citizen, may enjoy all the privileges of a British subject either in this country or in the United Kingdom.

Mr. PARENT: Under the Indian Act I understand that an Indian is not a "person". Will he become a Canadian national under this Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, I must confess that I have not given consideration to the question of the Indian. However, I have no reason to doubt that under the disposition of this Act an Indian would be a Canadian national if he was born in Canada.

Mr. VIEN: When is the minister going to bring down that definition of the declaration?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I can take it that these clauses are adopted. I was going to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. FIELDING: And let the Bill remain in committee?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, for the purpose of the declaration.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would seem to me that subsection (b) of section 2 more properly belongs to the Naturalization Act. I do not think we have any right to declare here how any man can throw off the responsibility of having become a British subject.

Mr. DOHERTY: The question is not one of throwing off British citizenship; it is purely limited to his Canadian nationality, and that is what he is throwing off. The British Nationality Act, which we have enacted also, provides how a man can throw off his quality of British subject. This Act does not touch that in the slightest. A man would lose his Canadian nationality when he threw off his quality of British subject, but his merely throwing off his quality of Canadian national does not affect his quality of British subject at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: What will he be? He is not a native of Canada; he is not a native of any other country. What on earth is he?

Mr. FIELDING: Nothing at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let us take a very simple case. A man was born in England of a father who was a Canadian national. That man would be a British subject and a Canadian national. He would have two qualities. By-and-by he thinks he would rather be a national or resortissant of the United Kingdom. He says: "I want to renounce my Canadian nationality," and that is all he renounces; he remains just the same British subject he was before. It will depend upon what the laws of the different portions of the Empire are whether or not he becomes a national of one of those countries. It is not essential that he should be a national of any thing at all when he is living in any part of the Empire which does not deem it necessary to define its nationalism. He may be in the unfortunate situation of being a national of nothing in particular; but he will always be a British subject, and under those circumstances, I presume he would be a national of the United Kingdom.

Mr. FIELDING: And yet a man born in the United States of a father who was a British subject, would be at the same time a citizen of the United States and a Canadian national?

Mr. DOHERTY: And a British subject.

Mr. FIELDING: By reason of this Bill only.

Mr. DOHERTY: He would be a British subject without this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING: This Bill makes him a British subject.

Mr. DOHERTY: It makes him a Canadian national. But before a man can be a Canadian national, he has to be a British subject. Supposing this Bill was never passed, a man born in the United States of a father who is a British subject is both an American citizen and a British subject. I know this sounds anomalous, and there is a provision in the British Nationality Act to enable a man, just as we provide here for throwing off the mere national, to throw off the quality of British subject where a man, under those circumstances by reason of his father being a British subject, is a British subject. Under that provision—I have not the text of it—that man may make a declaration of alienage and cease to be a British subject, or he may refrain from making that declaration and continue to be a British subject. There are in the world any number of people who are in the

anomalous position of being subjects of two countries.

Mr. CANNON: Will this Bill, from an international viewpoint, receive any application so far as Canada is concerned, outside of our territory?

Mr. DOHERTY: No law has any application outside of the territory of the country that made it, but I think I am safe in saying that it is the universal international custom to accept a country's own definition of who its citizens or subjects are unless some other country disputes it. If somebody gets disputing over some of our most distinguished citizens, I can readily comprehend we may have serious disputes between different parts of this Empire as to who is entitled to claim some of the distinguished gentlemen I see in front of me. If such dispute should arise, I would not contend that our law should govern anywhere outside of Canada, any more than a British law saying that a man is a British subject governs anywhere outside of the British realms. Such laws have to depend upon international comity for any recognition outside. It would be just as absurd for me to say that this law will govern outside of Canada as to our nationality, as it would be for the British Prime Minister to say that when the Parliament of Great Britain passes a law, defining a British subject, that makes people in France say: That man is a British subject. People in France say so on account of international comity, but they are not bound to do so; they might legislate and say: That man is a French citizen, and that is the law of France.

Mr. CANNON: As I understand my right hon. friend, the question is not one of law, but of courtesy, and this law is passed so as to secure representation by a Canadian national at future meetings of the League. Those meetings are held generally outside of Canada, so that the law would never apply except through courtesy.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sorry, but I cannot make for Canadians a position that does not belong to anybody in the wide world. When a British man, say Mr. Balfour—nobody will doubt his identity as a British subject and statesman—arrives at the Assembly in France and says: "I am a British subject," there is no law to entitle him to recognition as such; it is not because the law of Great Britain says he is a British subject that in France he is a British subject. He is a British subject in France because France recognizes the fact. But if France chose to legislate and say that everybody born in England should be a French citizen, every one of those men, the moment he stepped into France, would be a French citizen. No country in the world can legislate to make a man its citizen outside of its borders, because no country's laws govern outside of its limits; but it is the universal practice of countries to define who are their citizens, and it is the usual practice of civilized countries to accept each country's definition of who is its citizen, until some other country puts in a claim to such people and then you may have a dispute.

Mr. POWER: They may enforce their right.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. We may pass laws until we are blue in the face; but we cannot prevent outside countries from passing laws contrary to ours, and we can never make our laws govern in a foreign country.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Friday, March 11, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

RETURNED SOLDIERS—SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That the name of Mr. Sutherland be substituted for that of Mr. Peck on the Special Committee appointed to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance, and the re-establishment of returned soldiers.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED

Report of the Chief Electoral Officer pursuant to section 74 of the Dominion Elections Act, as of date, 9th March, 1921. —Mr. Speaker.

Volume 3 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, parts T to Z.—Right Hon. Mr. Meighen for Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

LAKE OF THE WOODS CONTROL BOARD

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 23, respecting the Lake of the Woods Control Board.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 24, for the relief of Frank Alexander Staunton.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 25, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Lang.

Bill No. 27, respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

Bill No. 28, to incorporate The Slave River Railway Company.—Mr. Tweedie.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. POWER

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On reading yesterday's Hansard I note that my name has been given as one of those who are to sit on the committee on soldiers' re-establishment and pensions. I have already stated to the House—and I gave my reasons therefor at the time—that I had no intention of acting on that committee this year. I would therefore like the Prime Minister to withdraw my name.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The name of the hon. member (Mr. Power) came, I think, from the other side—from the Whip or the Leader—in the ordinary course. Undoubtedly, if the hon. member desires not to act, some arrangement will be made to have another hon. member to take his place.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RALWAYS REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK CAHILL (Pontiac): May I ask the Government when we may expect a detailed report of the Canadian National Railways for the fiscal year 1919-20?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Minister of Railways is not in his seat. I will direct the matter to his attention and have it referred to on Monday.

On motion of Mr. Meighen, the House proceeded to the order: Notices of Motions.

POLITICAL PATRONAGE IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the best interests of Canada and its people would be served, and the principles of responsible Government would be maintained by a system of political patronage wherein appointments to and promotions in both the Outside Civil Service and the Inside Civil Service would be brought under the specific consideration and recommendation of the members of Parliament, or the defeated candidates of the party in power; always having due regard for the stability of the service, the promotion of deserving officers, and the proper conduct of the business of the country; and that the Civil Service Act be amended in conformity therewith; and also to place the Civil Service Commission in an unequivocal position, consistent with its dignity and importance in a new sphere of action.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that it would be to the advantage of hon. members of the House if the hon. member could find it convenient to move just a little further down the Chamber, thus enabling a much larger number of members to hear him.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I regret that my physical condition is such that I must curtail my remarks to-day. Possibly it is just as well, as I understand that the House is unanimously in favour of that part of the resolution which deals with the Outside Service. Besides, the authority of these medical advisers is inexorable; I have to bow to their orders. I do not propose to take up in any very great detail the subject matter of this resolution. I may point out, however, that during the war—and if I tread on anyone's corns I hope I will be pardoned, for I am taking a view of the matter from a little distance—fads of all descriptions were foisted on the public. We had the food control; we had the fuel control; we had the Board of Commerce; we had the labour movement agitation; we had the Grain Growers' movement; we had the U.F.O. movement; we have had liquor movements of various kinds, both ways; we have had the railway movement. Last, but by no means least, we have had the fad of taking the Outside Service in with the Inside Service and tightening up the Inside Service so as to make it as close a corporation as ever existed. Then, there were a thousand and one other freaks of a people carried away from their usual stability of thought and action. It was useless to try to stop such movements. Some freak or faddist, under the guise of democracy, would proclaim his fad, and forthwith it would assume definite form and be fastened on the public in direct contradiction of every principle of responsible government. The strange part of all this is that we were making war on Germany because of her

autocracy, and yet every precaution pertaining to responsible government was directly and ruthlessly thrown to the winds in the carrying out of these activities. This applies not to Canada alone, but to Britain and to France as well.

As I have said, among other fads forced on the public by uplifters was the bringing of the Outside Service under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. In a nutshell, the rule adopted was that the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission would override the member of Parliament who was directly responsible to the people—although, for generations the member of Parliament had had the nomination of appointees in his riding—and would communicate with some local kindred faddist who was not responsible to the people—some personal friend possibly; some uplifter with no judgment in appointments of this kind. I could give various instances; I have a list of instances where the member of Parliament would know nothing about the matter until he found a man in office, and upon tracing it up he would find that the nomination had been made by some local uplifter or some gentleman who meant well possibly, but the member would have no say in the matter at all. I could give other instances in which the member's orders were overridden by the Civil Service Commission in connection with these appointments. It is not necesary that I should go into the details; others may do that. Instances by the score—indeed, by the hundred—are well known where the first the member of Parliament would know of an appointment would be to find the man in office, placed there by the manipulation of some clerk in the Civil Service Commission. Under the former rule, not only was the member of Parliament held responsible for the Outside Service; he was consulted also in respect to appointments in the Inside Service. This is not generally understood. I can well remember that, in Sir John Macdonald's time, members of Parliament were always consulted in regard to appointments, not only to the Outside Service, but to the Inside Service as well, and I think it is only proper that they should be. Most assuredly members of the Government should have full control. Under present conditions, I understand a deputy minister can tell a minister that he will not bow to his ruling; that he will not accede to his recommendations, but do as he has a mind to; under this cast iron law that has been placed on the statute book. I can well remember, in Sir John Macdonald's time, one member having the patronage for his own riding not only made appointments in the Outside Service, but also through the minister concerned, made appointments of his fair share of the Inside Service. He was also very active in helping other members with their appointments in the Inside Service. On one occasion when he recommended an appointment for the Inside Service, he was quietly shown that he had far exceeded his number, and he was amazed to find that his recommendations in support of other member's nominations were all charged up to himself. I mention this merely to show that in those days the Inside Service, the best the country has ever had, was recognized by Sir John Macdonald as belonging to the member of Parliament through the minister immediately concerned. I want it distinctly understood that the minister immediately concerned and the member of Parliament should be responsible for appointments to the Outside Service, and if the member of Parliament does not make a proper recommendation, then the minister will be absolutely justified in declining to accept that member's nomination.

Objections have been raised to members of Parliament having anything to do with the Inside Service, and the chief objection comes from members for constituencies in and around Ottawa. In the old days, the two members for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp and Mr. Chabot) had a hard time of it, and I expect the action of the people in rushing to those members by hundreds for jobs was responsible for bringing on this change. Under this resolution, that will be quite unnecessary. I claim, as representing the riding of Victoria, that I am as much entitled as any of the members for Ottawa or the constituencies immediately adjoining, to make recommendations for appointments in the Inside Civil Service in this city, and that I am entitled to give the young gentlemen and ladies in my constituencies who wish to make the Civil Service their vocation in life, an opportunity of doing so. Therefore, some system that would bring that condition of affairs about should be adopted. I am a firm believer in the powers of the House of Commons and of Parliament, and I would suggest the advisability of appointing a committee of this House to investigate the Civil Service Commission and

the Civil Service, as a whole, session after session, taking their time and forming a committee in conjunction with some officers of the Civil Service. At the present time, if a clerk has some disability placed on him or if he has some grievance, no opportunity whatever, short of an appeal through friends on the side—and that does not amount to anything—is given him of having his grievance redressed. There should therefore, be some responsible body, —mark you, I believe all these public bodies should be responsible to the people, I do not believe in close commissions at all—to whom such clerks and other members of the Civil Service who have grievances could apply, and to whom application could be made in case of persons improperly promoted in a department. I have a mass of correspondence in regard to this matter, but I will not use it. I will, however, mention the case of one clerk who had been working at a salary of $900 a year or so ago, and who is now receiving a salary of three or four thousand dollars and is controlling, without any special education or qualification, the appointments of men who are infinitely his superior in education, tact and judgment. Under present conditions, all this sort of thing goes on and there is no redress. The cast-iron rule of the inside Civil Service stands in the way, and the matter cannot be adjusted. I understand that even some of the senior civil servants have had the temerity to tell members high up in the Cabinet that they decline to permit them to interfere in matters of that kind; that such matters belong to those civil servants entirely.

There are just two forms of human government—trust and mistrust. I do not want to be personal or to hark back, but I might just point this out in that regard. It may be remembered, that in 1915, and up to the first of March, 1916, I had the honour or raising 375,000 soldiers;—I had the honour of raising upwards of 450,000 altogether. When we started the system of groups, little bunches of soldiers, twenty-five here, fifty there, and so on throughout the country, some of my colleagues, very wise men, and many outside people, came to me and said: "But how are you going to control these soldiers?" I said: "In the name of Heaven, who controls them now? They know the way home at night; they know how to go to bed; they know how to conduct themselves properly as gentlemen, without the uniform, and when they don the uniform, with all the honour and pride involved in that action, they are going to behave themselves like gentlemen." These people wanted special officers appointed to control these soldiers; but in the whole Dominion, there was not a solitary police court case worthy of being a police court case out of those 375,000 men during the six months in that year. I have never been afraid to trust the people or members of Parliament in their appointments. I have never known a bad appointment made in my constituency through either my recommendation or that of my opponent when he had the honour of representing the riding, during the time when members of Parliament under the old rule had the privilege of recommending appointments to the Outside Service. You must have something directly responsible to the people, and the member of Parliament is the only one man who can be held responsible. The uplifter, the clergyman, the private wire-puller, are not responsible to the people, and they cannot be reached as can members of Parliament.

The various forms of irresponsibility are autocracy such as the Kaiser's; those fads such as food controls; labour agitators; Grain Growers and U.F.O. organizations. I trust the gentlemen representing the U.F.O. and the Grain Growers will not take my remarks amiss; the point I want to make in connection with them is that they do not represent the principle of responsible Government; they have no settled policy of human government other than what is based on a negative quality. In other words, it is not trust; it is mistrust. I am making these remarks in all kindness. Other forms of irresponsibility are ultramontane and uplifting churches; Bolshevism and all kindred organizations, where the consent of the people as a whole does not control. Under responsible government, good results have always followed, whereas under Civil Service government results have always been bad. I have lists showing the inferior class of some of the appointments made under the Civil Service Commission, although the people do not hear about such appointments. I can give one instance in which three fellows who were appointed committed misdemeanors, and when they were about to be arrested, they skipped out. You never hear of the crooks appointed under this system. I remember in one case a member of Parliament protested against the appointment of a man, but certain clergymen interfered and the man, a noted scalawag, and reprobate, was ap-

pointed over the recommendation of the member and over the recommendations of men in the riding and elsewhere of other and better men. I could give dozens of instances of that kind. Under responsible government you can get a high class of men. If you look back to the old days, you will see the best men, graduates of universities, getting positions, whereas now little boys and girls get them and the big men of the country cannot find positions in the Civil Service the same as they did under the old system of responsible government appointments. No government can be a compromise, nor a combination of responsible government and autocracy.

I will cut my remarks short because I know the House is familiar with this question. Permit me to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Prime Minister for arranging to give me this opportunity of addressing a few words to the House to-day, and also for your kindness in giving me a place near the centre of the Chamber.

Mr. ALFRED ERNEST FRIPP (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, I have seconded the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) in whole, though I am rather inclined to think that in part it ought not to apply to the Inside Service. I understand that the mover is satisfied with that position.

I speak upon this resolution because of some little experience that I think I have gained while having the honour of having a seat in this House representing this Capital city of the Dominion. In order to deal with this question properly, it seems to me, one must go back to the original Act, consequent upon which the Civil Service Commission was formed. As you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that Act was passed about 1908, and its purpose, as exemplified by the clauses of the Act itself, was, shortly, to place the control of appointments to the Civil Service of Canada under this Commission, and to provide that all appointments should be made after examination. That was the real purpose of the appointment of this commission. Before that, as hon. gentlemen are well aware, both political parties made appointments to the Inside and Outside Service. I experienced a short period of that privilege, if one may so express himself, by suggesting the appointment of certain persons in the city of Ottawa, and I venture to say that the appointments I made were as good if not better than the appointments now being made by the Civil Service Commission. Subsequently, the Government of the day, prior to the last election, made it a plank in its platform that political patronage so far as the Outside Service was concerned should be abolished, and that the Outside Service should be placed under the control of the commission.

With regard to political patronage, I am free to admit that I was one of those who were strongly in favour of its abolition so far as both the Outside and Inside Service was concerned. I must confess, however, that I have to some extent changed my mind, and my reasons may be stated in this way. First, while we are all in favour of the abolition of political patronage, our experience has been, I think, since the commission has been operating along these lines for the past three years, that the commission does not abolish patronage. By handing over to these gentlemen who constitute the Civil Service Commission the making of appointments we have not abolished patronage or attained the object we had in view when we placed this serious responsibility upon their shoulders.

My second objection is that it has cost this country an unnecessarily large sum of money in order to put the Outside Service, particularly, under the control of the Civil Service Commission. My third objection is that it has caused throughout the country, and especially amongst the Civil Servants of Canada; a great deal of unrest, and necessarily the work of the Government has not been as expeditiously and as efficiently done as it otherwise would have been.

Dealing with the first point I make, that the appointment of the Civil Service Commission does not abolish patronage, I do not propose to labour that except to give one or two instances. Instead of a member of Parliament recommending a man for the position, we will say, of a letter carrier, or any other position in the Service, we have simply handed over to two or three gentlemen the power to select that man. Now, if the selection were based upon the man's having passed an examination with a higher percentage of marks than any of his competitors, and upon that only, one perhaps could not object very much, but the difficulties—there are two—are these: First that the examinations set is not an examination upon the duties the man will have to perform if appointed; and, secondly, that is not the only consideration which, in my experience, has entered into the minds of the

commissioners when they have made such appointments.

Take for example a large case which comes to my mind as I speak. Last year this Government undertook, with the authority of Parliament, to reorganize the Printing Bureau in the city of Ottawa. I have already expressed myself in this House in no uncertain way as to my views upon that question, but just let us see how patronage worked out there. The Civil Service Commission recommended to this Government that we should employ experts to classify the Civil Service of Canada. Well, we all know what that meant. It meant that these gentlemen, Messrs. Arthur Young and Company, came to Ottawa and gathered together the necessary material for this book, which is called "The Classification of the Civil Service of Canada," at an expenditure of very large sums of money. I find upon making inquiry that this country paid to Arthur Young and Company in the year 1918-19 $34,695, and in the year 1919-20 $95,270, and subsequently an additional $10,000 odd.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there any more to pay?

Mr. FRIPP: No, the $10,000 odd was the last sum to be paid.

Mr. H. S. BELAND: What is the total?

Mr. FRIPP: It is $139,666. I wonder if any hon. members have ever read this classification. I open it at any page. Here, on page 527, is the position of Parcel Postman. The definition of class reads:

> To perform, under supervision, all work connected with the delivery of parcel post mail matter in the business and residence sections of a city; to deliver mail to nearby suburban offices; and to perform other related work as assigned.

Now surely it does not take an expert to tell us what the duties of a postman are. But this commission, instead of doing this work themselves as they ought to have done and might very well have done, employed these gentlemen and paid them a large sum of money. And one would have thought that having made a classification of the Civil Service, Arthur Young and Company would not possibly have considered their work complete without suggesting to the Government how the Civil Service could be reformed and, if necessary, reduced in numbers. But no; having made this classification these gentlemen stepped right out and another concern was brought in by the Civil Service Commission, Messrs. Griffenhagen and Associates, who have been undertaking the reorganization of the service. Surely Arthur Young and Company were not paid simply to compile a book setting forth the duties of the various public servants of Canada, and stopping there. It was, and ought to have been made, a necessary part of their work to report at the same time as to how the Civil Service could be improved, a work that has been attempted by Griffenhagen and Associates, who, I understand, have been paid about $70,000 to date. I am glad to observe, from newspaper reports, that the Government have considered it advisable to dispense with the services of these gentlemen.

Allow me to revert to my illustration. A part of this work of Arthur Young and Company was the reorganization of the Printing Bureau in Ottawa, and upon the recommendation of a German-American named Wolfe, a member of this firm, 400 men were laid off from the Bureau without an opportunity of appeal, without the chance of being heard as to whether it was just or necessary that they should be laid off in view of old age or any other possible reason that they might advance. They were laid off merely on his say-so. Surely it was a most obnoxious form of patronage for this country to have conferred on a gentleman of this kind the power to decide as to who should be employed in and who should be dismissed from one of our large institutions. But that is not all. These very same gentlemen are charged now with the destruction of very valuable books, as appears from the resolution of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), as well as of some invaluable plates, which cannot be restored, used for the printing of certain public documents. Under the circumstances, I contend that the Civil Service Commission has not been the means of abolishing patronage; it simply appropriates this power to itself or delegates it to others, its nominees, to say who shall be appointed and who shall not.

Let us take another illustration. Suppose any one of these departments required an architect, or a solicitor, or a barrister. Do the Commission make the appointment? No; they simply ask Mr. John Brown, Mr. Smith, and some person else to pass upon the recommendations that have been placed before them; and that is merely handing patronage over to three irresponsible persons, who, for personal or religious reasons, or from any other motive you choose to suggest, may be influenced in their choice of the applicant to fill the position. Now, that is an

entire departure from the object for which the Civil Service Commission was originally established, namely, to hold competitive examinations, ascertain the results, and then report to the Government. Now they make these appointments, sometimes themselves, but very largely upon the say-so of other persons whom they consult of their own motion.

My second objection is that it has cost this country too much money to put the Outside Service under the control of the Civil Service Commission. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), the Ex-President of the Privy Council, said in a speech last year that there were 5,000 persons employed in the Inside Service and 35,000 in the Outside, and I should like to bring to the attention of the Government just what it has cost this country to place the Outside Service under the control of the Commission. In 1908-9 the Civil Service Commission cost this country $12,531.45, and it had five permanent employees. In 1909-10 it cost the country about $11,000 and had eight permanent employees—of course, they needed just a small staff to prepare examination papers; indeed, they did not even prepare the examination papers; they merely collected the necessary details for the purpose of holding the examinations. In 1910-11 the cost was about the same; in 1911-12, it was $14,000; in 1913-14, $35,000, with fifteen employees. In 1915-16 the cost had risen to $41,970, although there were fourteen employees; but in 1917-18 there was a further increase in the cost, which was $43,925; while there were sixteen permanent employees and ten temporary employees. In 1918-19, including what was paid that year to Arthur Young and Company, it cost this country to classify the Civil Service and pay the salaries of the Commission, $149,399, and the permanent employees of the Commission numbered twenty-six, while there were forty-eight temporary employees. If you deduct the amount paid to Arthur Young and Company for that year, viz., $34,000, from the total, it will be seen that the Civil Service Commission in that year cost us practically $100,000, as compared with the cost a few years before, when the Outside Service was not under its control, of between $11,000 and $14,000 at the most. In 1919-20 the Commission and its employees, including the companies I have mentioned, cost the country $297,999.76. In that year their permanent employees had increased to forty-six and the temporary to one hundred and fifty-nine. Now, of that sum of $297,000 odd, $95,270 was paid to Arthur Young and Company; so that the Civil Service Commission itself cost us about $200,000 for that fiscal year. Why? because the appointments in the Outside Service must have entailed the large number of extra employees engaged. Now, Sir, I submit with all due respect to the Commission, that they have failed. I say, Sir, that they have failed to take care of the situation which this Parliament felt some years ago ought to be removed from the control of members of Parliament.

What has happened? Let us give a simple illustration. A postmaster is required in some county, say, in British Columbia. The stipend attaching to the position is, let us say, $50 or $100 a year. Now, that appointment has to be made at Ottawa. A certain amount of money must be spent advertising it in the local papers, and after considerable delay, the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa select the man. Surely that man could have been selected, and as good an appointment, if not better, made, by the member of Parliament in that locality, a man who is responsible to the people.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is not the postmaster now, as a matter of fact, selected on the recommendation of some one outside of the commission?

Mr. FRIPP: He is certainly selected upon the recommendation of another person, so that patronage is really diverted from the member of Parliament to an irresponsible person. Now I have the highest respect for the gentlemen who form the Civil Service Commission and the officers on the staff; but what I submit, Sir, is that this Government and this Parliament have given them an impossible task, in the sense that they cannot really secure greater benefits, or as great benefits—at all events if they do it is at much higher cost, at enormous cost to this country—as were formerly obtained. After all what we are striving to achieve is to increase the efficiency of the Civil Service, but that efficiency is not increased by the present system in any way—rather do I think it has diminished. We have departed from the well-known principle of the proper functions of the Government which is to govern and administer the affairs of the country. The Government should take the responsibility itself and do away with government by Commission. Then I think we shall be on safe ground. I submit that the Commission cannot give a better service—at all events as regards

the Outside Service—than the local member or the defeated candidate of either political party, or any prominent man in the locality, could give by recommending for a position the person that is most fitted for it.

The present condition of affairs has caused a great deal of unrest in the Civil Service. I am told, Sir, that after the reclassification was made appeals were filed, and are now on record, to the Civil Service Commission to the number of thousands. Why, a thing has occurred in the Civil Service in Ottawa which is most unusual: A certain body of civil servants have become a trade union and are known as Local No. 66. Just to illustrate to the House what I mean,—and that is the point I wish to make,—just to illustrate how our Civil Service is being apparently driven into a position that it ought not to be driven into by the desire of its members to see that justice is done to them by the Civil Service Commission—I received a resolution adopted by a local union Lodge No. 412 of the International Association of Machinists, in which they recite the following:

> Whereas the Associated Federal Employees of Ottawa Federal Union No. 66, has after months of effort failed to secure the slightest recognition from the Government, nor has the latter granted the request of the said Union for an investigation into the charges and complaints made against the Board of Hearing.
>
> Be it resolved that as a Labour Organization this Association do place itself on record as supporting the claims of Federal Union No. 66 for recognition, and as expressing their opinion that the charges and complaints brought forward, and indeed to demand the fullest investigation into the administration of the said Board of Hearing.

The complaints referred to in the resolution arise out of the reclassification.

I say there is unrest in the service. There is a feeling that the Civil Service, both Inside and Outside, are not being fairly dealt with by the Canadian Parliament. Along that line I wish to make one or two observations. It seems to me that the Inside Service in Ottawa might well be re-organized by given the deputy ministers proper salaries and making them responsible for the management of their own departments free from the interference of any person. A very well known business man in Montreal who was asked by the Government during the war to become a member of the War Trade Board in this city spoke to me as follows one day: "Mr. Fripp, I cannot understand how your ministers really carry on as well as they do. In the first place instead of devoting themselves to matters of policy nearly half of their time seems to be taken up with matters of detail that ought to be managed by a good deputy. That deputy ought to be paid at least $15,000 and he should have full control of that department. His chief clerks ought to be paid salaries commensurate with their duties. That deputy and those chiefs of the different branches of the department should be held responsible for the work being done in a proper manner." It is the opinion of the gentleman in question, and it is my opinion, that if such a system were carried out the Civil Service of Ottawa could be properly cut in half. Then decent salaries, and adequate living wage, could be paid to those who are doing the work of the country which is not by any means the case at the present time. Why, seventy-five or eighty-five per cent of the Civil Service in Ottawa are receiving less than $1,000 a year. How can men live respectably and appear respectably dressed, as they have to, on salaries of that kind?

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to show that the experiment—for it was only an experiment for which no political party is responsible; Parliament as a whole is responsible—the experiment of placing appointments to the Outside Service under the Civil Service Commission has not, to put it very mildly, worked very satisfactorily in Canada during the past three years. The plan might work all right in a small country, but Canada is too large and too scattered a country for any body of men to be able to sit in this city and make proper appointments to the public service for all portions of the Dominion. In view of that fact, and bearing in mind the experience we have had, we might well take away appointments to the Outside Service from the commission upon the grounds which I have mentioned, namely, upon economical grounds; upon the ground that the commission are not doing away with the evil that we were anxious they should do away with—the making of appointments upon political grounds and as a matter of political patronage—and finally the ground that our Civil Service, if properly treated and given adequate salaries, wil increase in efficiency and perform the duties much better than they are doing at the present time and with more satisfaction to themselves. Why, Sir, let me give one more illustration. The Militia Department engaged numerous employees during the war, many of whom were returned soldiers—temporary employees. I

know that there are two hundred odd of these employees leaving at the end of this month. Many of them are returned soldiers, most of them are married men. They have had four or five years experience as first-class clerks and they have made good. Why should not these men be transferred to other departments that need experienced clerks when the Civil Service Commission is advertising every day for clerks needed in different departments? It seems to be a rule of the Civil Service Commission that no man who has been a temporary employee can become permanent no matter how efficient he may be. I think that is a good illustration of the necessity of reconsidering the management of the Outside Service, and of seeing that the duties of the Civil Service Commission should be confined practically to the Inside Service in this city which is immediately under their observation and under their control. It is a mistake to add to the duties of the commission in Ottawa, which are already heavy and onerous for the Inside Service, the additional duty of having to appoint men all over the Dominion to the number, as estimated, of nearly thirty-five thousand.

Mr. JOHN L. CHABOT (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting with more than ordinary interest for the remarks of my esteemed colleague of the city of Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) on the question before the House. We have both had a somewhat similar experience in the course of our parliamentary career, and I think I am well within the judgment of this House when I declare that no other members have ever suffered from the pernicious effects of the patronage system to the same extent.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that during the first years I sat in this House as representative of the city of Ottawa I lost my practice and many of my friends. I gave up time, day and night, week-day and Sunday, month in and month out, in a vain endeavour to satisfy the army of applicants seeking Government jobs; and for every man or woman that apparently became my friend because I had succeeded in finding them a job, I made a score of enemies with unsuccessful competitors and their friends. I think, if I remember rightly, it was Abraham Lincoln who on a certain occasion when asked his opinion about appointments to the Civil Service remarked, that if for one vacant position there were fifty applicants you made forty-nine enemies and in due course the appointed one became an ingrate. Well, my experience in the city of Ottawa has to some extent proved the correctness of Lincoln's statement. Surely this reason alone would have justified any hon. gentleman having like experience in opposing to the limit of his voice and vote the movement to restore the patronage system.

I am compelled to declare that I am absolutely at variance with the views that have been expressed by my esteemed colleague (Mr. Fripp); and I may add that it was only on the distinct understanding that the patronage system was to be abolished that I consented to contest a seat in this House at the last general election. Patronage was abolished, and I may state, Sir,

4 p.m.

that for the past three years life, so far as its public duties are concerned, has once more become worth living. I have been able to devote myself to my practice out of session, and while this House has been in session, I have been free to give my time and what small ability I may have to matters of real national importance. Of course, last session and the session before I may have been apparently derelict in the performance of my parliamentary duties, but I wish to state that my absence was caused by illness, and while I am not asking for sympathy I am offering this as an explanation of my apparent neglect.

An Hon. MEMBER: We are all happy to see you well.

Mr. CHABOT: I must admit, Sir, that I am not able to understand how any member of Parliament can really desire to return to the old patronage system, at least if he has had any personal experience therewith. Moreover, may I remind the House that this has a far wider importance than its bearing on the personal fortunes of individual members? Its baneful effects are so well known and acknowledged throughout the country—and nowhere so emphatically as in this capital city—that it needs no assertion nor argument on my part. Every political pary has in succession claimed to have considered its abolition of so much importance that it has been made a prominent plank in every platform for many elections. Some of the greatest minds that have adorned these benches have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms in condemnation thereof. And, further, I am satisfied that in so expressing themselves they have given voice to their honest and well-matured conviction—but alas! until some three years ago partisan pressure was too severe and their good intentions perforce became abortive.

Parliament itself, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for the legislation now on the statute book and for the splendid reform which was inaugurated less than three years ago and which has since been on trial. Parliament did not take this step hastily. It knew what it was doing, and surely nothing very serious has occurred in the interim to modify, much less change, the principles or the view then so generally expressed and so definitely given effect to. Of course, it is outside the limit of human power to satisfy in their entirety the expectations or demands of the Civil Service of Canada or of any other country.

In the course of this debate the House has listened to considerable criticism of the Civil Service Commission, and many harsh things have been said and—may I add?—many ill-founded assertions have been made of its actions. But if the House will consider a moment I think hon. members will agree with me that Parliament imposed upon the Civil Service Commission an almost impossible task when it assigned to it the duties called for under the Act of 1918. At that time the staff of the Commission consisted of some fourteen or fifteen, housed in quarters and equipped with machinery adequate for the more or less routine and perfunctory work of which it at the time had charge. In the interim that staff has been increased to a strength of 225, every man and woman of which is working at high pressure and an appreciable percentage of whom find it necessary to put in many hours of overtime. I claim that that shows beyond the last doubt that the duties of the Commission have become more numerous and more important.

In the comparatively brief interval since that Act was passed machinery has been organized and a staff built up which has practically reorganized the service and put the entire machinery of Government on a new, modern and more efficient basis. Undoubtedly some mistakes have been made. Some temporary disturbance of work and some passing inconvenience to the departments must inevitably attend a reorganization so drastic, and indeed revolutionary, but in my opinion the result has been eminently satisfactory. What has been aimed at and what has been actually accomplished is being better understood and more thoroughly appreciated every day, not only in the service itself, but throughout the country, and I cannot imagine it would be possible to make a greater mistake than to stop the work of progress and reform which has been so well started and so assiduously developed.

The Civil Service itself—and I know whereof I speak when I make the statement—is opposed to any return of the patronage system, notwithstanding the remarks made by my worthy colleague that a great deal of unrest exists in the service itself. I should like to read to this House a letter which I received only to-day, and which I think shows that my hon. colleague has either been misinformed or is labouring under a delusion. This letter, which is dated the 11th instant, is addressed to me by the Secretary-Treasurer of the Civil Service Association of Ottawa and by the Secretary-Treasurer of the Civil Service Federation of Canada.

Dear Sir,—The undersigned, on behalf of the Civil Service Federation of Canada, representing the Outside Service from coast to coast, and the Civil Service Association, representing the Inside Service at Ottawa, respectfully but urgently beg to draw your attention to our views with regard to the question of patronage, which is at present before the House in the form of resolution.

We are emphatically opposed to patronage in any form. We regard the abolition of patronage as the most outstanding and beneficial reform in the history of the Canadian Civil Service, and we desire to express our gratitude to you for the enactment of the present Civil Service Act, which embodies the Merit System, and in doing so, we voice the undoubted sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the service.

It has been the experience of the service in the past that under the patronage system influence predominates and worth counts for little. We are convinced that under the Merit System, meritorious service will be rewarded and toadyism will disappear. It is true that during the present period of transition conditions are inevitably somewhat chaotic, and the advantages of the reform have not yet been realized. We feel sure, however, that if the Merit System is given a fair trial effective and satisfactory methods of administration will be evolved and carried out.

Yours respectfully,

L. H. LAMOTHE,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Civil Service Federation of Canada.

J. H. RYAN,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Every thoughtful elector in the country is antagonistic to patronage as a manner of appointments to the public service. The system has been condemned by every commission appointed by the various political parties that have held the reins of power in this country. I have already pointed out, that the leading public men of all political schools of thought have expressed themselves unmistakably in favour of the competitive system. In every progressive country in the world to-day this is the system which is followed in recruiting the public service, and I would therefore re-

gard any interference with the present methods that are being developed in our federal service as a retrograde step which can only result in disaster.

Feeling as I do, Mr. Speaker, that patronage as it existed some years ago was unsatisfactory, unbusinesslike, undemocratic, and in some cases unfair—and a last but not the least argument in support of my contention, that it has been one of the chief causes of the downfall of almost every Government since Confederation—I cannot support the resolution of my hon. and gallant friend, the member from Victoria.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve-Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to congratulate the mover of this resolution, the genial member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) upon his being with us after a somewhat serious illness. I think I voice the sentiment of all hon. members when I express the wish that he may soon be completely restored to health.

I gave very close attention to the remarks of my hon. friend this afternoon, and I was pleased to note that he was applauded by hon. gentlemen on the other side when he gave expression to sentiments that were decidedly Liberal in their character. He said that no Government could be carried on if there was distrust of the people; that any such attitude on the part of a Government would result in chaos and anarchy; that the only way to govern a country was to trust the people. These, Sir, are eminently Liberal sentiments and Liberal principles, and I am glad to see that they are accepted with readiness by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

I sympathize, Mr. Speaker, with some hon. gentlemen who would like to restore patronage in the Civil Service in order to get a little more kudos with some of their electors. But after twenty-five years' experience in public life, I am still in favour of that great reform which was brought about by the Liberal Government through the establishment of the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa. I am in favour of the Civil Service Commission for the appointment of officers to the Inside Service, and I think that we should have in the large cities like Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Quebec, of course.

Mr. BUREAU: Three Rivers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In all the large cities where there is a branch of the Civil Service, competitive examination should be held in order that these centres may be given the best possible service. There is no use in beating about the bush, Mr. Speaker; you can have an efficient Civil Service, both inside and outside, only by maintaining the system of competitive examination. I am not speaking of petty post offices, lighthouse keepers, charwomen, and so on; I am speaking of the regular Civil Service, inside and outside. As was stated this afternoon, the appointment of a country postmaster, for instance, might well be left to the recommendation of the elected representatives in the House of Commons. If the representative cannot safely be trusted with that responsibility he is not worthy of the mandate that he has received from the people. If he is given the responsibility, he will have to face the people if he does not recommend a man who is suitable, morally and otherwise, for the post to which he is recommended.

I have had some experience in the government of the country. I have presided over one of the large departments, and I know whereof I speak so far as patronage is concerned. Let me tell my hon. friends who have not been in the Government—but some of whom, judging by their radiant faces, will soon grace the Treasury benches—that life would not be worth living if the Civil Service Commission were abolished. As was stated a moment ago by my genial friend from Ottawa (Mr. Chabot), the life of a minister of the Crown would not be worth living if he could not give at least a few hours a day to the study of national affairs. I have worked under both systems—when there was no commission, and after a commission had been established. When there was no commission, a minister of the Crown almost had to be a hero in order to accomplish anything for the country. Why, Sir, his office was besieged from Monday until Saturday, and his house was stormed, by the army, the host, of office-seekers. He could not appoint them all, and naturally he was accused of nepotism, of thinking only of his family. I am glad to take this opportunity of declaring that although I have been charged by disgruntled office-seekers with having given offices to every member of my family, none would have accepted and none did accept a Government job while I was Postmaster General or Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But as I could not appoint an army of office-seekers, I was accused, of course, of giving fat jobs to every member of my

family—to every cousin, to every friend, and to every elector.

No country, Mr. Speaker, can hope to have sound, responsible government if the hands of its ministers are tied through the activities of office-seekers. That has been the experience of England and of the United States as well. It is not so many years—because the reform was accomplished only in the fifties—since nepotism reigned supreme in England. It is due to the exertions of men like Peel, Macaulay—who presided over one of the first Civil Service Commissions in England—Gladstone, and Beaconsfield, that there has been established and firmly rooted in England the best Civil Service in the world. Not very long ago I read a statement made by Lord Morley in his memoirs with reference to Lord Minto and his vice-royalty in India. Commenting on the fidelity and loyalty to the Crown during so many years of from three hundred to four hundred millions of Indian subjects, he said: It is largely due to the excellent Indian Civil Service, which is a model and an example to the whole world. In England, you never hear of a member of the House or a minister of the Crown being pestered by office seekers. It is now part of the constitution which is not written, that the hands of a minister, the hands of a member of the House of Commons, are unshackled; he can speak his mind freely, and he is not bothered and stampeded by office-seekers. How has that condition of affairs been brought about? By the system of competitive examination, which has in England given the most perfect Civil Service that exists in Europe.

As regards the United States, I am not so old that I do not remember some of the presidential elections. I recall, when I was a boy, the elections of Grant, Garfield, Hayes and McKinley, and at every election, it was openly stated that "to the victor belonged the spoils." Whichever party came into office, the public servants of the United States would at one fell swoop be dismissed from office. It was a scandal to think that the great republic would treat her public servants in that fashion. That is no more the case, thanks to the commonsense of the American people. The leaders of both parties united, and there is to-day a permanent Civil Service Commission, to which belong the most influential men irrespective of parties, and that commission at times suggests reforms which are adopted by Congress. Sir, since 1883, the Civil Service in the United States has been declared permanent, and thus you have at Washington a Civil Service which is second only to that of Great Britain.

In Canada, my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster), who is the senior member of this House, knows how the lives of ministers of the Crown and of members of the House of Commons have been made unhappy through this infernal patronage system. I remember in the old days that members of the Civil Service from our various constituencies would come into the lobbies of the House of Commons and order ministers and members out of their seats and dictate to them what increase they should get, stating that if they refused, their families would vote against the minister or member; that the parish would vote against the minister or member, because some of our parishes are made up of one family, some of the families being as you know very numerous. In 1907, my then colleague, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, one of the best men this country has ever known, decided that we should put a stop to that system, and he introduced into this House a Bill instituting the Civil Service Commission. Two men were appointed, Prof. Shortt, and Mr. LaRochelle, K.C., of Montreal—two excellent men. Since that time, the commission has been increased, and I declare that I personally trust in the wisdom ability, and honesty of Hon. Mr. Roche, with whom I sat in this House, Mr. Jameson, ex-M.P., and Mr. LaRochelle, K.C. They are gentlemen who have had very wide experience. The system may not be perfect; we are simply beginning to introduce that system into Canada, and I quite understand that some people are somewhat perturbed by the loss of patronage. Let it be understood that henceforward patronage is abolished and, as the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) said a moment ago, life will be worth living. Members of Parliament will be able to work for Canada, will have some time left to study our national problems. When this country is faced with a huge railway deficit, with an enormous war debt, we, the representatives of the people, can well afford to leave the administration of the Civil Service in the hands of the commission. Of course, I quite understand that there may be some abuses. I regret, for instance, the appointment of Arthur Young and company, and I deplore the appointment of Griffenhagen and Company. The country could have well improved—if there was anything to improve in the Civil Service—the business of that commission without calling upon strangers.

Mr. BELAND: Foreigners.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, I am afraid to use the word "foreigner" or the word "stranger." I remember one day that Sir Wilfrid Laurier nearly created a revolution in this country because by a slip of the tongue he used the word "foreigner" when he should have used the word "stranger." The presence of those foreigners explains why, for instance, a man like Mr. Sydney Smith in the Post Office Department, a son of an ex-Postmaster General of Canada, one of the most faithful public servants this country has ever had, was replaced a few days ago by a German under an assumed name.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We shall hear more about this later on. For the moment, I wish to say this: I have no objection to give the public men of this country on both sides of the House the right to suggest the appointment of country postmasters, petty customs house officers and all other local office holders throughout the country; but as regards the Inside Service at Ottawa and in the large cities, I cling to the Civil Service Commission. Of course, the commission can stand some reform; but the principle of competitive examination is essentially sound and fair; it is essentially British, too.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and I am opposed to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). I do not believe in political patronage. It has been tried in many countries of the world, and it has been found wanting everywhere. I think that positions should go to merit and never to influence, on the part of either the candidates themselves or of their families, and I am opposed to nepotism in the distribution of public offices. Of course, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve has said, the system is not altogether perfect, and there is room for improvement. Let us make these improvements, and not do away with what is certainly a great public reform.

There is one matter I wish to deal with for a moment or two, and that is, the fact that this Government is not giving proper support to the Civil Service Commission. While this Government pretends to have abolished patronage in the public service, it has not done so in many instances. This country is going to proceed in a few months to take the decennial census, and commissioners are to be appointed, if not already appointed, for every electoral district in the Dominion of Canada. Each commissioner is going to appoint enumerators; there will be many of them in every county, so altogether throughout the Dominion it means the appointment of thousands of officers. I submit that here was a case where patronage should not have been exercised. The Civil Service Commission should have made the appointments just as it does in the different departments. Last fall I had the same experience, I suppose, as other hon. members had, of receiving a letter from the Chief Statistician for the Dominion, Mr. Coats, sending me a list of the subdivisions in my electoral district of Quebec East, asking whether I approved of such subdivisions, and if there were any suggestions I should like to offer. I sent suggestions to this gentleman, and at the time he agreed with me so far as those suggestions were concerned. Seeing that he had so much confidence in me so far as the conditions under which the census should be taken in Quebec East were concerned, I offered him my services in the selection of a commissioner to take the census. I told him I would be happy indeed to co-operate with him when the selection of that officer should be made. To that letter I received an answer reading as follows—Mr. Coats is evidently a French scholar:

OTTAWA, le 16 décembre 1920.

Cher Monsieur,—J'accuse réception de votre lettre en date du 26 novembre, et vous remercie pour vos suggestions qui seront suivies pour la division de Québec-Est en sous districts de recensement.

Concernant la nomination des commissaires, ces officiers seront comme dans les autres recensements, nommés par le député appuyant le Gouvernement.

Votre bien dévoué,

R. H. COATS,
Saisicien du Dominion.

Monsieur Ernest Lapointe, M.P.,
126 rue St-Pierre,
Québec, Qué.

Translated it reads:

Dear Sir.—I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated November 26th, and thank you for your suggestions, which shall be followed as far as the subdivision of the electoral district of Quebec East are concerned, for census purposes. As regards the appointments of the Commissioners such officers will be appointed as has been done formerly by the member supporting the Government.

Yours very truly,

R. H. COATS.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Coats will be promoted.

Mr. LAPOINTE: To that letter I offered a modest answer reading—I will translate it—as follows:

Dear sir,—I acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 16th in which you state that the census commissioners will be appointed by the member supporting the Government in each electoral division. In reply I beg to call to your notice that in the division of Quebec East the member is not a supporter of the Government. Would you have the kindness to tell me under those circumstances who will be consulted with regard to the appointment of the Commissioner?

Believe me, Sir,
Yours very truly,
ERNEST LAPOINTE.

To that letter Mr. Coats replied as follows:

OTTAWA, December, 21, 1920.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 18th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the appointment of the census commissioners is now in the hands of the Right Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Yours very truly,
R. H. COATS,
Dominion Statistician.

Then on January 25 I wrote to the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce the following letter, in French, which I will translate:

The Right Hon. Sir George Foster,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir George,

On December 21st last Mr. Coats, Dominion Statistician, after many communications wrote me that the appointment of the census commissioners is in the hands of the Rt. Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Consequently I take the liberty of recommending to you for appointment as census commissioner for the division of Quebec East Mr. Arthur E. Simard, Notary, 52 rue St-Joseph, Québec.

Mr. Simard has his office and his residence in the division of Quebec East, is an elector, is well-acquainted with the population, and is the best qualified man, to my knowledge, to fill this position.

Believe me, with consideration,
Yours very truly,
ERNEST LAPOINTE.

On January 27 I received the following reply from the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce:

Dear Mr. Lapointe,

I have your letter of January 25th forwarding the name of Mr. Arthur E. Simard, 52 rue St. Joseph, Quebec, for the position of census commissioner.

In answer I beg to say that the position of census commissioner for Quebec East has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Paul Samson, N.P., St. Roch de Quebec.

Yours very truly,
GEORGE E. FOSTER.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Too late.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Now, Sir, I bring to your attention the fact that this was on the 27th of January. I was surprised that the appointment had been made at that time. It has not yet been made public, or not until very recently at all events. I have nothing to say against Mr. Samson. He is a nice gentleman, well qualified, and a good Conservative. The only point of inferiority he would have as compared with the gentleman I recommended is that according to the new law of one man, one vote, he is not an elector of Quebec East. I think Mr. Simard should have been appointed as he is an elector of the division.

Mr. DAVIDSON: May I ask what was the politics of the gentleman whom my hon. friend recommended?

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is a Liberal, by all means. There are so many Liberals in that electoral district that it would have been difficult for the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce to select anybody else, so he had to go outside the division to get a man. I say, Sir, this is patronage with a vengeance, and it is no use for the Government to pretend that political patronage has been abolished when such cases as this occur.

But it is not only as regards the census commissioners that political patronage is exercised; it is exercised in connection with the most prominent positions under the Crown in Canada. Take the case of judges. How many advocates belonging to the Liberal party have been appointed during the two past years?—I mean so far as my own province is concerned. Let me say, at once, I have nothing to say against the appointments to the Bench that have been made in the province of Quebec, not even against those that have been made recently. I have not one word of criticism to offer so far as those gentlemen are concerned. But when you are aware of the fact that in the province of Quebec there are many more Liberals than there are Conservatives—and this is true not only as regards the Bar but in other professions and walks in life—is it any wonder that my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), cannot see his way clear to offer a judical position to any member of the Bar in that province who happens to be a Liberal? Do not be mistaken. I am not complaining because I have not been offered a position myself; I would not accept one if it were offered me. But, Mr.

Speaker, why pretend that there is no more patronage in the public service of Canada in the face of such facts? And there are other positions of prominence too in which patronage is evident. This Government has a reputation for the number of commissions it has created,—commissions of a very important character. How many Liberals—and I speak particularly in regard to the province with which I am best acquainted—have been appointed on these commissions? Well, Sir, when it was necessary to appoint a man from Quebec they always resorted to this very estimable gentleman, Sir Hormidas Laporte, who has been a prominent commissioner of the Government from the province of Quebec on all the boards which they have created, because he was a member of the Conservative party, and a supporter of the Government. Indeed, Sir, they have even tried to induce him to join the Government; but as this is a matter on which the electorates have something to say, they have not so far succeeded. Well, I say that patronage must be abolished; it ought to be abolished; and we should have honesty, frankness, and sincerity in regard to this as in regard to any other question. It is only camouflage to say that patronage does not exist in regard to many positions; and instead of having patronage, virtually if not nominally, as my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) suggests, we should be sincere about the matter and really abolish patronage, giving to the best qualified men those positions that are vacant. And the Government should help the Civil Service Commission in that respect.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This subject, which has been debated this afternoon, mostly on general principles, will no doubt come before the House in its details before this session is very many weeks older. Therefore, I am not going to go extensively into the matter now. But I wish to say a word or two in respect to what has been said by speakers that have already addressed the Chamber. In the first place, with reference to my old friend and colleague who moved the motion (Sir Sam Hughes), I do not need to say more than that, in common with all my fellow-members, I was glad to see the vigour which he still maintains, though under great disabilities; and we do not, I think, fail to keep in our memories to-day, under certain circumstances not so favourable to him as formerly in the matter of health, the greater vigour and energy which for many years he displayed in this Parliament when his health gave him an opportunity to do so. Though I do not agree with the tendency of his argument, nor the conclusion to which it would lead one, I accord him, as I do all my fellow-members, the perfect privilege of expressing his ideas fearlessly and frankly in the House. I shall do the same on this occasion, and perhaps on others, with reference to the subject which is now before us, for I consider it a very important one.

In the first place, I desire to correct a wrong impression which is prevalent throughout the Civil Service, throughout the city of Ottawa and, I think, probably in this Chamber, as to the work which has been performed by the Civil Service Commission, by the first employee of the Civil Service Commission, Arthur Young and Company, and by the employees, of the sub-committee of the Privy Council, Griffenhagen and Associates. First of all, let me ask hon. members, who are going to form their opinion with reference to the results of the work, that they take two things into consideration: First, the immensity of the work which was to be done; and, secondly, the perturbed and untoward circumstances under which this work was begun and has been carried on up to the present time by the Civil Service Commission and by their employees. I do not need to go into detail with reference to this. We all know that the years through which we have lived since 1913 have been troubled years in every respect, no less troubled in any respect than as regards the work of the Civil Service, in the way of actual performance of duty and also in connection with the reorganization and improvement of the service. Let me also ask, is it generically a thing upon which we must decide merit, that a man's name is Wolfe and not Jones? Is it the essence of a proposition that a man's name should not be Griffenhagen but might very well be Brown? We may have our likes as to names, but at the same time, in a matter of service performed, is it the name or is it the service that counts? It is quality and character; there can be no two opinions about that. Now, my hon. friend opposite made a very strong assertion,—he is apt to make strong assertions; he sometimes makes very strong assertions without good ground. His assertion in this case amounted to this: That a foreigner by the name of Wolfe stole into the sheepfold in Ottawa, took hold of a venerable member of the Civil Service, chucked him out of the service neck and crop, and put in his place—a man with German ante-

cedents, if not a German name. What foundation has my hon. friend for making an assertion of that kind? He has not any.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will give proof to the right hon. gentleman.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the first place Arthur Young and Company had nothing to do with putting civil servants out of office, or putting people into office as civil servants; not one single iota of influence or right of action or power had they to exercise in that respect. Arthur Young and Company—regardless of whether it was a good thing to take that company or another—were employed by the Civil Service Commission to do what? To classify the positions in the Civil Service. The Civil Service Commission themselves made the placements and the re-placements, the retirements and the appointments, and Arthur Young and Company had nothing, good, bad or indifferent to do in connection therewith. The classification that they did was the classification of positions—ascertaining the qualifications for, and the scope of work of certain positions—and their experience enabled them to give valuable advice in that respect. They were asked to do it, paid to do it, they did it, and the positions were classified, in the main, according to their recommendations, modified by conferences between them and the Civil Service Commission. Once the positions were classified it became the duty, the sole duty, of the Civil Service Commission, by whatever tests they might use, to fill positions and to make retirements.

Now, Sir, if there is one piece of work that was ever performed on this Hill to the credit of the commission, and to the credit of the Government which helped or enabled to help it to be performed, it is the re-organization of the Bureau of Printing and Stationery. There will be a report placed before this House in a short time which will give the history of that re-organization. Let me say two or three words with reference thereto. An investigation was ordered by the Government of Canada and several years ago a committee of three, if I remember aright, was turned into that Printing Bureau and asked to make a report. The committee made a report and the members of the House know what that report was. On the groundwork of that report the Civil Service Commission engaged Arthur Young and Company not only to carry out the classification work but to organize that department—which meant what? Which meant to find out, in the first place what were the physical relations in the department not simply of the units of one branch of the service, but of the units of all the branches of the service. For instance they found on three, four or five flats, one unit each segregated on its flat and trying to carry on its work by communications with the other units. It was obvious that if you could get all the parts of a unit together that had a common basis of work, if you could get them close together and acting in unison you would do the work much more economically, much more quickly, and much more effectively, than if you had one unit in one building and another unit in another building elsewhere in the city. That simply goes to show the form of work that organization takes.

Now the company went to work. It passed through the Bureau, it performed its duties, and the organization was completed by the Civil Service Commission who placed every officer that is under it and displaced every civil servant that went out from it, not the organizing company itself. The results are seen. What are they? Four hundred-odd employees are not now at work there who were employed before that organization. Are we honest in our desire for economy? Is it right to get up here and say that this Hill is packed with civil servants, and then to turn round and rend the organization that has carried out the suggestion that you made? Four hundred-odd employees less are now at work in the Printing Bureau than were employed before the organization was carried out. What else must be added? From $500,000 to $600,000 a year is saved in salaries. You might save salaries and you might not get the work done; but the other point is this—that more work, better work, more congenial and more uniform, and characterized by an esprit de corps, is now done in the Printing Bureau than ever before. There you have the results. The same committee, minus one man who has since died, that made the initial investigation and pointed out the need for re-organization in the Bureau, the other day made a thorough investigation of the re-organized Bureau. Its report will be presented to the House, and it carries out absolutely just what I have stated in two or three sentences. You cannot judge a re-organization until it is completed and until it has had just a little time to work on the

completed new basis. In this case it is seven or eight months since the re-organization went into full effect, and it has consequently settled down into the groove of actual and efficient work. That is the condition with reference to the Printing Bureau. What happened next? The Government saw how that work was done, they kept track of it every week it was going on; and when they saw not only that a great saving was effected, but that better work was performed with amelioration of the former conditions—not only as regards hand work and machine work but with respect to the work generally and with the resultant esprit de corps that comes from the operation of a body united and congenial—when the Government saw that they said: There is still more work to be done on this Hill. The suggestion has been made "Just leave it with the deputies and it will be done." We have had deputies on this Hill ever since 1867. The deputies have had powers, large powers, ever since. Deputies have sat from generation to generation in these very places that I have been speaking of; they have sat in the branches we are now organizing; and yet these things have gone on and organization has not taken place. There are great difficulties in a minister re-organizing a large department that he has the headship of. He has not the time to do it, he has not the knowledge necessary to do it, he cannot do it. A deputy head is almost in the same position, although he has an opportunity of being very much better acquainted with all the units in his department and the men in those units, than the minister has. But there are the facts of the case. In some way or other you have to get a breath of new inspiration from outside; you have to get a little bit of the light of modern business introduced innto a department; you have to get some new enterprize and some new initiative; to call the attention of a department to new business methods as they are so rapidly developing in the world of business to-day. The Government thought its duty was to extend re-organization. It immediately cast about to determine as to whom it should put in charge of that re-organization, and it engaged most of the men who had been in the employ of the Arthur Young Company, and who had worked in the former reorganization and classification, these men having taken over the mechanical organization work of Arthur Young and Company and transformed themselves into another company—which, by the way, is incorporated in Canada and has membership in Canada. Looking over the field, it came to the conclusion that these were the best men to undertake the reorganization of some of the departments on this Hill. Why? They had become familiarized with the circumstances and conditions of the service, in the reorganization of the Printing Bureau, and if you brought in a strange body of engineers they would have to acquire all this knowledge that these men already had. We thought that that was a qualification which we should take advantage of, and we did. We made a contract with Griffenhagen and Associates under which they were to give us certain engineering work for a certain amount of pay. We appointed a sub-committee of the Privy Council to have charge of the contract and to work out with these men and with the officers of the departments, in a spirit of co-operation and amity, improvements in the other departments.

5 p.m.

Mr. MURPHY: Will my right hon. friend allow me to ask a question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly.

Mr. MURPHY: Were Griffenhagen and Associates given any greater or different authority with regard to the replacing or displacing of officials than that which the Arthur Young Company had?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will come to that. So we made the contract, and the sub-committee of Council has been working that matter out with those men. I have had the misfortune—or good fortune, I am not saying which—of being the chairman of that sub-committee, and I know the work which it has entailed and the amount of care which that sub-committee has given to the work. The same reorganization is being put into effect in two of the departments on the Hill, the Post Office Department and the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue, and in the course of a little while, longer or shorter, a perfected reorganization will be had in both those departments, as it has been had in the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

What is the modus operandi? These gentlemen make their observations to find out the defects—where services are being duplicated, where unnecessary services are being performed; where modern methods of printing and machine work may take the place

of hand labour; and when they have completed their observations they make their reports and their recommendations as to what is to be done to overcome those weaknesses and effect improvements. The sub-committee of Council, with what time and ability it has, goes carefully over those reports. Then those men and the officers of the departments get together and with the sub-committee come to points of agreement. I may say that in all the improvements which are being made in the two departments which are now under reorganization there has scarcely been a point upon which in the end Griffenhagen and Associates with their staff and with the deputy heads and other officers of the departments which are being reorganized have not come to a point of agreement, and the work has been carried on in co-operation. That does away with so much that has been said about sending a lot of men into a department, and without any co-operation with or knowledge of or implemented work from the department itself, letting them go hither and thither to do as they choose in these matters.

Now to answer my hon. friend's question. Griffenhagen and Associates to-day have no more power than Arthur Young and Company had before. When the sub-committee have considered Griffenhagen and Associates' reports, and have authorized the work to be taken in hand, then the officials of Griffenhagen and Associates and the officials of the department work together to carry it out.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend uses the word "to-day." I do not know whether he wishes to limit Griffenhagen and Associates' authority as to time. If so, I should like to ask what authority they had before to-day?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must not have the least suspicion that I am trying to dodge the question.

Mr. MURPHY: I have not.

SIR GEORGE FOSTER: I am going to give him a flat, square answer, I am giving the methods so as to see how the final results were reached. The office work of Griffenhagen and Associates is simply to find out and recommend as to methods of work; and when their recommendation is agreed to by the sub-committee then Griffenhagen and Associates' duty is just to find out what services can be amalgamated, what can be done away with and what can be put in as an improvement in their place. And Griffenhagen and Associates never took Sidney Smith by the coat-collar and threw him out of the department any more than they could take Mr. Fripp by the coat collar and throw him out of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was not their business, and they had nothing to do with it. If any changes are made they will be made by the Civil Service Commission, which alone can authorize retirements, transfers, appointments and promotions. Now, I hope I have answered that question fairly.

Mr. PROULX: Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Why was Mr. Smith put out of the department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that he has been put out. I do not know who will go out and who will not; that is for the Civil Service Commission. Neither the minister, nor the sub-committee, nor Griffenhagen and Associates have anything to say about that until the Civil Service Commission send in their report to the Council as to what shall be done in the way of retirements, appointments or otherwise. I am not going to pursue that question any further except to say that I am, and always have been, a protagonist of doing away with patronage, and my record in that respect is well known to this House. From the time I became a member I imbibed that idea, and I have always kept it and tried to forward it all that I possibly could.

Mr. FIELDING: In the census appointments?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am coming to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not dodge that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is a little " previous" about that. I am coming to that a little later on. But I am frank to say this, that in the multiplied work of Dominion administration over three or four thousand miles of territory, there is an area which can well be canvassed as to whether it shall be undertaken by the Civil Service Commission under their rules, or whether it shall be done in some other way.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: "Hear, hear." That is a loophole which was opened by my

hon. friend—a loophole which would be opened by every frank man on that side or on this side of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When you come to the appointment of a petty officer up in the Yukon, such as a caretaker or something like that, it is debatable whether you shall tie up everything to three men here in Ottawa in order to have that appointment made according to its rules. Do not let us forget to be frank and straightforward with each other in that respect. Now, in so far as there may be betterments in administration, I am open to the adoption of those betterments, but I am absolutely against putting patronage back either here or in the Outside Service, except under very exceptional circumstances, and there may be those very exceptional circumstances. It is a good thing to take advantage of the experience of others, and I take the experience—to go no further—of Great Britain and of the United States, both of whom have evolved, through centuries, Civil Service systems which are very effective and of a very high order. We can come to that same thing here in Canada. I do not want to go back to the old system of patronage. I felt my heart throb in response to sentiments expressed by the member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot), when he faintly adumbrated the joy and the pleasure of living in Ottawa as a public man in these days as compared with the times when patronage had full sway. My experience goes exactly on all-fours with his in that regard. Speaking from my own experience alone, under the system of patronage the member of Parliament is subjected to continual pulling and hauling, hectoring and domineering, all going to make up a process which goes on when the patronage gate is half open and the multitudes who would like to pass through have to be shaved down to the fractional number that can pass through—and the burden, compared with which the burden of Atlas was a holiday recreation—is borne by the member of Parliament.

Now, let me come just for a moment to the remarks of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). When I came to consider the equipment necessary to the taking of the census, I approached the subject with a mind prepossessed in favour of having the Civil Service Commission take the matter in hand, but, like a good minister, I also had the exigencies of the service to take into account. I sat down with the Civil Service Commission; we canvassed the whole matter thoroughly, and then I asked the commission to make their will evident to council. They recommended that, so far as the census was concerned, being an emergent work distributed over the whole country and involving over 13,000 appointments, it would be impossible for them to undertake that work and do it in accordance with the exigencies of the situation. It is true that my hon. friend and all representatives in this House were asked by the Dominion statistician to furnish some information as to the boundaries of their constituencies and their relation to the boundaries of census commissioner districts. They gave that information, and it was utilized. When it came to the appointment of census commissioners and census enumerators, that under the law, is placed under the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am responsible in the end for all these appointments, and as the quickest and most satisfactory way of dealing with the matter, I went back to the experience of all Governments from 1867 to the present time, and adopted the same policy. If I had had more time to think about it I might have thought out a scheme of my own, but I relied on the experience of the Fathers in that respect and trod in their footsteps. If my hon. friend had only written me a little earlier he might have received the answer that I would take into the very best consideration possible the representations that he had made. He was a little disappointed in that respect, but that must be attributed to the fact that he did not get an answer giving assurance of full and serious consideration. But, honest Indian, as they say, if the member for Quebec East had been in my position and I in his, would he have done very much differently?

I do not think I will labour the point any further. My main object, Mr. Speaker, was to clear up a slight misapprehension, which existed more widely than it should, as to the work which is being carried on in the reorganization of some departments.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask my right hon. friend how he comes to say that there will be about twenty-four thousand appointments? Is the estimate based on the number of polling districts in the country?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It comes about in this way: there are about 230 members in the House, some representing double constituencies, but most of them represent-

ing single constituencies. So that, at the least, you will have one census district for every member of Parliament in point of numbers. Some districts are so divided for economic or geographical purposes that you have to have more than one census commissioner for a district, but broadly speaking there will be about 230 commissioners. The enumeration has to take place within a very short time, and you have to have sufficient enumerators in each district to cover the ground in the period allotted. Altogether, the enumerators will number over 13,000 we do not know exactly how many there will be.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of interfering in the interesting quarrel between the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and his friend the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp). According to the representations made by my friend from Ottawa, there has been in this Civil Service business gross mismanagement, gross extravagance, gross waste of public money. That is a statement made not by any hon. member on this side, but by a supporter of the Government, one who is in close touch with governmental departments here in Ottawa. At all events, if he has not made correct statements in the matter, it cannot be because of any lack of opportunity to get the facts. I leave that, however, as a matter between the right hon. gentleman and his friend from Ottawa.

So far as the Government have honestly endeavoured to abolish patronage, my sympathies have been with them. I raise no objection to it from the point of view of those who desire to exercise patronage. But my complaint is that the Government have not abolished patronage, although they have professed to do so. The Government of which I was a member introduced an effective Civil Service reform when they appointed a Civil Service Commission to deal with the Inside Service at Ottawa. I do not mean to say that the system then adopted was such a vast improvement in every department; even the old system of patronage, if you call it so, was capable, under wise administration, of giving to the people in general honest and faithful service. I shall speak for my own department, because it is the one of which I have the best knowledge. When I retired from that department, I believe I left, in the public service, a body of men, many of them appointed by me, many of them by my predecessors, as well qualified to administer the public service as any men that could be obtained under any system of competitive examination. That is my conviction, and I know my successors in office have testified to the quality of the men they found there. Although I mention what is the case in my department, I have no doubt that the same thing will apply to other departments as well. The principle, however, of examination is a good one; you have to have it; it is not perfect, but I do not know that anything better can be offered. I confess that within my opportunities and observation, I should like to have a man come into my office and sit down and talk to me, so as to let me have some knowledge of what he knows, what he is capable of doing, his capacity, his temperament, all that enters into the best qualities of a man. I should like to have that opportunity if I could. In the absence, however, of any better system, the system of examination seems to be the proper thing; at all events it gives you a test of a man's education and his qualifications from the educational point of view. Therefore, I agree with and support the principle of competitive examination as applied to the Inside Service at Ottawa. I believe that principle could properly have been extended, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said this afternoon, to the large cities and towns, wherever you could adopt the principle of competitive examination. The Civil Service Commission was never intended to be a patronage distributing body; it was intended to conduct competitive examinations and to award prizes according to the marks achieved. That system could be followed out in the case of the Montreal customs house, the Montreal post office and such offices in St. John, Halifax, Toronto, Kingston and other of the larger cities. If the Government had gone that far, I think they would have made a further step in the right direction. They have gone a good deal further than that; and while I am not objecting to that, I do not think it is working out very well. When you undertake to appoint a petty officer of some sort—I am using the words of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) when he spoke of a petty officer up in the Yukon—say a minor postmaster in one of the towns away down in the far-off districts of New Brunswick, how is the Civil Service Commission going to appoint that man? What knowledge can they get about him? There is no competitive examination. They put up a ticket stating that the office is vacant, and Tom, Dick and

Harry put in their applications. How can the Civil Service Commission adopt any system that will enable them properly to judge of those men's qualifications? They have to refer to somebody. What I suppose they will do to-day is to refer to the post office inspector of New Brunswick, and he will go down into that district and make inquiries of somebody in the neighbourhood. But he must be guarded; he must not, for his life, ask a member of Parliament, because the latter knows something about the matter. He has to ask somebody who knows nothing about it. The system is very much like the system of examining men for a jury. You cross-examine men as to their knowledge of the case, and by the time you are through, you almost reach the conclusion that only imbeciles are qualified to be on a jury at all. That is pushing the thing to the extreme. The absence of patronage does not worry me. When the Government went beyond where they could use the competitive examination, I think they went rather too far. Under the old system, if a vacancy occurred in a little post office in the constituency of one of my hon. friends opposite, he was notified and he selected some one on the advice of his friends and neighbours, and in nine cases out of ten the man whom he recommended was a decent, honest man. If he had not been so, he could not have been appointed. Under the new system, there is so much red tape that it takes months to fill a vacancy, and that in itself is an argument against the system. While I think the Government went further than necessary, I have no complaint to make except to point out that where there is no opportunity for competitive examination, I do not see how you can apply the system for which the Civil Service Commission was created. The point, however, which I desire to make to my hon. friends opposite is not that they have abolished patronage; my complaint is that they have not abolished patronage. The meanest kind of quality in mankind is hypocrisy, and it is just as mean in politics as it is in social life. Hon. gentlemen opposite made a great virtue of abolishing patronage; they put that plank in their platform; they talked about it throughout the country and in this House; they spoke about the glorious record of this Government in abolishing patronage. But what do we find? My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) comes here to-day, and admits that in another month or two, in his own department 24,000 men are going to be appointed under the old patronage system. My right hon. friend has truly said that he has always denounced political patronage; but if he has been constant in denouncing it and then he practises it, what are we to think of him? I have in my hand an extract from a speech of my right hon. friend, in which he is giving us a picture of the evils of patronage. Perhaps, his picture is a little coloured, but he not only pictures the evils of patronage, but speaks of the great harm that is going to come to those who practise it, and I want him to take that to heart. This is a speech made by my right hon. friend some years ago. It will be found in the Hansard of 1916, at page 907:

Sir George Foster: Now, as to patronage, I have been thirty-four years in public life; I have been a pretty close student of political parties and political history in this country, and I have simply this to say—I give it as my individual opinion—I have long felt it and I feel it now—that in the whole course of my political life I cannot point to a single instance where political patronage ever raised the status of the bench, ever promoted the efficiency of the Civil Service, ever helped to economy in administration or enhanced the status of public administrators, no matter what functions they performed, ever helped a member of Parliament in reality, or ever strengthened a Government in reality.

I would draw my right hon. friend's attention to that. Even the present Government will not be strengthened in reality by his 24,000 appointments.

On the contrary it almost always causes the dry rot and disintegration that break up government after government and party after party,—

Think of that, 24,000 appointments made which will introduce dry rot which is going to break up the Government.

—and I wish now, in the white heat and light of this great contest and struggle and the self-sacrifice that we are called upon to make, that we might speak from the heart out, and make an agreement in this country between both parties, that hereafter patronage shall not be applied by political parties in the administration of our public services. Now, that is a frank admission. Some may say to me that I have no right to make it. I presume upon my grey beard and thirty-four years in public life, and I make that statement for what it is worth. I will just append to that one single sentence, and it is this; that if there is any laxity in the public virtue of this country to-day, if there is any canker of public corruption, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you can trace it to the baleful effect of political party patronage.

Having reflected upon these pious utterances made not many months ago, the right hon. gentleman immediately, as he says himself, goes back to the old system and appoints 24,000 people under the system of patronage.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The old dry rot.

Mr. FIELDING: The old dry rot, the old corruption, and my right hon. friend will see now, if he applies his own words to the situation, the end that is awaiting him. I had a little experience like that of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). I have referred to it already; I may enlarge upon it now. A man in my constituency had heard somewhere that the members for the counties were going to nominate the census men, and wrote to me about it. I wrote him that I thought he was mistaken, but I would inquire. So I wrote to my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) intimating that I had had this question, and I would be glad to have an answer. I said I could understand that possibly the Civil Service Commission was going to make the appointments, and if so, I had no objection to make, but if for any reason —and I anticipated they would find a reason—they were not going to have the Civil Service Commission do it, I said perhaps the suggestion of my correspondent was all right—that if patronage had been abolished the members representing the various counties, irrespective of politics, should make the nominations. I got the answer that my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) did. They were going back to the old game. They were going to take nominations only from the members supporting the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I admit there might have been a difficulty in the Civil Service Commission making these appointments in the way they make others. Considering how long it takes to appoint a country postmaster, I do not know how long it would take them to appoint 24,000 officers, so I will not quarrel with my right hon. friend for assuming they could not do the job. But if he wanted to be honest in the matter why did he not say:—This is a case in which I will ask every member of Parliament to make nominations, no matter what his politics. Then he could have fairly said he was trying to abolish patronage. No, he could not do that. He has gone back to the old game. He has boasted and tried to take credit for the abolition of patronage, but he has returned to it now. How can he expect that the Government will be respected in this matter by the community at large in the face of the acknowledgment he makes to-day that he is not going to allow any hon. member on this side of the House to make any nomination? He is not going to abolish political patronage. He is going to use these 24,000 appointments in connection with the census as a corrupting agent, a canker, a dry rot, as he describes it here. He is going to use them in the old way. Yet he is going to stand before the people of this country and say: Oh, give us credit, for we abolished patronage.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I am not quite sure whether I am lost in admiration of the indignation—I wonder how real it is—of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), or whether I am covered with confusion, confusion in some measure for myself, but in large measure for my right hon. friend to my left (Sir George Foster). Woe is my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, for do we not all know that it is written, it is necessary that scandals should come, but woe to the man that bringeth them, even to the least among my children. It were better for him that he should have a millstone hanged about his neck and that he should be cast into the sea than that he should have given scandal to even the least among my children. And lo and behold, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce hath given scandal to one who counts among the greatest, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. That hon. gentleman is overwhelmed with indignation. He sees the coming back of the dry rot and the corruption that is going to undermine all that is good in this world. Why? Because on one occasion, which he himself admits is an occasion when the Civil Service Commission could not properly have made the appointments in question, the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the performance of his duty undertook to make them. My hon. friend is scandalized because in the making of those appointments the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not think it necessary to consult the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's or the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) who, we notice, was very ready to nominate his political friend. I wonder how it would have worked out as political patronage if application had been made to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the hon. member for Quebec East, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's as the hon. member for Quebec East had already done, absolutely without regard to considerations of political patronage, had found it

absolutely impossible for him to nominate anybody save one of his most active political supporters for the position. I wonder how different the situation would have been then. I wonder whether his scathing language about hypocrisy does not find some landing place on the other side of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us get down to commonsense, I respect the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's too much to believe that he was serious—he actually admits he was not serious, see the smile on his face —in the expression of indignation for which he could hardly find words. Why, he had just admitted himself that if there was fault to find with this Government in its Civil Service legislation, it was that it had gone too far. He pointed out, and, speaking for myself, he pointed out with a good deal of force, that when you have got to the stage where the competitive examination system is applied to the making of classes of appointments where that system could not find its application, he was bound to question whether you were not carrying the principle too far. I am prepared to concede that it is open to question, and that there is room for consideration in that regard. He had just admitted that, and then he treated us to all this mock indignation over the fact that census commissioners were chosen by the minister. So far as there has been reference to those who were chosen, we have been told they were eminently fit people; the hon. member for Quebec East gave us testimony in that regard, and then my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's raises his hands in holp horror because there are going to 24,000 enumerators appointed, all eminently fit people, by the commissioners whom the Minister of Trade and Commerce selects, and he speaks of the dry rot and corruption coming back again. Let us be serious. Let us proceed to the question with which we are concerned.

In so far as the principle embodied in the Civil Service legislation is concerned, for my part it commended itself to my judgment when that legislation was adopted. It commends itself to my judgment still. I do think that there are evils attached to purely political patronage against which the law should provide some system of check, and that, as I understand it, was the principle which underlay the Civil Service legislation as we have it at the present time. The principle is absolutely sound, in my judgment, but it is well to remember that when you come to put principles into practical application, however good those principles may be you must at the same time have the application of sound common sense. There was once a very great artist who was asked what he mixed his colours with to produce such beautiful results, and his answer was: "With brains, Sir." Now, when you come to apply any principle you must exercise common sense. We have had three years of experience in the working of this particular Civil Service legislation, and I see in that experience no reason to depart from the principle that underlies it, although I think that in the carrying out of the Act certain things may have developed that make it proper for us all to consider whether in the practical application of the principle there is not room for improvement, and whether you would not, perhaps, obtain better results, from the point of view of efficiency in the public service as well as from the standpoint of economy—which, after all, is the objective of those who are held responsible for the working of the system,—if certain of the provisions of the Act were modified. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has indicated a line of consideration, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) quite agrees, I understand, with the view implied therein, that is, as to whether the application of the principle indiscriminately to all classes of public servants is wise in the interests of the efficiency of the public service. Just to take one class that occurs to my mind at the moment. I am not expressing any final conclusion as to what ought to be done, but I think it is fair for us to put before the House things that present themselves to our minds as indicating a possible necessity for modification in the law as it stands. Let us take one class—a numerous one—those men who have to be employed in purely manual labour. Now, there is a case where certainly you cannot apply any system of competitive examination, and it seems to be a question that calls for serious consideration whether it might not be advisable to withdraw that class of people from the operation of the provisions of the present Civil Service Act. Reference has been made to rural postmasters. Possibly, it might be to the advantage of the public service that they should be withdrawn from the control of this Act; and in the very carrying out of the Act itself it would seem to me, while adhering to its principle, while seeing to it that proper precautions are taken against abuses of political patronage, that at all

events, we should consider the wisdom of making such provision for the exercise of direction on the part of those who are ultimately responsible to the public as would create some corresponding relation between that responsibility—which, under our system of government, both governments and members of Parliament cannot avoid—and some measure of opportunity for being heard in connection with those things for which they are held responsible.

We have heard a good deal this afternoon on the merits of this suggestion. None of us can have his eyes closed to the situation created by the Act, and it is not impossible that, in the first fervour of the desire for absolute reform, some things may have been overlooked that should have been taken cognizance of, and perhaps the pendulum was allowed to swing too far in one direction. These are things that call for consideration. They have been receiving the attention of the Government, and with the additional light which has been thrown on the subject this afternoon, it is the purpose of the Government further to consider the question as to what modification, if any, might in the public interest be made in the present law, and more particularly in the present system of its application. And in view of this declaration which I am now making, I understand —and this, I believe, was anticipated—that the hon. gentleman who made the motion, is prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Before the hon. gentleman who has introduced the resolution either withdraws it or puts it to the decision of the House, I wish to offer a few remarks on the subject with which it deals. I cannot support the resolution because I contend that it is vicious in principle and unfounded in fact. The assertion that it is vicious in principle I base upon the remarks that have been made by previous speakers during this debate. There is no doubt that a Civil Service which is to offer the required standard of efficiency should be a service altogether outside of the evils of patronage. This has been recognized in every truly civilized country. It has been recognized for years in Great Britain. The system has been introduced in the United States recently, and, so far as Canada is concerned, this reform, as in the case of practically every other great reform in this country, was first talked of and then put upon our statute books by the Liberal party, under the leadership of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The reform of the Civil Service in regard to patronage is, therefore, I say, a good one, and this legislation aiming at its abrogation is vicious in principle. I said that the resolution was not only vicious in principle, but that it was, as regards the present Government, unfounded in fact, and I will explain that contention. I see no reason why Government supporters on the other side of the House should complain that political patronage has been taken from their hands. Every day, every month, every year since 1911, and particularly since 1917, political patronage has been rampant. It has blossomed and has flourished under the present system. No appointment of any importance has been made in this country except through political patronage, and only appointments of no importance have been left to the Civil Service Commission. The reason for this is quite obvious. Why, even when a law is being introduced in this Parliament, we find patronage prevails. If it provides for appointments to important positions carrying with them fat salaries, in most cases a clause is inserted in the Act, and special provision is made in the estimates, providing that the appointment shall not be subject to the Civil Service Act.

I do not wish to detain the House very long, I merely desire to say this further: Not only on general lines has this Government preserved and maintained the system of patronage, but in the province of Quebec especially, patronage has always existed since 1911. And when I was listening to the hon. gentleman who spoke of the Department of Justice I was wondering if he really wanted to be serious or whether he was trying to be humorous. In the cities of Montreal and Quebec, in every city of importance in that province, not an appointment is made in any branch of the service without the political leaders supporting the Government being consulted. We all know that. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has referred to judicial appointments. The judiciary in our province is highly respected, and that is because it deserves to be respected. I desire to say, however, that as far as the Minister of Justice is concerned, since he has had to choose the judges in our province his choice in the majority of cases has been most happy. I therefore do not wish to offer any criticism, but simply to call attention to one instance which shows that even when appointments to the very highest posts are made politics are not excluded.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CANNON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not refer to that one instance. It is a well-established rule that nothing shall be said in debate which in any way reflects upon the judiciary. If it is desired to call in question any such matter there is a well-known rule of procedure to be followed.

Mr. CANNON: I do not wish to reflect upon any member of the Bench, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to call the attention of the House to the fact that not very long ago a gentleman highly respected, a gentleman recommended by all the members of the local bar and who was the batonnier of our province was not appointed to the Bench, and the reason given why he was not appointed, notwithstanding all his qualifications, was that he happened to be the partner of a Liberal minister in the provincial Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, I say that when such a condition exists the Government supporters ought to—

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, in view of the statement which he has made, I presume I am responsible for the fact that the gentleman referred to was not appointed.

Mr. CANNON: I hope not.

Mr. DOHERTY: I presume I am responsible since, of course, I officially made the nomination of the gentleman who was appointed to the vacancy which otherwise the gentleman alluded to might have filled. Let me assure the hon. gentleman, that if he was informed that in the decision come to the fact that the gentleman to whom he refers was the partner of a Liberal member of the profession had anything to do with the decision arrived at at that time, he was entirely misinformed.

Mr. CANNON: As far as my right hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) is concerned, let me say that when he was out of the Chamber I stated that I wished to congratulate him upon the appointments he has made to the Bench in the province of Quebec, in most cases, since he has been Minister of Justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the last instance to be brought to your attention as to the exercise of patronage, not only in the province of Quebec but throughout the Dominion, is that of the appointment of census commissioners. I have before me the list of the census commissioners appointed in the several constituencies in the province of Quebec. We may look this list over once, twice and three times, and nowhere will be found the name of one gentleman who might have been, or who might be, directly or indirectly connected with the Liberal party in any way whatsoever.

An hon. MEMBER: Bleu.

Mr. CANNON: In our city of Quebec every name on this list is the name of a true Bleu. With respect to the gentleman appointed in my constituency I do not wish to offer any criticism, he is an honest, respectable man and I am quite sure will perform his duties with satisfaction to the public. But the point is this: Why should the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when addressing the House in eloquent terms as he did this afternoon state the enormous sums of money which have been spent all over this country to bring about Civil Service reform and the abolition of patronage, and yet when the right hon. gentleman himself as a minister, has to make appointments in Canada, as a truly reactionary Tory he goes back to the system that existed forty years ago and to every post appoints one of his own friends? Let the right hon. gentleman do so if he wishes, but if he is a supporter and partisan of patronage in civil appointments let him get up here and say so. Mr. Speaker, I go further. The list to which I refer—not drawn up by my right hon. friend I know, but by the two ministers representing our province, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) and the Postmaster General—shows that in every constituency these two gentlemen have chosen former Tory members or former Tory candidates. It is their right to do so, but let them have the courage to get up in the House and admit the fact, and let this Government cease squandering hundreds of thousands of dollars on so-called Civil Service reform and cease pretending to the people of this country that they are trying to abolish patronage. On this question, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has said, let us be honest and let us cease to be hypocrites. This is the stand taken by hon. gentlemen on this side and I think it is the stand supported by the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1911 there was promulgated something which has since been forgotten, I refer to the Halifax platform. That platform contained a plank declaring that patronage should be abolished. In 1917 this Government went to the country and one of the main planks in its platform was a similar

declaration. I say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding all the promises and declarations made by the Tory party in Canada, notwithstanding the enormous sums of money expended by this Government to reform the Civil Service, notwithstanding the scandal of Griffenhagen and other American experts imported into Canada to do things that Canadian experts could have done and done much better—notwithstanding all this I say that the present Government stands to-day in favour of patronage. The Government shows it in all its acts and appointments. The money that has been spent is money uselessly spent, and the promises made will never be kept by the present administration.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) followed his customary practice of general fault finding, but I must say he did not indulge himself to his usual extent in those violent adjectives and political pyrotechnics with which he is prone to decorate his speeches in this House. The hon. gentleman was good enough to commend the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) for certain appointments to the bench in the province of Quebec. I am rather inclined to think that inasmuch as the hon. gentleman did not commend the minister for all the appointments made, the right hon. gentleman is perhaps to be congratulated more on the appointments which did not meet the approval of the hon. member for Dorchester than on those which did.

The hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks endorsed the word "hypocrisy" which was used by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and also repeated the advice of that hon. gentleman to the effect that henceforth we should be honest—politically honest. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the thought comes rather late from these hon. gentlemen, especially from the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. However, the aspiration is a worthy one, and I trust that the hon. member will be spared for very many years to demonstrate his sincerity and to retrieve some of his past in this regard.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's referred to the Halifax programme and to a plank therein relating to patronage, and charged that this Government was guilty of hypocrisy or insincerity in not redeeming that plank. I do not know any hon. gentleman in this House who is running a greater risk than the hon. member if we are to define political insincerity as he defines it. A Liberal platform was issued in 1893, and if non-fulfilment of that platform for fifteen years warrants any person in charging with political insincerity those who failed to fulfil it, then I am afraid my hon. friend will occupy a very unfortunate position. And more recently we have the Liberal platform of 1919, which I think he indicated not so very long ago that he could not follow out in its entirety. But last year the hon. gentleman stated in this House:

> I think myself that we find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise, and we all find when we come to the responsibility of office that we may have to modify our views.

Well, the hon. gentleman could speak feelingly in that respect, for he has had a great deal to do with the framing of platforms, and, if I may say so, with disregarding them afterwards. Now, Sir, in regard to the appointment of census enumerators, it has been conceded by one or two gentlemen opposite—I think I am correct in saying by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, and the hon. member for Gaspe and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux)—that the Civil Service Act has gone too far. I think those are pretty nearly the words used by both those hon. gentlemen. It seems to me that they are right. Time has demonstrated that the Civil Service Act has gone too far, and our position in regard to appointments to the Civil Service is absolutely illogical and ridiculous. In so far as making appointments for the taking of the census is concerned, surely the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's should be the last to complain. We had a census taken in 1911, when that hon. gentleman was a member of the Government, and I know I am right in saying that to all positions from the Atlantic and to the Pacific only their own political friends were appointed. There was no Civil Service Commission at that time to make those appointments; it never was thought of. In the county which I have the honour to represent the patronage was handed over to the defeated candidate. The appointments were made through that gentleman, and the work, I believe, was well done. It became quite apparent to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George

Foster) that the Civil Service Commission could not possibly make these census appointments. That has been agreed to by hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, and who at the same time charged the Government with political patronage in this particular. Well, if the machinery provided by the Civil Service Act proved to be inadequate for the purpose, then it strikes me as a very natural thing for an old politician-statesman like the right ron. Minister of Trade and Commerce to fall back on a custom which has been in vogue in this country from time immemorial.

The hon. member for the two constituencies in the province of Quebec, the rural constituency of Gaspé and the industrial constituency of Maisonneuve, appears to be very much perturbed about the possibility of a return to patronage. He pictured in lurid language the horrors to which a member used to be subjected by patronage seekers, how he was worried and heckled and disturbed from morning till night. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can suggest to the hon. gentleman one way by which he, at least, could cut his worries in half should there be a return to the patronage system—by just resigning one of his two constituencies. I fancy every hon. member would think himself very fortunate if he could reduce all his political worries as easily as could the hon. gentleman. It is not my intention to discuss this resolution at any great length. I have spoken on this matter before, and I am perfectly consistent tonight when I express my opposition to the appointment to offices in this country being left in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. I am saying now something that I have said before in this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You mean the Inside Service too?

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I am more concerned, naturally, about the Outside Service, but I would go beyond that and say I think a mistake was made in handing over the making of appointments for both the Inside and the Outside Services to a Civil Service Commission. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for any three men occupying offices in Ottawa, I care not how capable they are, to make appointments to positions in all parts of this great country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They cannot do it; the thing is not only impracticable, but impossible. They must seek advice from some source or from some person, whether the appointment is in British Columbia or in Nova Scotia—and I mention the extreme West and the extreme East in order to emphasize the impossibility of any three men in Ottawa carrying on that work. Under the present system these three gentlemen—and I say nothing whatever against them or their capabilities—are responsible for the selection of persons to fill positions in all parts of the country. But if a man is to be appointed in British Columbia or in Kingston, they cannot run out to British Columbia or to Kingston and investigate the matter personally; they must apply to some person in British Columbia or in Kingston on whom they can rely. The ridiculous and illogical feature of it is that they must not under any circumstances seek the advice of the member for the constituency, although the efficiency or inefficiency of the service depends upon whether or not the appointment is a good one—and the member for the constituency is the man who is held responsible for the proper carrying on of the work. The whole thing seems to me to be absolutely illogical.

I have no doubt that the intention was a good one when it was thought fit to make these appointments through a body of men here in Ottawa, but time and again we have had evidence of their inability to carry on. On some occasions they have advertised for applicants for a position and have literally been deluged with applications, whereupon they have delegated to men chosen by themselves the task of going over these hundreds of applications and weeding them out. Is that getting rid of patronage? It is merely the transfer of the work to some person who is responsible to no one.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said that he would not have the operations of the Civil Service Commission apply to the appointment of country postmasters and incumbents of small offices of that kind. But the principle is the same whether it is applied to some country post office or some larger office; I cannot see how it is possible for a board of three men to look into the merits or demerits of cases as they come before them and make proper selections. I do not think it is right; I do not think it is in the interests of the country. Moreover, the present system is most undemocratic. There is no more democratic way in making appointments to these positions than through the recommendation of the member. Suppose a postmaster is to be appointed, we will say, in the county of Frontenac. Now, what happens? If I have any astuteness as a politician I certainly am going to ascertain what the

people in that particular locality want. I am merely their representative or mouthpiece; they are the ones who are making the appointment. I contend, therefore, that the appointment through the member, the member then being held responsible, is by far a more democratic method than the making of appointments through a Civil Service Commission.

Now, I am going to express my candid opinion as to what should be done. I would like to see the Government remove at least the Outside Service, from the control of the Civil Service Commission. I want to go further than that and state what my position is—and I am speaking only for myself. I would—call it patronage if you like—place the responsibility on the member for the making of appointments in his constituency, regardless of what side of the House he sat on or what party he supported. In this respect my view will probably differ from that of many hon. gentlemen in this House. But it does seem to me that when the people of a constituency expresses their wish at the polls to have a certain man do their business for them, that man should be entrusted with the recommendations for that constituency, not the man whom the people said they did not want to do that business for them. I would be willing to support this resolution if it were amended along the lines I have suggested. I repeat that this is merely my own view in regard to the matter. At all events, if that course were taken, the charge of making use of this responsibility for political purposes would, necessarily, very largely disappear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend not maintain the commission for the appointment in the Civil Service here at Ottawa of technical officers and so on?

Mr. EDWARDS: That probably might be done. I think also that the Civil Service Commission can serve a very useful purpose in setting examination papers and examining candidates for important positions. You can have that examination test if you like; I would raise no objection to that. But for my part, I do not see how a minister of the Crown gets along in running his department. He must have a deputy minister; he must have certain clerks who will devote their whole time to the study of the details of his department. Here is a body of three men in Ottawa who have the say as to who is going to handle this, that, or the other branch of that department. The minister is held responsible for the proper administration of his department, but he has nothing to say as to whether this clerk can or cannot perform more effective work than another in a certain branch. The decision in that regard rests with three gentlemen who cannot possibly understand the situation as well as he does, and who must apply to someone else with more knowledge of the subject than they can possibly possess. So I charge against the system as it is now that it must result in inefficient administration of the detailed work of a department; that no person can judge better than the minister and his deputy as to the arrangement of the clerks and officials in his particular department, and to take that duty out of his hands and put it into the hands of a board of three men, is, it seems to me, illogical and not in the best interests of the conduct of his department.

That is all, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to say in regard to the matter. It is not that I have any desire as a member of this House to handle the patronage pertaining to my constituency. In fact, I am sure, representing as I do a rural constituency, I am only saying what applies to practically every other rural constituency, namely, that the patronage does not amount to a hill of beans so far as the member is concerned; but the responsibility is there just the same. I do not care if the appointment is merely that of a country postmaster; if you put in a person whom the people of that section do not want and who is really not a proper person to occupy that office, while, under present conditions, the member has nothing to say about the appointment of that man, the member will undoubtedly be held responsible if that man proves inefficient in his position.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on this resolution, let me at the outset associate myself with those who have preceded me in this discussion with kind thoughts and words of appreciation of the effort made by the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). That gallant member has shown distinctly this afternoon the reason for the splendid work accomplished by him in the early stages of the war; he has shown the stuff of which he is made when, in his condition physically, he can come before this House and present a case in the manner in which he has presented it this afternoon. His effort deserves the congratulation of the House and the admiration of members on both sides.

Like the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), I cannot support the resolution in its entirety. I would though be in favour of some of the provisions of the resolution. Like the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I decline to subscribe to a condition that permits the defeated candidate in a constituency to have charge of the appointments in that constituency. I agree absolutely with the hon. member that the elected member, the person selected by the people as the fit and proper person to represent them on the floor of this House, should also represent them in the constituency in matters of that kind. I regret though that I cannot follow my genial friend any further in his remarks, nor agree with them, particularly, as regards the reference he made to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), when he spoke of that hon. gentleman's insincerity during his term of office, which was from 1896 to 1911. When the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's took charge of the finances of this Dominion, and when the government of which he was a member took control of the affairs of this Dominion, in 1896, those who are interested in the political affairs of the country know well the condition that obtained in Canada then; that there was depression on every hand and that the country was in almost a state of rebellion. But, as has been stated on the floor of this House, again and again, and on many platforms throughout the country, notwithstanding the moderate reductions made in the tariff by the hon. member who then controlled the destinies of the finances of this country—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget that we are discussing the question of patronage as proposed in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria. I think it would be unfortunate if the hon. gentleman went on to discuss the general administration of a former Government.

Mr. PEDLOW: In duty bound, I bow to the ruling of the Chair and I do so gracefully. I was merely replying to a point raised by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. SPEAKER: The point raised by the hon. member for Frontenac had to do with the question of the consistency of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's on the question of patronage. It had nothing to do with his administration in other respects.

Mr. PEDLOW: I had just about reached that point, Sir, when you called me to order. The then Minister of Finance proved conclusively that he had, during his term of office, saved the citizens of this country a sum of no less than $300,000,000 in customs duties. In this respect I claim that the then Minister of Finance was absolutely sincere in following the Liberal platform of 1893, and in this regard I think the hon. member for Frontenac was hardly fair to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

To return to the question that is immediately under discussion, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria, and some of the remarks that have followed in regard to that subject, I claim that the defeated candidate has no right to have control of the patronage, if you like to call it that, in any constituency. The sitting member, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has so well expressed the matter, the elected member for any constituency, regardless to which party he belongs, has and should have the right to represent his constituents both in this House and in the constituency.

Let me look for a moment at the condition of the Civil Service of this country. What do those of us who have had the privilege of going around the various departments find? Do we find peace and contentment? I am sorry to say that, in my judgment, the very opposite prevails. There is on every hand discontent, dissatisfaction and unrest, and the classification that has recently been made by the firm that was imported from the country to the south of us to do the work is, to a large extent, responsible for that condition. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) this afternoon made reference to the magnificent work accomplished by that concern, Arthur Young and Company and also Griffenhagen and Company, more particularly in the Printing Bureau. He claimed a great improvement in the efficiency and output of that department and so on. But since coming to Ottawa three weeks ago, I have been informed that the output of that department has been greatly reduced since those dismissals have taken place, and I understand that a large quantity of the printing that was formerly done by the Printing Bureau is now done by offices throughout the city of Ottawa outside of the Government service, that work being paid for by the Govern-

ment, so that the large amount of saving that is claimed by the Government through the dismissal of those 400 employees is to a large extent, a myth.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce intimated that part of the work accomplished by Young and Company was classification of positions and outline of requirements of the various departments. I found, on looking through the volume on classification of last session that one of the qualifications that was required was rather interesting and I will read it to the House. "Employees for the Senate cloak room." These employees were, amongst other things, required to be capable of rendering first aid. I have often wondered why this provision.

I agree most heartily with the conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), that the Civil Service Commission is doing a good work in this country. If this commission is developed along proper business lines and receives the assistance of those in the service, the heads of the departments, and if the Government will only place on the deputy ministers and the heads of each department, the responsibility that should be placed on them and pay them in proportion, not necessarily to length of service, but to the results produced by them, then and then only will this Government receive efficient service at the hands of the various departments of the Government.

The Minister of Justice claims that the underlying principle of the Civil Service legislation is good, but that there is room for improvement. I agree with him. I should like to know what institution of human origin is perfect. Even in their old age they go on improving from day to day, from week to week, and year to year. Notwithstanding the many shortcomings that have been observed in the operation of the Civil Service Commission in Ottawa, I have no hesitation in saying that it has already accomplished much, and I believe that if the commission receive the assistance and support they deserve at the hands of the Government and of Parliament they will accomplish much in the years to come, will accomplish much in the years to come.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) stated that the Civil Service is undoubtedly sound and British to the core. I know something of the Civil Service in the Old Land, and the underlying principles that obtain there. Those principles are that appointments to the service shall be upon competitive examination, and that promotions shall be based on length of service and ability. That is why the Civil Service of Great Britain is the admiration of governments the world over. I think that the system of competitive examination is the proper method of making appointments, to the Inside Service at least. There is a good deal in what has been claimed by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) with regard to the Outside Service. These latter appointments, I have no hesitation in saying, should be left to a large extent in the hands of the elected member. I do not make this statement because I desire to obtain work of that kind, for I know it is irksome and will not be a pleasant duty for any hon. member to perform. I am sure he will find that instead of it being a political advantage, it will be a disadvantage. However, he is the man best able to perform work of that kind.

We have heard very much this afternoon on the subject of patronage. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is apparently adverse to patronage except in exceptional circumstances. Apparently he thinks that circumstances alter cases, and the exigencies of the situation appeal to him whenever that is necessary.

The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) entertained the House this afternoon with some correspondence they had had with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I have also had occasion to deal with this question of the appointment of census commissioners and enumerators. The impression seems to have been very general throughout the constituency of South Renfrew, largely, no doubt, due to the claim made by my opponent and his associates in the election of 1917, that patronage would be done away with if the Union Government were elected, that patronage actually had been abolished, and as a result I have been almost deluged with requests from individuals in every part of my riding for my influence in securing them an appointment as enumerator. I am not at all surprised they were of the opinion that I could assist them. Like my hon. friend from Quebec East, I also received a communication on Oct. 30th regarding the census of 1921. I shall not read the entire communication, but it sets forth what was stated by my hon. friend from Quebec

East this afternoon, enclosed a schedule of polling subdivisions, and asked me for a considerable amount of information. Feeling this was an olive branch thrown out along the line of the claims made by the Union Government in 1917, and since, I thought as the representative of the riding I would be quite justified in sending in the information asked for, which entailed a considerable amount of work, I wrote:

If you think I can be of any further assistance to you in this regard kindly write me again, and be sure and return the enclosed proclamation.

I had forwarded a proclamation giving information as to the different polling subdivisions. I went on:

Do you wish me to name some fit and proper person for the position of chief enumerator for the district of South Renfrew, or is it the intention of the Government to have the appointees named by the Government candidate in the last election? It occurs to me that possibly now that the "patronage system" has been done away with, the duly elected representative in each riding will be consulted in matters of this kind.

I did not receive a reply to that part of my letter at that time, but some time later I received a letter from a friend in Toronto, a gentleman I have known for a great many years, and who has been employed on the teaching staff of one of the collegiate institutes there. He wrote in part as follows:

We male teachers were talking at the collegiate about the taking of the census next year. Two or three years ago we helped in the registration and did our work for nothing. We think we should not be overlooked now. We, in the city here, are free early in the month of June and none can do the work better. Let patronage under our friend Meighen die, and give the appointments to teachers rather than to politicians.

I quoted that extract in a letter I wrote on November 15, to Mr. Coates as follows:

I have just received a letter to-day from a Toronto friend who is a teacher in one of the Collegiate Institutes in the city of Toronto, and I am taking the liberty of quoting the following extract from him.

That is, the quotation I have just read.

Now, I have no idea as to what arrangements your department proposes in regard to this matter, but it does strike we that the proposition made by my correspondent is a most excellent one, and deserves your earnest consideration. Men of this class are, undoubtedly, the best fitted for work of this kind, and there is no doubt about it, but that those selected for this work should be selected, regardless of politics. Patronage, which is supposed to have been buried since 1917, certainly should find no place in this work, and I sincerely trust your department will consider the subject along the lines suggested in the above quotation. By the way,

[Mr. Pedlow.]

your letter to me on November 2nd instant, in answer to mine of November 1st, did not give a reply to the last paragraph, of that communication, and I have been wondering since if it was an oversight on your part.

I refer there to the paragraph I read a moment ago. Some days later I received the following communication from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, signed by R. H. Coates, Dominion Statistician:

Dear Mr. Pedlow, I have yours of November 15, and agree that the school teachers would make excellent enumerators. A difficulty in the way is the fact that the census will be taken on June 1, 1921, and we shall complete the work in the field within the next following three weeks, during which time, of course, the schools are still open. Our census, as you know, is a rather elaborate inquiry. The matter of the appointment of enumerators will not arise until about March next, when your suggestion will be fully considered. The census commissioners and enumerators will be appointed, as in previous censuses, namely, on the nomination of the Government. It is the intention to place the appointment of enumerators more directly under the commissioners and to hold the latter somewhat more responsible for them than in previous censuses. We took the matter up in detail with the Civil Service Commission, at whose suggestion the appointment of the field staff was left at the discretion of the department. The staff to be appointed for the work of compilation will, however, be named by the Civil Service Commission. I regret the delay in answering your previous inquiry in this matter, which is due to my absence from the city of Ottawa.

Now, I reported to my friend in Toronto, from whom I received a reply, and I shall quote the following short extract:

Toronto, December 11.—I have been informed just lately by Mr. Mowat that I shall have to see certain members of the Ward Conservative Association if I wish an appointment. So you see the ward heeler still has the pull and the teachers will simply stand aside and watch the other fellow perhaps less competent do the trick.

As I have already stated, I have received, in consequence of the impression left in my riding, hundreds of communications asking me to appoint different persons in different sections of the riding as enumerators. But in every case I have replied that it was not within my province to do work of that kind, another gentleman in the riding, whose name I shall refer to later on apparently having been considered by the Government the fit and proper person to attend to this matter on behalf of the constituency. In this instance, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who has always supported the abolition of patronage, is apparently in the position of the Apostle Paul who says: "For the good that I would, I do not; and the evil which I would not that I do"; and "when I

would do good, evil is present with me." He also reminds one of Lot's wife, who, when leaving the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrah—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. PEDLOW: Looked back on the pleasures of sin and was turned into a pillar of salt. Although the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his associates in the Government profess to have turned their backs on the evils of party patronage, in their heart of hearts, they still long for it. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) said that he hated the present system, which he described as unbusinesslike, unsatisfactory, and unfair, and I agree with all that he has said. Why this hypocrisy, this insincerity, and all this humbug? The word "humbug" has been used rather frequently to-day, and I do not know a more appropriate word in this connection. The Minister of Trade and Commerce and his staff of 24,000 census employees bring to my mind the utterance of a celebrated citizen of this world who exclaimed: "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." But there is this difference in the present instance, that the Government members and the Government defeated candidates all over the country have done the gathering in of these 24,000 of the faithful to perform the compilation of the census returns. Mr. Speaker, "there is not so great faith," no, not in all Canada, as this method of doing away with party patronage serves to illustrate.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to ask what my hon. friend has been quoting from?

An hon. MEMBER: The Bible.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am afraid the hon. member who asks this question is more conversant with overages in the wheat business and—

An hon. MEMBER: And Chinese immigration.

Mr. PEDLOW: Overages and Chinese immigration—

Mr. LEMIEUX: And dry docks.

Mr. PEDLOW—and apples and cabinet positions—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. PEDLOW:—than he is with the source from which I have been quoting—the Book of Books. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask this question in all seriousness: Is the Government really sincere in its protestations?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. PEDLOW: Let us see what happened in 1917 during the election. I am sure that other constituencies, like mine, were invaded by a flow of oratory and eloquence from one end to the other. The principal claim advanced for the support of the electorate was based on the issue of winning the war, and the Unionist party brought the gallant colonel, who was my opponent, all the way from France to win the war in South Renfrew. Among other things it was contended that there would be no more political parties in the future, that henceforward members would all belong to one party, that there was going to be a love feast down here at Ottawa after the election, and that there would not be any more patronage. As I have already stated that is one of the reasons why I, for one, have been besieged with requests for the nomination of parties to do the work of taking the census in the south riding of Renfrew. Before proceeding further with this branch of the subject I would like to draw attention to an article which appeared in the Ottawa Journal on Saturday, August 14, 1920. In that article I find the following:

> Mr. Mackenzie King in his speech at Paisley asked what constructive legislation Union Government had passed.

The Journal says:

> That is an easy question. No Canadian Government ever passed so much advanced legislation. Here are four examples: The abolition of patronage—

and so on.

I would like to show the House further what, according to my experience, actually happened in connection with the abolition of patronage, and I am going to quote from some correspondence that I had with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in his concluding remarks wondered what the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) would do if they had been requested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to name a fit and proper person to oversee the taking of the census in their respective constituencies. No such request was made to them, I understand, by the minister. Had the member for Quebec East been asked to make such an appoint-

ment he would doubtless have replied that it would be impossible for him to find anybody in his constituency but a Liberal to appoint to such a position; and I am sure the member for Shelburne and Queen's could have made a suitable appointment from his constituency. But I have here a letter from the Minister of Trade and Commerce asking me to nominate a person for the position of returning officer in the forthcoming referendum in South Renfrew. The letter which is dated July 15, 1920, is as follows:

Dear Sir:— It is necessary to have an appointment made of a returning officer for the prohibition referendum which is soon to be held in the Province of Ontario. It has been usual, I think, to appoint the Sheriff or Registrar of the County and, failing these, a good and capable man.

Dr. Reid has had matter more in charge but has just left for British Columbia. He has sent me in a list of persons recommended and I find that your riding is vacant. I therefore take it that you have not recommended anyone. Would you kindly attend to this matter at once as the Secretary of State is anxious to get the names in hand. It will prevent further correspondence and much trouble will be saved if you will send in the full name of the man you recommend, his occupation, address, and the locality or building in which he will sum up the votes.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. E. FOSTER.

Mr. DUFF: Who is the letter addressed to?

Mr. PEDLOW: It is addressed to "I. E. Pedlow, Esq., M.P., Renfrew, Ont." I took it for granted—

Mr. DUFF: That there was something doing.

Mr. PEDLOW: —that the Government were really sincere up to that time. On July 17th, I replied to the right hon. gentleman as follows:

Dear Sir,—Your favor of the 15th, inst. is the first intimation I have had that I was expected to name a suitable person for the position of returning officer for the prohibition referendum for the South Riding of the county of Renfrew.

I have, however, very great pleasure in recommending Albert Edwin Bradwin, Editor and Proprietor, "The Watchman" newspaper, Arnprior, Ont., as a suitable person for this appointment. The votes will be summed up in the Town Hall Arnprior.

The sheriff or registrar of the county, resides in the North Riding of the County of Renfrew, consequently, I do not consider either of these officials eligible for the position, and this is the reason why I am submitting the above named gentleman, who, I feel confident, will fill the position satisfactorily.

Yours very truly,

Mr. CAHILL: Was he appointed?

[Mr. Pedlow.]

Mr. PEDLOW: The balance of the correspondence will show what happened if my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience. Nine days later I was informed that the communication of July 15th, was sent me in error, and that it should have been sent to Lieutenant Colonel Martin, who was the defeated candidate in South Renfrew in the 1917 election.

Mr. DUFF: How did you find that out?

Mr. PEDLOW: I have a communication here which explains that, but it is marked "Personal and Private." If I had the permission of the writer to do so I would certainly like to place the letter on Hansard.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I fear you will not get the permission.

Mr. PEDLOW: On the day I received this communication I called up the secretary of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was in charge of the office during the Minister's absence, and explained to him the unfortunate position in which I had been placed at the time, because I had informed Mr. Bradwin that I had recommended him for the appointment, and he in turn had told his friends of it and it had become public property. Therefore I asked that the nomination which I had made should be confirmed. The secretary of the Minister of Trade and Commerce assured me that he would look into the matter and see if the nomination I had made could be confirmed. He promised to write me, but from that day to this I have not heard anything further from him in regard to the subject. I then called the Prime Minister up on the phone. He too undertook to make inquiries into the matter and see if it were not possible to have the gentleman nominated by me appointed to the position. He likewise was to have written me but did not do so. I therefore wrote to the Prime Minister as follows:

9 p.m.

RENFREW, ONT., August, 3, 1920.

Dear Mr. Meighen,—Following our phone conversation of 27th. inst. regarding the appointment of returning officer in South Renfrew, for the Prohibition Referendum; I have been expecting a communication from you as a result of the investigation you promised me you would make at that time, and considering that such has not been received up to the present date, I am taking the liberty of writing to remind you of your promise, and I sincerely trust, if not asking too much, you will take time to let me know the result of your investigation under that subject.

Yours truly,

In reply I received the following:

OTTAWA, ONT., August 5, 1920.

Dear Mr. Pedlow,—I duly received your letter of 3rd, August. I looked into the matter about which you telephoned me and found that Mr. Payne, Sir George Foster's Secretary, had written you already a full explanation and that really there were no facts, so far as I know, uncommunicated to you.

I am sure you understand there was no desire on anyone's part to make difficulty for you of any kind. Under the circumstances, I do not think you have just ground of complaint that your recommendation was not accepted.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

I replied to that as follows:

RENFREW, Ont., August 6th, 1920.

Dear Mr. Meighen,—It is not my desire to prolong this correspondence unnecessarily, but in acknowledging your esteemed favour of August 5th, in answer to mine of the 3rd, I desire you to understand that the information given you, "that Mr. Payne, Sir George Foster's secretary, had written me already a full explanation" of the subject under consideration is not correct.

On receiving Mr. Payne's letter of July 26 I phoned him, protesting against the change indicated, and he promised then to write me that evening fully on the subject, with particular reference as to whehter the appointment of John Brennan, of Arnprior, had been finally confirmed or not.

John Brennan, I understand, was named by the defeated candidate in South Renfrew in 1917.

Not hearing from him as promised, I called him up again at ten o'clock a.m. on Thursday, July 29th, and was told by whoever answered the phone that he had gone away on his holidays. I have heard nothing further from him since that date, so the information given to you in this instance is certainly not in accordance with the facts, and although it is only a trifling matter, still, I know you have been misinformed, and should know it.

I also wrote to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) on August 3rd, 1920, as follows:

Dear Sir,—On Tuesday, July 27th, I received a communication from your office in reply to my letter of July 17th, in which I named Albert Edwin Bradwin, of Arnprior, as a fit and proper person for the position of returning officer for the prohibition referendum for South Renfrew, and immediately on receipt of that communication in your absence I took up the subject matter with your private secretary, and he promised during the course of our phone conversation to make investigation regarding this appointment along the line of my suggestions and write me without fail that evening. So far I have not received the promised communication. I am therefore taking the matter up with you.

For your information I will recall briefly the position in which this matter is at the present time. On July 16th I received from your office a communication asking me to name a suitable person for the position of Returning Officer in South Renfrew for the prohibition referendum, and I replied to that request the following day, July 17th, naming a gentleman that I know would be entirely satisfactory to all parties concerned in this riding, and one entirely capable of filling the position satisfactorily. On July 27th I was informed that the letter of July 16th asking me to name a fit and proper person for the work was intended for Lt.-Col. Martin.

In view of this situation you can easily understand the unpleasant position I am placed in at the moment, for my choice has already been announced, and for that selection to be ignored, for reasons that are obvious, is neither fair to me, nor is it, I submit, good politics from the Government party point of view. I accepted the intimation in good faith and made the nomination in the same spirit, and for me to be told now practically that the elected candidate of this riding is not capable of making a selection of this kind is not an evidence of the claims made by the Government during the past three years, namely, that party patronage was completely done away with.

Lt.-Col. Martin, in my judgment, has no more right to name the officer for the above position than any man on the street. The fact that he is the defeated candidate in the election of 1917 should not, in view of the protestations of the Union Government then and since, entitle him to any say in a matter of this kind, and I sincerely trust you will not allow the nomination made by me in this instance to be overruled by the exigencies of party politics.

Eleven days later I received this communication from the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, dated August 14, 1920:

Dear Mr. Pedlow,—

Yours of August 3rd was handed to me by my secretary, on my return to Ottawa.

I should have considered it sooner but for a rather pressing engagement I have had with an old enemy, Mr. Lumbago, to wit, I thought one enemy enough at a time, and now come to you, more friendly and, I hope, by no means so relentless as the other.

The double notification was due to a mistake of my secretary in mailing the letter to you instead of to Lt-Col. Martin, as has been explained by him. In asking Lt.-Col. Martin, who had been a candidate for the riding and is a returned soldier, for the name of a suitable person to act as returning officer, the custom which has prevailed hitherto under all governments was followed. It is difficult, as you know, at once to get rid of old customs, even if they may be susceptible of improvement, though great progress has been made by the present Government in that direction.

I trust that no very great inconvenience will arise from the little misunderstanding that has taken place. Meanwhile you will have noticed that the referendum has been postponed. Anyway, I do not suppose that your nominee has taken any responsible steps consequent upon the sending in of his name. It is also to be remembered that though a nomination was asked for there was no implication that the name sent in would result in a final appointment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have occupied a considerable time in reading this extensive correspondence, but I think it is only right that it should be placed on Hansard, for it

is quite in keeping with the spirit that has prevailed in the discussion this afternoon on the resolution now before the House. This brings me to these conclusions. Why not quit this pretending and this humbug? Why not put into practice the spirit of the claims and protestations made by the Government on this subject? Why not give heed to the demands of the people who themselves are most interested,—the civil servants? Why not listen to the appeal of all right thinking people everywhere? Why not follow the example of the Mother of Parliaments as well as the example of the Government of the great Republic to the south of us and decide for all time to do away with this evil thing, this custom that is so unbusinesslike and so unfair?

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this resolution to pass without making a few observations upon it. I was very glad to see that the hon. and gallant member for Victoria, Ontario (Sir Sam Hughes) had so far regained his health as to be able to introduce his resolution this afternoon, and I hope his complete recovery will only be a matter of a short time. But, Sir, I cannot agree with the hon. member's resolution. In the campaign of 1917 one of the foremost planks in the platform of this Government—that is, if it was this Government then—was the complete abolition of the political patronage system. I remember very well hearing the late Hon. Arthur Sifton and also the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), both ministers at the time, state distinctly on a public platform in the city of Calgary that that was one of the planks of the Union Government and that they would put it into force. I believe they made an honest attempt to do so. I do not mean to say that the system as it is to-day is perfect, not by any means, but I do believe it is a step in the right direction, and I trust the Government will have sufficient determination to continue the present system and improve it from time to time.

I know for a fact that ever since it was learned that this resolution would be introduced, Civil Servants of the Federal Government have been profoundly affected; indeed, the matter has affected the peace of the homes of quite a few of our Civil Servants. To give this House an idea of how the Civil Service organizations view this matter, I wish to read the following resolution passed by the Civil Service Federation of Canada and endorsed by the Civil Service Association at Ottawa:

> We are emphatically opposed to patronage in any form. We regard the abolition of patronage as the most outstanding and beneficial reform in the history of the Canadian Civil Service, and we desire to express our gratitude to you for the enactment of the present Civil Service Act, which embodies the merit system, and in doing so, we voice the undoubted sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the Service.
>
> It has been the experience of the service in the past that under the patronage system influence predominates and worth counts for little. We are convinced that under the merit system, meritorious service will be rewarded and toadyism will disapper.

Then, Sir, here is another resolution from the Saskatchewan Customs Association:

> Be it resolved that the Saskatchewan Customs Association reaffirm its belief in the principles of the merit system, and the classification of the Civil Service, as at present administered and press for the continuance of the present system under the control of the Civil Service Commission and most strongly object to the return of the Civil Service to patronage.

One of the planks of the National Progressive party is "the complete abolition of the patronage system." My good friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who is opposed to the abolition of the patronage system, sets up a straw man so that he will have the pleasure of knocking him down. I submit that it is quite an easy matter for the Civil Service Commission to select a competent man to act as postmaster in a country district, no matter where it may be situated, because you can bring it right back to the people themselves. In many cases I have been applied to by persons who wanted the position of postmaster in a country district and it has been my practice—as I know it has been the practice of several members of this group—to write to the person who wanted the position suggesting that he have a petition circulated among the people who would get their mail from the office in question, and if they wanted him to be their postmaster surely he was the man who should be appointed. We have also post office inspectors all over the Dominion who are very well acquainted in every constituency. I am sure that every hon. member should do all in his power to prevent the restoration of the old political patronage system.

Now, we have two Civil Service organizations which are of great value in maintaining and increasing the efficiency of the Civil Service. I am speaking now of Federal Union No. 66. I wish to read the following short extract from a publication of that organization:

> Since its inception perhaps one of the most common criticisms made of Federal Union No.

66 has been that its policy was destructive—that it aimed at tearing down existing administrative machinery in the service yet proposed nothing constructive to take its place.

This criticism has always been without foundation. We have, it is true, pointed out, in no uncertain terms, the defects of the present system and the requisites for an efficient, contented and loyal Service.

Having covered this phase of our work we propose to make public in a series of memoranda our plans, as submitted, looking to the attainment of that efficiency, content, and loyalty We ask the service to study then dispassionately and without prejudice. We do not say they are perfect; we do not hesitate to say, however, that they are far in advance of any other effort so far made by Civil Service organizations.

It will be noted that our plans contain nothing revolutionary. We do not advocate placing the control of the Service in the hands of the rank and file of the Service. We ask that these have a voice but not the sole voice in the Civil Service administration. In short, we ask for Witley councils.

"Witley Council" is the name given to the Board of Hearing in the Old Country. I will explain very briefly the form of the Board of Hearing we have hear, which takes the place of the Witley Council. I quote again from this publication of Federal No. 66:

We consequently favour a certain amount of decentralization of control, from the Civil Service Commission back to the deputy ministers and branch heads in the departments, by whom certain features of Civil Service administration can be so much more effectively and promptly handled.

The Board of Hearing in connection with our Federal Civil Service is composed of a member of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Jamieson, who is chairman of the Board; two deputy ministers, and two civil servants representing the staff, or what we might call the rank and file. Federal Union No. 66 believes that the number of the representatives of the rank and file should be increased from two to perhaps six or seven. In any case they ask that the personnel of the Board of Hearing be changed or increased. Here is a further extract from a publication of Federal Union No. 66, dated March 14, page 3:

The Commission is suitable for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

That shows clearly that this Civil Service organization, Federal Union No. 66, is strongly of the opinion that the Civil Service Commission is a valuable organizaton for the making of appointments to the Civil Service. The article goes on:

It is as desirable now as it was when the Commission was first formed, that appointments to the Service and promotions within the service, should be made through the Commission. The merit system is the only logical system of selection of persons to fill vacant positions and this organization would strongly resent and protect against any attempt to foist the pernicious patronage evil again upon the public service of Canada. It can not be too strongly emphasized that only when appointments are made for merit can it be expected that the public business will be carried on expeditiously and efficiently. Before the adoption of the merit system the Civil Service was cursed too long with misfits and failures who gravitated into the Service by political "pull." The Associated Federal Employees who aim at increased efficiency and business-like methods, feel that a return of such conditions would be intolerable.

Hence we ask for Joint Councils, not to replace the Civil Service Commission, but to work in harmony with it; a sharp line of demarcation being drawn between its functions and those of the Councils. The Board of Hearing should, in our opinion, be abolished.

I wish to say just a word or two regarding the Printing Bureau. I made it my business to inquire at the fountain head of information regarding the conditions in the Printing Bureau because I had been told by a certain member of this House, who was at one time an employee in the Printing Bureau, that conditions in that institution were far from satisfactory and that when he went into the Printing Bureau, it was through political pull that he got in, and when he got in, the foreman of the Printing Bureau received his card and told him: "Well, I have no work for you; in fact, I have no room for you; we are overcrowded here now; but hang around, perhaps there will be work for you after a while." This young man hung around until he was tired hanging around, and then he left in disgust because he found that he was not earning his money. Hon. members know very well that the cause of such a condition in the Printing Bureau was the old political patronage system; that under that obsolete system men were appointed who had no right to be there at all, men who knew nothing whatever about the printing business.

What was the condition of our Printing Bureau when the strike was on in Ottawa a few years ago? Again I got information from the fountain head source that there were in that Printing Bureau men who knew nothing whatever about the printing business and that moreover men were in there who were supposed to be proof-readers, who were blind, and who could not read print, even of the largest size. If the patronage system should be re-established—and I hope it will not be—what condition will our Civil Service be in? It will amount to this, that no man of any ability will go into the Civil Ser-

vice; no man will want to work for the Government if he knows that the merit system is not in force. It will be needless for him to take a position in the Civil Service and try to rise to any higher position, because it will be political pull and not the merit of the man that will govern the conditions of his employment.

Reference has been made to the Old Country system of Civil Service. I have lived in the Old Country, and I know a little about how smoothly the Civil Service runs there. The Civil Service there knows not of a change of government. Everything goes along smoothly just the same as if no change of government had taken place. But what were the conditions in Canada a few years ago, for instance, away back in the early eighties? I have seen Tories discharged to make room for Grits and Grits discharged to make room for Tories in Civil Service offices out in the West. Such a condition should not prevail, and it certainly will prevail if we go back to the old patronage system, but I again express the hope that this Government will see to it that we do not go back.

As regards the present system, I must say, in my constituency I have no fault to find with the appointments. I was asked in certain cases if certain men were qualified, and if I considered they were, I certainly said so. It is true, I did not have the honour of recommending the census commissioner, but the appointment that has been made is, in my opinion, quite satisfactory. I again express the hope that if this resolution comes to a vote it will be voted down. I trust this Government will see to it that it is their duty to continue in force the Civil Service system that we have now.

Brig. Gen. GRIESBACH (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this question is one which involves efficiency in public business and the public good, and from that point of view, I cannot support the resolution now before the House, although I am bound to say that I do not entirely agree with certain aspects of the present situation. As regards the Outside Service, I feel the same difficulty that other hon. gentlemen have found in understanding how it is possible for the Civil Service Commission to make a proper selection at great distances from Ottawa and if, as a matter of fact, they consult with the local personages, then I think it is due to the members of the House and the public generally that we should know who those personages are and their standing in the community. As regards the Inside Civil Service, I think good work is being done. By far the largest part of the Civil Service is agreed that the system prevailing under the Commission is infinitely better than the patronage system. If they think well of the present system—and they do—then we should hope for better things and give to the commission a reasonable opportunity to carry on and work out their problems to a successful conclusion.

I cannot agree with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), who spoke in this House to-day and who took the view that patronage has not been in fact abolished, but that the patronage formerly exercised by members has been passed on to others who now exercise the same patronage. I cannot agree with that for this reason. I define patronage, as we understand it in this connection, as the power of appointment exercised by political personages with a view to political results. People cannot be born into the Civil Service; some persons must make appointments. If those persons, not being political personages, having no political results in view, and being honest and efficient themselves, proceed in a proper manner in making those appointments, nothing better can be done, and that particular method is away ahead of the system which formerly prevailed.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer. In the old days, under the old system of patronage, upon a change of Government taking place, appointments were confined to the dominant party. Members of the Civil Service previously appointed kept quiet, attended to their work, did their best; members recently appointed were at liberty to go to their member of Parliament or to the defeated candidate with their grievances and, generally speaking, the Civil Service was satisfied with its job and loyal to the Government, and loyal to the State. Under the commission system of Government a new feature has been introduced, I regret to say, by a small number of civil servants. As I said a moment ago, for the most part, civil servants are perfectly satisfied with what is attempted to be done and they hope for better things in the future; but a small body of civil servants are dissatisfied, and they have introduced a new feature into the Civil Service of this country.

That feature is this: They have introduced the sentiment which is said to exist as between capital and labour. They have introduced that idea which is fathered by

the I.W.W. and the O.B.U., that there exists a continual state of warfare between employer and employee, which can only be cured by constant agitation and perhaps, ultimately, by direct action. That particular body is confined to Ottawa and is known as Local Union No. 66. The members of this House have received its publications, and are in a position to form their own conclusions as to what sort of men these are. Now we do not want that spirit in the Civil Service of Canada. We want a service that will be loyal to the state, a service that will be the backbone of our state. We do not want our Civil Service to acquire the attitude I have mentioned, which is deplored everywhere, and is particularly to be deplored between the state and its employees. I have just this to say in conclusion. I would like to see the Government take power to itself at an early date to put itself in a position to dismiss the whole lot of that Union, and to fill their places from the ranks of returned men, of whom there are thousands in this country fitted for this particular kind of employment, and extremely anxious to get it.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): I have but few remarks to make, Mr. Speaker, and were it not for my desire to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) who has introduced this resolution, I should perhaps not take part in this debate at all. I wish to congratulate him upon having brought this matter up, although I am not in a position to vote for his resolution as drawn. I am sure that we are all sorry to observe some impairment of the old-time physical strength of the good man he has always shown himself to be, but we still appreciate his many fine qualities of heart and mind, and hope that his vigour will be restored, and that he will be spared for many years to this Parliament and to his thousands of friends in this country. I cannot vote for the resolution as drawn because it affects both the Inside and the Outside Service, and there is not the least question that it is only through such a body as the Civil Service Commission that we shall be able to command ultimately in this country a Civil Service that will have the respect of the people of Canada, and will give that efficient service which the people have a right to expect. I do not mean to depreciate in any way what the Civil Service Commission have already done, for I believe that when they were appointed they found appointees in the service of both political parties. I believe the Commission are doing their best, and the only serious criticism that can be made of them is their bringing in foreigners to reclassify the Civil Service instead of having the work done by Canadians. Both the Civil Service Commission and the Government have accepted the responsibility for engaging these men. I think it is to be regretted, particularly at a time when the members of the Government one after another have been telling this Parliament that we have reached the status of a great independent nation, able to take part in world affairs, that in a matter of purely domestic concern and of no great significance they have themselves gone outside of Canada to find men able to make a classification of the Civil Service of a country with a population of eight millions. I believe that the Civil Service Commission is necessary in connection with the Inside Service, because candidates for appointments can best have their education and efficiency tested by examinations. Even after they have passed an examination and a certificate has been issued as to their qualifications, the new appointees have to serve under a deputy or branch chief who, if he finds they are not qualified in other ways, that they lack tact, for instance, judgment or integrity, may have them censured or transferred to an inferior position in some other department. I do not consider the Outside Service is in the same position. For many positions in the Outside Service a slight education may be sufficient. What is required in that service more particularly is tact and judgment, integrity, and devotion to duty. While I do not wish to attach any blame to the members of the Civil Service Commission I must say that during the last year or two they have made appointments for which had I been responsible, I would not have dared to put my foot in my constituency again. It is only recently we have been witnesses to cases of neglect of duty and defalcations which have shocked society. Men appointed by the commission a few months ago have had to be dismissed and replaced by new appointees, under exactly the same conditions, and with no more knowledge of the tact, devotion to duty, and integrity required than those who preceded them.

My hon. friend the ex-Postmaster-General (Mr. Lemieux) emphasized this afternoon that we the representatives of the people should be given all possible time and opportunity for the study of great nation-

al questions. I thoroughly agree with him. I have rejoiced on many occasions during the last few years since I have been on this side of the House, that I have lost the opportunity of exercising patronage in my county. I have had more leisure than heretofore. When I was able to exercise patronage my house was invaded at 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning and up till 11 o'clock at night; and when I travelled through my county I would be stopped for half a day to listen to the complaints of those in the service or the aspirations of those desiring to get in. It has been a different life for me during the last few years. To show what little effect patronage has on winning elections I may say that when I had the responsibility of making appointments for my county I was always returned by majorities running from 1,000 to 1,500, but when my opponents enjoyed the exercise of patronage, as was their right until the last election, they were reduced to the impossibility of keeping a candidate in the field and I was elected by acclamation.

It is only by raising the standard of the Outside Service, as well as of the Inside, so that it may command the respect of the people of Canada that we shall discharge our duty fully by the electorate. In the light of my experience of public affairs in this country, and particularly in my own county, I am forced to the conclusion that it is in the best interests of the public service of Canada that all appointments, to the Outside Service at least, should again be made on the recommendation of the members elected to Parliament by the people. I do not, in this statement, anticipate any personal advantage; I advocate the reversion to the control of members of Parliament of appointments to the Outside Service purely and simply because I believe that it is the only judicious method that can be followed. Members of the Civil Service Commission, sitting in their offices in Ottawa, cannot possibly have the personal and local knowledge of applicants and conditions in any county which the member representing that county would possess.

Take the position of Collector of Customs, which involves the handling of large funds that might possibly hold out a serious temptation to any young man. The member in the constituency where a vacancy for such a position occurred, would be in a position to recommend the appointment of a thoroughly competent, responsible, and trustworthy man. He is personally acquainted with numerous men fitted in every way for such a post, and I see no reason why his recommendation should not be accepted. The same thing applies to such a position as that of Fisheries Officer. I think we should adopt the method followed for many years in France, where the member for an electoral division is charged with the responsibility of making such appointments as shall be in the interest of the whole constituency irrespective of political considerations. In this Parliament we have now three or four different classes of citizens represented. Besides Liberals and Conservatives, we have representatives of Labour and Agriculture, and what I contend, Mr. Speaker, is that every member of Parliament should have the responsibility—because it is, or ought to be essentially, a matter of responsibility and not of privilege—of recommending appointments. It does not matter whether a man belongs to one party or another, whether he is a supporter of the Government in power or a member of the Opposition. The fact that he has been returned to Parliament by a majority of his constituents is evidence that he enjoys their confidence and is entitled to express their views; and this is one of the most important matters on which they could express any desire. I have no very great desire to return to the old conditions, and certainly I have no desire to do so because of any personal considerations. But when the time comes, I shall be quite willing to shoulder my share of responsibility in the recommending of appointments, as I did for years in the past.

The Government of to-day claims to have abolished patronage; but in view of events which have been referred to in this debate, I do not think the people place any credence in this profession, for, since coming into power, the Government have thrown out practically every Liberal officer in the country and have brought in all their own friends. Customs officers, postmasters, and other officials, appointed under the Liberal regime, have been cast aside and their places filled by candidates approved of by the party authorities. While there may be a show of genuineness about the appointments made by the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the supporters of the Government can allay the suspicion of the people in regard to what must strike them as a most remarkable accident, that appointees selected by the commission have so frequently been Conservatives. In my county I have recommended hundreds of men whom I know personally—for I have

been travelling throughout that county for the last thirty years and more, and know every child that has been born there during that period, having followed the career of every one with paternal interest—and I am still to see one recommendation I have made accepted. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of members of Parliament to make appointments, and their sense of responsibility to the people will influence them in making proper appointments; for they know that if their judgment is faulty, they will suffer in consequence. I agree with the remarks that have been made by many of the speakers who have preceded me, and I trust that the suggestion I have offered will appeal to the Government.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): While I do not propose to vote for the resolution before the House, I believe that if the abuses under the present system were tabulated they would lead one to the conclusion that they form the general rule and not the exception in the administration of affairs by the Civil Service Commission as it is constituted to-day. It appears to me that, in effect, patronage has been taken from the hands of the individual member and placed in the hands of deputy ministers, post office inspectors, post masters, and various menial employees of the Dominion Government. It is unfortunate that all members are not prepared to lay their complaints before the House and establish the fact that this substitution in the bestowal of patronage has really been made. The crux of the Civil Service Act lies in section 45. If there is any merit at all in the Act, it is to be found particularly in that section. Promotion, and promotion upon merit, is the basis of the Civil Service Act. Otherwise members might as well go back to the old system, and appoint those whom they thought best regardless of whether or not there might be a better person in the field. Section 45 of the Act says:

Promotions

(1) Promotion is a change from one class to another class with a higher maximum compensation, and vacancies shall be filled, as far as is consistent with the best interests of the civil service, by promotion.

(2) Promotion shall be made for merit by the Commission upon such examination as the Commission may by regulation prescribe. The Commission may by such regulation restrict the competition at such examinations to employees or to employees of a certain class or classes of a specified seniority, and may prescribe what marks may be obtained by such employees for efficiency and seniority. Such marks shall not, however, exceed one-half of the total marks that can be obtained at the examination.

Now, Sir, I have a case in point which I brought to the attention of the House last session and which in set out at page 4,518 and following pages of Hansard. I thought when I brought this matter before the House last session, that the undertaking given to me by the Minister in charge of this Act would have led the Civil Service Commission to remedy the injury which had been done us in the province of Alberta in this particular instance, but we are yet waiting any redress. In that particular case three men made application for the position of assistant Postmaster in the city of Edmonton. The three men were Clendenning, Thompson and Cryderman. Notwithstanding the fact that these three men had made application in writing to the Civil Service Commission, notwithstanding the fact that they were supposed to pass an examination and to receive marks in competition with each other, the Superintendent, Mr. Ross, the Deputy Postmaster General, and the members of the Civil Service Commission arranged it among themselves so that a man by the name of Rutledge, of Winnipeg, would be transferred to the position of Assistant Postmaster in Edmonton and the men in that city had the satisfaction merely of receiving a letter from the Civil Service Commission that the appointment had been made. Now there is a distinct breach of the Civil Service Act in that instance, and that is not the only case which I have tabulated, but as to which I shall not bother the House. If this was done over the Dominion of Canada, as I have reason to believe that it is to a fair extent, then the usefulness of the Civil Service Commission has ceased.

On the left of the Speaker a number of jocular references have been made to the appointment of the census commissioners. Well, perhaps that is not entirely as it should have been; but the complaint that they make in that respect is the complaint that I make in another respect. Where inspectors of post offices, for instance, who belong to the political persuasion to which my hon. friends opposite adhere, go about the country and appoint, whether things are equal or not, men of their political persuasion, then I say that they are also violating the principles of the Civil Service Act in that they are exercising a patronage that they ought not to exercise because they are really taking it out of my own hands to make our own appointments and making appointments of people of their own political persuasion. If that condition of things

exists, I say, Sir, that I feel quite as capable so long as I represent East Edmonton, of making the appointments myself. I think it is well that there should be some appointments made such as I have in my mind, and for this reason. Up at Lake LaBiche, in Alberta, the appointee is of the Liberal persuasion, and he is active at the present time in making accusations —both against this Government and against myself—sweeping accusations that cannot be substantiated. I am perfectly willing that he should keep on doing that because it will be easier for me to destroy him and his friends when I get started.

I was in favour of the abolition of patronage in 1917, I am in favour of the abolition of patronage now; but I was not in favour of the transfer of patronage from members to deputy heads, and other officials in 1917; neither am I at the present time. I submit that while I cannot vote for the resolution before the House when it comes to a vote, it is urgent upon this Government to see that there is some remedy under this Act whereby patronage if not under the members of Parliament throughout Canada, that there will be a cessation of patronage dispensation within the public departments whether it is at Ottawa or elsewhere.

I wish to call attention to another point before I resume my seat, and it is in anticipation of an argument which may be made against me—that if appointments are made of politicians who use their positions for political purposes it is possible to remove them under section 32 of the Civil Service Act. That section which is headed "Political Partisanship" and reads as follows:

> No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with any such election, or contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for any party funds,

You will see from what I have read that there is only one condition under which a remedy can be given to a member who feels that he is aggrieved by a person who is a partisan, and it is that this person must be a partisan during election time. So that the party complained of has five years or four years, as the case may be, during which he can carry on political propaganda against the employer, and the member has no remedy unless the offender continues that attitude during the time there is an election. I submit there should be some remedy in this respect also. I have no objection to any man having his political opinions; this is a free country and he should have the liberty to exercise those opinions as he sees fit. But I also believe that there should be some recognition of the respective positions of employer and employee; and it is undignified, if not disloyal for a person to accept a position from the employer and then contrive all he can against him. If that is true in the case of the particular individual it is also true of the state. I submit, therefore, that the state should be in a position to see that the employees who do not behave themselves and who do not care to serve loyally, at all times and not merely when there is an election, shall be dismissed from the service.

10 p.m.

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend participating in this debate, but I notice a document here containing the names of the census commissioners for the various counties throughout the province of Quebec, and I find that the Tories of the county of Pontiac have been slighted by the present Government. The address of the first commissioner for the county of Pontiac is given here as , 71 Spadina Ave., Ottawa. Now, Sir, the Tories are a bad lot anywhere, but I do not believe that they are any worse in Pontiac county than they are in Carleton county, and I think this appointment, since it was to be a Tory party appointment, should have been made from the county of Pontiac and not from the city of Ottawa.

I was asked by the Chief Commissioner of the Census for suggestions as to taking the census in the county of Pontiac which is one of the largest in the Dominion. I advised that he should have three commissioners for the three main divisions of the county. As I pointed out in a previous debate, I am as a rule careful not to make suggestions to this Government, because the best suggestion in the world would be so badly managed by them that it would have been better never to have made it. Apparently the Government followed my advice to some extent; at any rate, they appointed three commissioners. With two of them I have no quarrel, for they are from the county of Pontiac. But why the third appointee should be a man residing in the city of Ottawa is beyond my reasoning powers and is, I think, incapable of

explanation by the Government. The older section of the constituency commences within thirty-five miles of the city of Ottawa, and for that district they have appointed Mr. Barry at Campbell's Bay. The second district, the Temiskaming, is about 300 miles from the main or older portion of the constituency, and apparently there is no person appointed there. The third is known as the Abitibi district, and there the Government have appointed Mr. Lucien Ladouceur of Amos, Que. When I was indiscreet enough to suggest a third commissioner I suppose they thought they had better have a good Tory friend who had been assisting them here, so they appointed a man from Ottawa. But they have not taken care of the Temiskaming or Ville Marie district by any one of these appointments, and it will cost the Government more to have either of these commissioners go to that district than to appoint a local man.

I suppose this debate will serve the purpose of leading some people in the country to believe that patronage has been abolished, for I do not know any other good Government purpose that it could serve. Of course, it will have no effect upon me because, since I became a member of this House, I have failed to see that political patronage has been abolished in any appointments that were of a nature to be useful to the party in power. Why, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) this afternoon in answering some criticisms from this side of the House treated the good faith of the Government in this matter as more or less of a joke. Apparently he thought it was quite a joke that any person should take the contention seriously that the Government were living up to their promises of 1917. He may think the Government is more or less of a joke, Mr. Speaker, but the great bulk of the people of this country do not; they consider the Government is a tragedy.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I understand this resolution is to be withdrawn.

Mr. COPP: Where did you get that from?

Mr. PROULX: My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said at the beginning of his speech that we would have more details of the subject matter of the resolution later on; and while my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in stating that we had had a few years' experience of this system and found that it did not work too well in some respects, rather implied that there might be some amendments made to the Civil Service Act; and taking into consideration also the fact that there was a ministerial caucus this morning, I infer that the matter must have been discussed there, and some promises must have been made by the ministers to their supporters that amendments would be made to the Civil Service Act this session. So I presume this resolution is going to be withdrawn.

In case it is not withdrawn, I wish to say that I do not intend to support the resolution. I believe that when Parliament some years ago applied the Civil Service Act to the Inside Service it was good legislation, and I believe the Act has worked very well in that respect. Mistakes may have been made, but ministers and deputy ministers also make mistakes. The Civil Service Commission, I believe, is trying to apply the Act to the best advantage. With regard to the Outside Service, I am of the opinion of my hon. friends, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), that for positions such as postmasterships in the large cities and towns the Civil Service Commission is the best body to hold competitive examinations and make the proper appointments; in other words, I believe that those positions should be filled on merit rather than as the result of political influence. With regard to the appointment of postmasters and other local officials in rural districts I have no fault to find with the previous practice. When my friends were in power I exercised the patronage in my constituency, I never shirked the responsibility, and I do not think I ever recommended a wrong appointment; anyway, my people never reproached me. I did not always please those who applied for appointment, I had to make a choice from among those I considered best fitted to fill the vacancy, just as the Civil Service Commission have to do now. I think the same applies in all other constituencies. Members of Parliament have a certain standing in their constituencies, and I think they can be trusted to make proper recommendations. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was very generous to-night, more generous than I have known him in the past, he being ready, he said, to concede to us the privilege of making recommendations. Well, I am not going to ask that privilege from this Government; but if they apply to me I will exercise the responsibility of re-

commending fit and proper persons for any appointments in my constituency.

When I was asked by the Dominion Statistician last fall to make recommendations with regard to the district for the taking of the census, I was not like my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow), I did not expect the Government would be so generous as to ask me to recommend any persons as census commissioners or enumerators, so I never volunteered any recommendations. I may say that from applications I have received I must assume that my electors, like the electors of my hon. friend from South Renfrew and of other hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day, have been deceived into imagining that patronage had been abolished and that those census appointments were open to all electors, irrespective of party affiliations. I may say that I received quite a few applications, which I forwarded to the Dominion Statistician. I expected that he would transmit them to the County Commissioner, and I know that if the applicants were appointed, they would be able to do the work properly. But I am not too sure that they will be appointed; I can see by what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said this afternoon that the appointments for the taking of the census are going to be political appointments. It would seem that this is about the only consolation left to Government supporters. They are not going to stay in power very long, and it must be a consolation to them to get a few of their friends appointed in connection with the taking of the census. I do not begrudge them the consolation; I think they are justly entitled to it. If they can make a few friends out of it and thereby save themselves from defeat at the next election, they are welcome to it, but I do not think that they will make enough friends to enable them to bring about that result.

I do not want to prolong the debate, Mr. Speaker. I do not approve of the resolution as drafted because it includes both the Inside and the Outside Service, and I want the Inside Service to remain under the Civil Service Commission. I think it would be a retrograde step to take the Inside Service away from the Civil Service Commission. If the resolution was amended in such a way as to leave the Inside Service with the Civil Service Commission, as well as all appointments to positions in the different cities—in post offices and customs offices—giving only the local appointments to members or to defeated candidates, then I would be disposed to support the resolution. As I say, I am not disposed to support it as at present drafted.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): Mr. Speaker, the discussion on the resolution before the House has disclosed some misunderstanding of the situation. Apparently my hon. friends on both sides of the House have during the last two or three years taken seriously the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and his confreres in the Cabinet when they were talking of the abolition of patronage. Those who have known the right hon. gentleman as long as I have must realize, however, his ability to make a most eloquent speech, to talk idealism, to pour forth platitudes—but when it comes down to doing things he is still imbued with the old doctrine of the dyed-in-the-wool Tory: "To the victors belong the spoils." In common with his confreres, he says: We are living under conditions of patronage just as we have done all the years that have passed.

Now, I am not deceived, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this matter. I had no confidence in the statement of the Government that patronage would be abolished; therefore I am not disappointed. When my friend, Mr. Coates, wrote to me, as he did to other members of Parliament, asking for information with regard to the areas that were being established in my constituency, for the purpose of collecting Census statistics I replied furnishing him with the information, but I did not, as other hon. members did, waste a moment of time in offering any suggestions or making any recommendations with regard to the appointment of census enumerators or any person else who might be employed in connection with the taking of the census in my constituency. I knew that such suggestions or recommendations would not be acted upon; they had never done so in the past. In spite of the protestations made by hon. gentlemen opposite, they had no idea that any such recommendations would be received or acted upon, they are not deceiving me or deceiving the country in regard to the matter.

As to the suggestion that political patronage in Canada has been abolished, why, Mr. Speaker, it is more rampant now than it ever was. Our friends opposite are using the Civil Service Commission, appointed by themselves to find jobs for some of their own political friends, and they are using that Commission as a buffer between themselves

and the people. That is all the Civil Service Commission was ever intended to be; that is all it has ever been used for. It is merely talking nonsense for hon. gentlemen to speak at length about political patronage being abolished; the people of this country know better. They know it, Sir, because they have had the experience and are having the experience every day and every hour. Down in my constituency I have adopted a new arrangement in regard to patronage. By some means or other, my friends opposite have caused unsuspecting people in some localities to believe that patronage has been abolished. They come to me and write to me asking that I recommend them for some positions in the service of the country. Well, Sir, for some time they continued coming to me, and I would tell them: If you want this job do not take a recommendation from me; that would absolutely put you out of business. So I have adopted another course. When a man comes to me who I do not wish to get a job I recommend him and he is sure of being turned down by the powers that be; the more and stronger reasons I have for keeping that man from getting a job, the stronger I make my recommendation, and the more certain I am that he will not get the job. If I had a friend whom I would like to get a job and there is practically no possibility of his getting it, I write a letter to some of my friends who will go to the powers that be and tell them that this man should not have the job because he is rather inclined to be tory—and sometimes he gets a job in that way. In fact, that is the only way that I can work patronage in my own constituency under the present Government.

I am inclined to accept the statement of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) who has told us frequently in this House—and he told us emphatically this afternoon—that policical patronage has not been abolished; that it was being handed over to a few individuals who make the appointments to the public service. My hon. friend is either right or wrong. If he is wrong, he is intentionally taking the stand that he does, for he knows. He has been a member of parliament for some years; he lives in Ottawa, where he is in touch with thousands of Civil Service employees; he knows the situation. If his statement is true, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace that the Government should stand up and talk about political patronage being abolished and thus try to decive the people. It is a quarrel between my hon. friends of the Government and the hon. member from Ottawa, their loyal supporter; one is right and the other is wrong. With the little knowledge that I have I am rather inclined to believe that my hon. friend from Ottawa is right and that my hon. friends of the Government are still trying to deceive the people in regard to this patronage question.

When the Minister of Trade and Commerce would make his solemn protestations, his eloquent appeals that we should drop party politics, hon. gentlemen on this side would say to me: "Why, how he is mellowing with years." They did not understand the hon. gentleman. They did not understand him then, and they do not understand him now. He can make eloquent pleadings in regard to the situation, but that is what he did as long ago as I can remember him in the province of New Brunswick; what he has done during all his public life he is doing now. Why, Sir, he admitted to-day that we are going back to old line party politics in the selection of 24,000 census enumerators. He is going to follow along the same old lines in which he was brought up and in which, I am sure, he will pass to the other side, notwithstanding the pleasant speeches which he makes in regard to the matter—speeches which do not mean anything to the people of this country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Before the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) left, he asked me to state that he wished this motion withdrawn, his object having been accomplished by the discussion that has taken place this afternoon. I therefore, wish to move that the motion be withdrawn. I understand that he has made the same statement to Your Honour.

Mr. McKENZIE: Might I be permitted to say a word?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, I was standing up when the hon. gentleman asked that the motion be withdrawn, and in that case I think I should be permitted to speak.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I thought no other members wished to speak. My motion is only made in case all are through.

Mr. DENIS: Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say; I do not want to delay the House. It appears to me that one point which should have been submitted to the Government has not been submitted. I

have in my hand a list of the census commissioners for the province of Quebec. As we all know there are in Quebec 65 constituencies, and in some constituencies, there is more than one commissioner, so that there are about seventy commissioners for the census of 1921 in that province. It has been argued that patronage does not exist any more, and that, therefore, these gentlemen who have been nominated as commissioners in Quebec should have been chosen from the people of both parties. If we take the last Federal election as representing the opinion of Quebec in regard to the Liberal or the Conservative party, we should come to the conclusion that the Liberal party is in the majority in that province. Therefore, if these nominations had been made on a non-partisan basis, the majority of the nominees should be Liberals. Are they Liberals or Conservatives? I have my opinion about that, but I shall not pronounce upon the subject. I should like hon. gentlemen on the other side to give the answer, and I am on the floor for that purpose of extending an invitation to them to do so. Out of about 70 nominees, are there 35 Liberals? Are ten of them Liberals? Are five of them Liberals? Are two of them Liberals? Is there one Liberal out of the 70 nominees? I should like to know.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there one righteous man?

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman really desire an answer to the question? I may say that we never concerned ourselves to inquire.

Mr. DENIS: Then it would surely be impossible that out of 70 nominations, not even one Liberal should be chosen. No one will believe that.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): As regards those appointments to which the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Dennis) has referred, it is not at all possible that one single Liberal has been appointed. The possibility would be rather the other way. The incredible thing would have happened if the Government had appointed a Liberal where there was a possibility of doing anything else. In the last election of 1917, we were told that appointments would be at least fifty-fifty as the Government was supposed to be fifty-fifty. In my constituency of North Cape Breton and Victoria, there were about 60 or 65 officials, great or small, in connection with the election, and out of those 60 or 65 there were two Liberals. That possibly is the conception of hon. gentlemen opposite of fifty-fifty. They have such a lofty appreciation of their own crowd, that possibly that is the proportion in which they would regard them, although the value and merit would go the other way. The two that I got out of the 65 were got by mere accident. At a place called Big Baddeck, a gentleman by the name of John Cylie was appointed. A gentleman of splendid Irish extraction, who would not act for the Government in the election, and at the eleventh hour they had to take a Scotchman by the name of McInnis. In the other case, they appointed a man who had no learning at all, who could not write his name, but at the eleventh hour he took cold feet and thought he would not be equal to the occasion, and in that emergency they had to appoint his neighbour who was the nearest man who would do the job, as there was no time to look around for anybody else. Therefore, out of 65 where the proportion was to be fifty-fifty, there were only two Liberals and those two appointments were made by the law of necessity and accident, so that nobody is going to surprise me in any way by telling me that this Government, although promising to do these wonderful things and to abolish patronage, has thrown all that to the winds and followed the old-time custom.

In the present series of appointments I see that the same custom is being exactly followed. I do not profess to be able to tell who all the commissioners in Nova Scotia are, but I know the names and personnel of the men in my immediate neighbourhood. Good fellows they are in every way, but they are, of course, of the stripe which they were expected to be under the circumstances. With that, I find no fault, but I find fault with this. For the last four or five years, and particularly for the last three years, we have been promised that all appointments of this class should go to returned soldiers; that returned soldiers were to be appointed to every office for which such men could be found. I know the men who have been appointed in the counties of Victoria, Cape Breton and Richmond, but not one of them is a returned soldier, and I am sure the place is full of men who are returned soldiers just as capable of filling those offices as the men who were appointed. Why were those returned soldiers not appointed? Why did the Government not keep its word in that connection? Here is an army of 24,000

men who will be appointed throughout this country, and what guarantee have we that when the matter gets out of the hands of the Government, any better appointments, as far as returned soldiers are concerned, will be made than the Government have made themselves?

I believe it is true that when a commissioner is appointed in any particular area, he has the selection of his men. He has been appointed on Tory lines for Tory service, not at all because he has given any service to his country overseas. When he comes to make his selections, he will have to pick out and put in office men who are Tory heelers in the different wards, and the returned soldier will not "have even a look-in," as the slang phrase goes. I, therefore, protest against what I may call deception, or perhaps, worse—treachery in making promises to returned men that they should receive offices of this kind and then, when the opportunity has arisen, where 24,000 men are to be appointed, returned men—and there are plenty of them in the country to do the work—are entirely ignored.

It is said that the average pay of those enumerators will be about $100, although, perhaps, some of them will receive more than that and some less. If you put the average at $100 for each of the 24,000, youg have something like $2,400,000 to be expended merely in connection with the enumeration or filling out the schedules. That would be quite an item amongst returned men who are to-day unemployed in this country; but we have no assurance, no guarantee whatever, that from the Atlantic to the Pacific a single returned man will be employed. It should have been made a condition precedent that returned men should get these positions. That is one of the things that should have been stipulated before the making of those appointments was handed over to the census commissioners. I know the men who were appointed in the part of the country from which I come are well-to-do men who do not need those jobs. They are not poor. They are well-to-do merchants, farmers, or contractors. They have lots of money, and are able to get along without a job of this kind, while on the other hand there are lots of clever fellows who have lost a leg, or a hand, or an eye, at the war, to whom such a job would be a God send, but they are brushed aside as no goods, and the positions are given to men who from a financial standpoint do not need them at all. I think it is only proper, in case the matter may yet be remedied and these jobs be given to returned men, that I should bring this matter to the notice of the Government, and I do so in all sincerity so far as the returned soldiers are concerned, but I am afraid there will not be much sincerity in any answer I may receive.

As to the merits of this motion, the situation in the Civil Service is an old story to those of us who have been here for many years. I remember the former Prime Minister making a statement when leader of the Opposition that the trouble with the Civil Service was that it was overmanned and underpaid. That was the statement made by the hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden). But did things get better after the right hon. gentleman got charge of things in this country? What happened? For the first three years after the Government came into power, between 1911 and 1914, when the war broke out, 11,000 men, roughly speaking, were dismissed, turned out on the road to make room for others, and 25,000 were put in their places, just for the sake of patronage. That is what has crowded the offices and the departments to such an extent that something had to be done. The ministers themselves did not care to take the responsibility of putting these men out, the deputy ministers could not put them out, there was nobody to put them out, and so the Government had to get Arthur Young and Company and Griffenhagen from a foreign country, and send them sword in hand into these different departments to kill, slay, destroy, and kick out these people for whom the ministers had no use. The departments had become overloaded with these men by reason of promises and patronage, and when these foreigners came to put them out it cost this country, according to the statement made by the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), which I believe is correct, $139,666—just to relieve the congestion in the departments that had been brought about by the mis-management of hon. gentlemen opposite.

A couple of years ago, when this matter was brought up in the House, I tried to illustrate conditions in the Civil Service by telling a little story that someone told me about the conditions in the departments in Ottawa. A minister of the Crown promised a man a job. The man came up here looking for the job, but there was no job for him. He knocked about the minister's office for a few days, and at last, in despair, the minister gave him a note

to the deputy, "For God's sake do something with this fellow. I must get him out of my office and out of my sight. Put him somewhere." The deputy had to obey, and was perhaps willing to obey, the behests of his master. He told this fellow: "Here is a pile of blue books. Take them out of here and put them away back there. Then when you have done that, put them in that room over there, then you can bring them back here. Keep at it all the time." Well, the man started in to move these books around from one place to the other, and kept at it continually for a week or so. Then he came back to the deputy minister and said: "Mr. Brown, I am not going to stay here. I am going away. There is something the matter. There is a blooming Bolshevist or something in this office that follows me around wherever I go. If I go into this room he is after me. If I go into that room he follows me there, and when I come back here, he is here too." "Oh, don't be alarmed about that," said the deputy, "that is your assistant." Such was the condition of things. The man himself had nothing to do, but he was given a helper to assist him, and I suppose there was somebody else helping the helper. That is the condition the Civil Service has arrived at.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us with gusto and a great pounding of wood this afternoon that in one department he found 475 men who were actually doing nothing, so he turned them out. He had put these men in himself; Griffenhagen found out there was nothing for them to do, so the minister told Griffenhagen to decapitate them. The minister has gained glory in the country for putting them in and now he is looking for more glory for putting them out, and I suppose there will be more glory coming to the Government for putting these fellows in once more again. Out they go, and in they come, and so the merry-go-round will go for the short time ahead of this Government. That is the way things are being done in the Civil Service. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh as if it were not a serious matter. Do they not think that the people of this country are a serious, sane people? Do they not think that our people are a God-fearing, truth-telling people, and have a right to believe what solemn old gentlemen who are ministers of the Crown tell them? No, they seem to glory in being able to camouflage the people of this country, and think them foolish mortals if they believe for one moment that the Government are serious about anything they tell them.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

And no wonder they reach that conclusion when I find resolutions of this kind being passed in some parts of the country. Here is a resolution that was sent to me, to the effect that there was no patronage in this country, that the Government was keeping to its word, and that it would be a pity to disturb them in the magnificent way they were carrying out their promises in 1917:

> Whereas the Dominion Government in 1918 passed an Act entitled "The Civil Service Act of Canada", by which Act political patronage was abolished and all future appointments and promotions were to be made by merit, and
>
> Whereas we have ample proof that the said Act is operating independent of political leanings, service and merit being the main consideration in appointments and promotions,
>
> Therefore be it resolved that this association places itself on record as being unalterably opposed to any return to political patronage so far as the Civil Service of Canada is concerned, and that a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada, the members representing Nova Scotia in the House of Commons the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and to the press of Halifax.

That has come to me from the fair province of Nova Scotia, where there are good honest men living quietly in the land of the apple blossom, men who go to church regularly, say their prayers as they should, eat plenty of fish, and sleep soundly at night, and believe that there is yet such a thing in this world as honesty. Well, in the simplicity of their hearts, they sent in this resolution and requested me to back it up in the House. I have submitted it to the House, not because I believe its contents, but, Mr. Speaker, I have been here too long and have watched the manoeuvrings of hon. gentlemen opposite too closely to be deceived in any way as to what their intention is and the way in which they execute it. But I read the resolution to show how people can be deceived and how they are led to put confidence where it really is not merited.

If the Civil Service Act were carried out properly I believe that it would work well, so far, at all events, as the Inside Service is concerned, and possibly the only way in which that service can be efficiently managed is by means of the Civil Service Act. Of course, it works both ways. It is clumsy and impossible to expect the Civil Service Commission to make appointments in remote parts of the country, and, on the other hand, it would be impossible to ask myself or any other man who lives in the extreme East or the extreme West to make an appointment at Ottawa. For that reason I believe that the Civil Service Commission should be given full control of the

Inside Service, as was done by the Liberal government in 1908. But I do believe that as regards minor appointments and appointments that have to be made in country constituencies, they would more properly be attended to by members supporting the Government.

Some hon. gentleman has said that the patronage should be given to defeated candidates and members not supporting the Government. I do not believe that myself. I am a party man; I make no bones about that fact. I believe in the party system, and I think that a proper, honestly conducted party is one of the essentials of clean government in this country. I am in favour of party, not because of any profit that the system could bring to me or to my friends, but because it is indispensable to wholesome government. We have not found any better way of governing this country than by means of the party system. It is therefore absolutely essential that that system should exist, and if the patronage which any party has charge of while in power is given to its friends and the work is properly done, I have no complaint to make. But what I do object to is that there should be deception, that men should parade the country and come to my friends saying: "Vote for me, because we have abolished patronage; we are all alike; there is no difference between us;" whereas, in their hearts, they know that this is not so and that patronage will be given to their friends.

Most extraordinary things happen in my riding, where there is a large population and a great variety of government interests. Appointments are made now and again, and I have frequently tried to help out. On one occasion particularly, where there were two offices vacant, I suggested that one from each party should be appointed in view of the fact that patronage no longer existed. But, nothing of the kind was done. Every time the Government happened to light upon their own friends, nothing but a Tory, and a good Tory, was appointed. Will the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Finance, or some sage of the Government, tell me how it is that the prophetic vision of the Civil Service Commission has every time lit upon a Tory? Is the olfactory nerve of the chairman, and of those around him, developed to such a degree that, merely by existence in such a Tory atmosphere, they can at a distance of fifteen hundred or two thousand miles pick out a Tory from amongst other mortals? Yet, that is what is happening. So that it is mere camouflage and deception to say that these appointments are made as a result of observation, examinations, literary tests, etc., when these various devices always achieve the end of selecting a supporter of the Government. I would say to the Government at once that if they desire to fulfil their promise that patronage would be abolished they should immediately determine to be honest about these things and to make these appointments in such a way as shall leave no room for suspicion.

Now, before I sit down, I want to have a word or two with the Minister of Justice in regard to his rush to the defence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon. No doubt the artillery which was turned on the Minister of Trade and Commerce from the direction of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was pretty hot, and the Minister of Justice, finding that the defence of his right hon. friend who sat alongside him had been badly demolished, thought that it was really time to rush to his aid, heedless of the fact that possibly there was no call from that gentlemen's friends for him to espouse his cause. I do not know how it was, but my right hon. friend's mind drifted into Holy Writ. Now, we do not very often find him in that realm.

Mr. DOHERTY: Force of good example.

Mr. McKENZIE: His law is usually very good, although, I must say, sometimes rather prosy. However, he generally succeeds in reaching his objective; I must do him that justice. As a reward of good hearing, keen attention, patience and good staying powers, one is generally able to get one's money's worth when the right hon. minister is expounding law. But this afternoon he made a dreadful mistake in his incursion into foreign ground. At last he found himself among the prophets; he found himself with Saul and other characters he does not meet very often. I could not understand what he was driving at when he said: "The offence is about to come, but woe unto him through whom it cometh." That is a prophecy. It was uttered at a time when it was half prophecy and half preaching. But it never occurred to the right hon. gentlemen to reflect on the occasion that called forth that prophecy. It was made shortly before the great tragedy of nearly two thousand years ago. "The offence is about to come, but woe unto him through whom it

cometh." The right hon. gentlemen never thought of the two principal characters that were going to carry out the prophecy —two striking characters. One of them was Pontius Pilate, and the other was Judas Iscariot.

Mr. DOHERTY: May I ask which of my hon. friends, the hon. gentleman who now has the floor and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, is Pontius Pilate, and which is Judas Iscariot?

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no difficulty in replying to my right hon. friend. I believe myself that Pontius Pilate was a lawyer; I have no doubt about that. He was a lawyer in authority administering justice; so is my right hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. McKENZIE: And, if I mistake not, Judas Iscariot was commercially inclined, and in the political arrangements of those days he would be Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have only to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I would advise the Minister of Justice, to ponder more carefully over what the outcome of his Biblical quotations will be in the future.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): I have learned many things this evening. I have learned that we have spent the whole day for nothing, because this resolution is going to be withdrawn. Before it is withdrawn I have one or two observations to make. Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I do not care for patronage. In 1917 I was elected against two opponents. They received eighty votes between them; so I do not care whether they get the patronage or not. One thing that I do object to, is to have hon. gentlemen opposite declare that they are sincere in this matter. I would like them to demonstrate their sincerity. It is useless to seek to disguise matters; hon. gentlemen opposite are Tories. They go to bed Tories, and they wake up in the morning with another name, whether it be Arthur Young, Griffenhagen or something else. Mr. Speaker, you know me. You know that I am a Catholic. I profess no other religion. If I should say to you that I am a Catholic Protestant attending a Synagogue you would laugh at me, would you not? You would say that I was a fraud and you would be right. I leave the decision to you. You can find just as suitable a name to characterize hon. gentlemen opposite when they talk about their sincerity. As to the question of patronage and the making of appointments by the Civil Service Commission, I believe there should be a competitive system. I think it is proper that the Civil Service Commission should make appointments; but as regards this petty appointment and that petty appointment, even in the case of a man who is employed in watching the building of a wharf, that is all nonsense. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a little sincerity in this matter for it is costing the country a lot of money. It is all well enough to say that at the Printing Bureau we have saved $600,000, but when we come to the Auditor General's Report we find that there has been a large sum paid for printing done outside the Bureau.

I shall not detain the House any longer except to say that we ought to be a little more serious than to spend a whole day discussing a resolution of this kind and then have it withdrawn. I am perfectly satisfied that what has been said by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is perfectly correct, and it will be hard for hon. gentlemen opposite to go around the country now and protest their sincerity in the matter of patronage—that patronage that was supposed to be abolished and never was.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) who was unable to remain until the close of the debate intimated to me that he was quite satisfied with the discussion and was willing to have the resolution withdrawn. I now submit the question to the House as to whether the hon. gentlemen shall have leave to withdraw his resolution.

Resolution withdrawn.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at eleven p.m.

Monday, March 14, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT

Report of the work of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for the calendar year ended December 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 29, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Essex).

Bill No. 30, respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Devlin.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 25, respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Lang.

Bill No. 27, respecting the Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

Bill No. 28, to incorporate the Slave River Railway Company.—Mr. Tweedie.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INCOME AND BUSINESS PROFITS TAXES

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What has been the total cost of administering the Income Tax Act during each year of its operation?
2. What was the total cost of administering the Business Profits War Tax Act during each year of its operation?
3. How many persons are employed in connection with the administration of the Income Tax Act?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Exact information cannot be given in connection with the administration of the Income Tax Act and the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act separately as the administration of the two Acts is combined. In the year 1917, however, there was no income tax, and the figures given for that year show the cost of administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act to have been: salaries, $51,385.98; other expenses, $6,788.83. Total, $58,174.81.

Business Profits War Tax Act and Income War Tax Act.

Cost of Administration.

	Fiscal year 1918.	Fiscal year 1919.	Fiscal year 1920.
Salaries ..	$72,789.44	$343,015.67	$771,444.75
Printing and stationery	28,583.27	81,614.24	147,930.69
Advertising...	320.39	29,986.52	1,736.00
Postage	1,033.59	17,974.42	51,970.14
Other expenses.. ..	5,470.19	23,206.53	53,295.65
Total.. ..	$108,196.88	495,797.38	1,026,377.23

Accounts amounting to $25,160.63 were received after the books for 1920 were closed, therefore not included. Number employed; fiscal year, 1920: Inside Service, 239; Outside Service, 547; total, 786.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. When the Dominion Government entered into an agreement under date of November 9, 1916, with the province of New Brunswick to operate the St. John and Quebec Railway as part of the Canadian Government Railways, what guarantee did the Dominion Government give the province of New Brunswick that there would be an adequate train service maintained on the said St. John and Quebec Railway?
2. Does the Dominion Government know that the passenger service on the St. John and Quebec Railway between Fredericton and Centreville has recently been cut down to a tri-weekly service which is altogether inadequate to accommodate the public on that portion of the road?
3. Does the Dominion Government know that the city of Fredericton and the different towns between Fredericton and Centreville are very much incensed because of the above curtailment of train service?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. None.
2. Tri-weekly service is regarded by the management as sufficient to care for the traffic at present offering.
3. No. When curtailments in train service are contemplated, the management submit all proposed reductions to the Dominion Railway Board, who investigate, and no curtailment is made except with the approval of that board.

RAILWAY CERTIFICATES AND BONDS

Mr. DUFF:

In connection with the issuing of railway certificates and bonds, namely, the Canadian Northern Railway Company, May 1, 1920, $15,000,000, and December 1, 1920, $25,000,000; and Grand Trunk Railway, $25,000,000 and $12,000,000.

1. Were these certificates and bonds all issued through Messrs. Dillon, Read & Co., of New-York?
2. If so, what commission was paid the said firm for handling the $77,000,000 worth of certificates and bonds?
3. What trust company, bank or individual acted on behalf of the Canadian Government?
4. Was Mr. Miller Lash, of Toronto, in any way connected with the sale of any of these bonds or certificates?
5. If so, in what capacity did he act?
6. What remuneration was paid to Mr. Lash?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes.
2. No commission. The different issues were sold to Dillon, Read & Co., who in turn made public issues in New York.
3. A. J. Mitchell, Vice-president for Canadian Northern; Frank Scott, Vice-President, Grand Trunk and Graham A. Bell, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, representing the Grand Trunk and Minister of Finance, respectively.
4. The firm of Blake, Lash, Anglin and Cassells, of which Mr. Miller Lash is a member, acted in a legal capacity in connection with the preparation of trust deeds and other legal documents.

5. Acted as advisory counsel with the New York attorneys of the bankers, advising them in regard to the borrowing powers of the company, etc.

6. Fees of Blake, Anglin and Cassels for the C.N.R. issues are as follows: May 1, re equipment issue, $2,000; December 1, re bond issue, $2,500; for Grand Trunk, re bond issue, $5,000; re equipment issue, accounts not received.

INCOME TAX BY PROVINCES

Mr. KNOX:

1. How many people paid income tax in each province?

2. Out of this number how many in each province were farmers?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. On income realized during calender year—

Province	1917	1918
Prince Edward Island & Nova Scotia	1,958	5,375
New Brunswick	1,049	2,839
Quebec	11,363	19,567
Ontario	18,034	48,468
Manitoba	6,174	15,599
Saskatchewan	6.030	10,016
Alberta	5,711	8,379
British Columbia	3,187	11,813
Yukon	214	502
	53,730	122,558

2. On income realized during the calender year—

Province	1917	1918
Prince Edward Island & Nova Scotia	17	37
New Brunswick	5	29
Quebec	94	163
Ontario	488	2,042
Manitoba	1,853	4,352
Saskatchewan	3,387	4,377
Alberta	3,011	1,356
British Columbia	104	417
Yukon	3	1
	8,962	12,774

INCOMES OF $200,000 OR OVER

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer):

On how many incomes of $200,000 or over was income tax collected in last fiscal year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Fiscal year ended 31st March, 1920, 11 individuals.

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE

Mr. GOULD:

1. Were the tests made by the use of "gas" to combat the grasshopper plague in Saskatchewan in the year 1920, considered successful?

2. Will further tests be made this year by the same agency?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

3. What was the total expenditure incurred by the Dominion Government in 1920 for the purpose of Research along the line indicated in the foregoing questions?

4. Did the experts of the Government report any probability of a repetition during 1921 of the damage caused by grasshoppers in former years?

5. What information does the Government possess as to parasites killing grasshoppers?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Experiments with poisoned gas to destroy grasshoppers conducted by the Entomological Branch in Saskatchewan, were successful as regards the killing value of the gas upon the insects, but the cost of the treatment, however, was found to be excessive, being at least $20 per acre. Chlorine gas only was used.

2. It is hoped to conduct further experiments in 1921.

3. It is difficult to state definitely the actual cost incurred in the experiments with gas owing to the fact that such work was conducted at the same time as experiments with poisoned bait, etc. Approximately, however, the cost of gas experiments was about $300.

SASKATCHEWAN EXPORT LIQUOR HOUSES

Mr. GOULD:

1. How many licenses were granted during the years 1919 and 1920 respectively to export liquor houses in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to close up those export liquor houses?

3. If not, why not?

4. If the Government intends to close up those houses, when will this be done?

5. Will those houses all be closed at the same time?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. No licenses for export liquor warehouses were granted by the Dominion Government in the province of Saskatchewan in the years 1919 and 1920. The Department understands licenses for such warehouses were granted by provincial authority.

2, 3, 4, and 5. Answered by No. 1.

TAKING OVER OF GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

Mr. TOBIN:

At what date has the Government decided to take over the Grand Trunk Railway System of Canada?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Grand Trunk will be taken over as provided for by chapter 17 of 1919.

IMPORTS FROM GERMANY

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Is it true that in respect of certain goods shipped from Germany, the Customs officers

refuse to accept the invoices as they are forwarded and establish themselves a valuation upon said goods?

2. If so, has the Minister of Customs given instructions to that effect?

3. Does that apply to all German goods?

4. If not, what are those to which such rule applies?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. After careful scrutiny of invoices of goods imported into Canada from Germany, it has been found necessary for the proper protection of the revenue to instruct Collectors of Customs to appraise all such importations for duty purposes under the authority of section 43 of the Customs Act.

2. Yes.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS OFFICE

Mr. SAVARD:

1. What was the amount collected at the Customs office at Rimouski during the year 1920?

2. How many employees are there and what is their salary?

3. Is the said office directly responsible to Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. Customs Revenue, $32,305.28; Sales and Excise Taxes, $1,742.54. Total $34,-047.82.

2. Two—Omer Beaulieu, Collector of Customs, $1,440; J. A. Tremblay, Customs Examining Officer, $1,020.

3. Yes.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. CAHILL:

1. How many non-commissioned officers were there in the Dominion Police at the time of the amalgamation with the Mounted Police?

2. How many of said officers are there in "A" Division at the present time?

3. Is it true that all non-commissioned officers of the Dominion Police were placed junior on the seniority list to non-commissioned officers in the Mounted Police irrespective of years of service; and is it further true that a Dominion Police sergeant, with 6 years' service as such, was, upon amalgamation, placed junior to a non-commissioned officer of the Mounted Police with only a few months' service as such?

4. At the time of the amalgamation of the two forces were three inspectors of the Dominion Police reduced to sergeants? If so, why?

5. How many non-commissioned officers of the Mounted Police were promoted to inspectors at the time or subsequent to, the date of amalgamation?

Mr. PECK:

1. What was the amount paid by the Government in 1920 for travelling expenses for Government ministers, officials and all employees on the following railways:

(a) Intercolonial railway.

(b) Government railways excepting Intercolonial, but including all others.

(c) Canadian Pacific railway.

2. What was the mileage the various ministers travelled during 1920 on the railways as divided in question (1)?

3. What was the amount paid by the Government including all the departments in 1920 to the following telegraph companies:

(a) Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph?

(b) Canadian National Telegraph Companies, including Great North Western, Western Union and all those companies being taken over by the Government?

4. What telegraph companies are the various departments instructed to patronize?

5. What amount of troops were carried (in the demobilization) in years 1919, 1920, west of Winnipeg on the following railways:

(a) Canadian Pacific railway?

(b) Canadian National railway?

(c) Grand Trunk Pacific railway?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Brome?

2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?

3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?

4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?

5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Missisquoi?

2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?

3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?

4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?

5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Stanstead?

2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?

3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?

4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?

5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Compton?

2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?

3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?

4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?

5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Richmond and Wolfe?
2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?
3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?
4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?
5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the county of Shefford?
2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?
3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?
4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?
5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many returned soldiers have purchased farms through the Soldiers' Settlemen Board in the county of Drummond-Arthabaska?
2. What was the average price paid for the said farms?
3. Have any of the said farms been abandoned?
4. If so, what disposition has the Government made of the said farms?
5. Has any loss been incurred? If so, what has been the net loss to the Government in connection therewith?

Mr. SEGUIN.

1. Has the Militia Department been able to collect, up to date, any amounts overpaid on account of assigned pay, war service gratuity and separation allowance? If so, how much?
2. What amount, if any, is still outstanding?
3. What steps are taken by the Department of Militia to recover the amounts thus unduly paid?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What is the total number of pounds of butter exported outside of Canada, year by year, since 1910?
2. What is the value, year by year, of the exportation since 1910?
3. What is the total number of pounds of cheese exported outside of Canada, year by year, since 1910?
4. What is the value, year by year, of such exportation since 1910?
5. To what countries were our cheese and butter exported, year by year, during said years, specifying the amount and value of each?
6. What quantities of butter have been imported from various countries since 1910?
7. From what countries and what amount from each of them?
6. What quantities of butter have been imported from the various countries since 1910?
9. From what countries and what amount from each of them?
10. Under what brands or the names is our cheese and butter sold abroad?
11. What brands or names of butter and cheese do we import from abroad?

[Mr. Tobin.]

12. What is the quantity in pounds of margarine and its value in cash, or any other substitute to butter, manufactured in the country since 1916, year by year?
13. What is the quantity in pounds and value of such substitutes imported into Canada, year by year, since 1916?
14. Has the inobservance of the law regarding the process of manufacture and the sale of such substitutes, produced in Canada or purchased abroad, been the object of several actions?
15. If so, what is the number of same?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. FOURNIER:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, telegrams, reports, memoranda, tenders and contracts, having reference to or in connection with the repairs of the wharf situated at St. Michel, County of Bellechasse, Quebec, from October 1st, 1918, to date.

Mr. CAHILL:

For a copy of all official correspondence between the Government of Canada, or any member therof, and the Government of the Province of Manitoba, or any member thereof, respecting subsection 5, of clause 325 of the Consolidated Railway Act of Canada.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, petitions, recommendations, telegrams and documents referring to the appointment of a Postmaster at the Town of Inverness, Nova Scotia, in 1920 and 1921.

Mr. LEGER:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents, relative to the resignation of Mr. John Sheridan, Indian Superintendent for the North Shore district, in the Province of New Brunswick, in 1920. Also copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents relative to his re-appointment to the said position.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ST. FOY ROUND HOUSE

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): moved:

For a copy of all letters, reports exchanged between engineers and officers of the Canadian National Railways concerning the demolition of the round house at St. Foy, opposite the Quebec bridge, the removal from that place of a mechanical staff to a place called Charny on the other side of the St. Lawrence River; the prorposed demolition of the station on the main line of the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec bridge.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the mover indicates that the correspondence asked for passed between the directorate of the Canadian National Railways and some other person. It would not be in the possession of the Government.

Motion stands.

AMALGAMATION OF MAIL SUPERINTENDENT'S AND POSTAL INSPECTOR'S BRANCHES

Mr. J. A. ROBB (for Mr. Casgrain) moved:

For a copy of Order in Council passed the middle of this month for the purpose of amalgamating the mail superintendent's department with that of the postal inspector.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Stand.

Motion stands.

DEVELOPMENT OF CANADA'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Government should bring forward a policy having for its object the development of the natural resources of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, only the importance of the subject of the development of the natural resources of this country would make me presume upon the patience of the House even for a short time to take up this question again; but I am so impressed with its importance, and so impressed with the fact that it is the duty of the Government and of this House to work out some policy whereby we may bring about greater development of our natural resources, that I am taking the liberty of once again dealing with this subject.

If one may judge by the many speeches made throughout this country by members of the different political parties in which this question is refered to and by the kindly reception with which the remarks on this question are always received, one must come to the conclusion that it is at least a popular subject. It is worth while, however, to remember that a pound of action is worth a ton of oration, and unless some of these orations are implemented by action, it would be as well that the speeches had never been made. I feel sure that the party which works out some scheme whereby these natural resources will be developed will meet with the applause and approval of the people of this country. I admit it is not an easy question to work out but I believe that if the best of brains of this House are applied to it, it can be done.

Just to illustrate the possibilities in some parts of Canada where the land is looked upon as more or less barren, I am going to quote a statement made to me by Mr. Stefansson, in which he shows the meat producing possibilities of Canada's northern lands to be among the greatest in the world. His statement boiled down is as follows:

North Alaska and Northern Canada have the same climate, vegetation and general natural conditions. Therefore, they have they same possibilities.

Between 1892 and 1902, 1280 reindeer were imported into Alaska. Since 1892 they have butchered more than 100,000. They now have 200,000 living animals and by the middle of May they will have from 260,000 to 275,000.

The Department of Education at Washington was handling the experiment, as the reindeer were introduced to benefit the Eskimos. Last year the Government at Washington began to realize its importance as an industry, rather than philanthropy. They appropriated $25,000 to study the conditions. They came to Ottawa and took our greatest authority on parasitic diseases Dr. Hadwin, of the Department of Agriculture here; got an American Grazing Expert and with Dr. E. W. Nelson, Chief of the United States Biological Survey reported on the industry. They visited Alaska. Dr. Nelson has returned and has testified before the Agricultural Appropriation Committee of Congress that the increase of reindeer in the future will undoubtedly be more rapid than in the past, (due to bad handling) until all available land in Alaska is covered. He says there will be 5,000,000 reindeer in Alaska in 1935. This will allow for the butchering after 1935 of 1,250,000 per year, equivalent to about 3,000,000 carcases of sheep.

The export of reindeer meat began four years ago to Seatle; the sale the first year was a failure, but the last three years it has been very successful. In 1919 dressed carcasses sold at Nome, Alaska, for 22c per lb. In 1920 though beef was going down, reindeer has gone up to 24c per lb., f.o.b., steamer at Nome. In 1920 there were 1,600 carcases sold or 150 tons. Small sales are due to large local consumption and limited freezer capacity of steamers. They figure on shipping 500 tons in 1921.

Mr. Stefansson concludes that Northern Canada, having 2,000,000 square miles as against Alaska's 200,000 has tremendous possibilities for meat producing.

It might be well to point out that in 1919 there were forty-eight million sheep in the whole of the United States. The extract I have read has no particular reference to the question with which I am dealing, but I quote it because it shows the possibility for development of some of what are considered barren lands of this country.

Now to get back to the question of mineral development which I was discussing. Raw materials are the basic elements of commercial progress, and Canada, possessing raw materials in such vast abundance, has an immense advantage over those countries that are not so fortunately endowed. While some of our natural resources such as agriculture, are being developed to a great extent in this country, I consider that the iron, coal and oil resources are being neglected. If you will study the commercial history of any of the great commercial countries of the world,

such as Germany, France, the United States and Great Britain, you will find that their commercial development has been directly in proportion to their production of pig iron and steel. Cobden, the great free-trader said that lumber and iron were the daily bread of the manufacturer, and even Kipling has written a poem in which he expresses the view that iron is the important factor in the commercial progress of any nation. Kipling's words many hon. members will, no doubt, remember:

Gold is for the mistress,
Silver for the maid,
Copper for the craftsman,
Cunning at his trade;
"Good" said the Baron,
Sitting in his hall,
"But iron, cold iron,
Is master of them all."

Mr. Speaker, before the war, Germany and the United States were making great industrial progress, and you will realize the truth of this statement if you consult the statistics. The figures show that in Germany and the United States the basic industry that pushed forward the rate of their progress was their iron and steel development. Henri Hauser, a professor in the University of Dijon, France, speaking of Germany's commercial grip on the world, says that Germany's production of pig iron was, in 1880, 2,500,000 tons; 1905, 11,000,000 tons; 1912, 18,000,000 tons. The United States official statistics show that the production of pig iron in that country was as follows: 1870, 1,500,000 tons; 1880, 3,500,000 tons; 1912, 30,000,000 tons; and of steel: in 1870, 68,000 tons; in 1912, 31,000,000 tons.

The authorities claim that Canada possesses these three materials in immense quantities, but notwithstanding this fact we find that her importations of coal, iron and oil in 1919 were: Coal, hard and soft, $70,603,005; iron and steel, including products and machinery, $161,619,059; oil, mineral, fish and others, $45,767,021, or a total of $277,989,085. In 1920, we imported iron and steel amounting to $181,000,000. In 1895, we imported only $8,500,000. If we consider the value of the Canadian dollar in the United States during the past few years it is obvious that we have lost considerably on exchange through importation of such materials as these. Yet these are the very materials which we are supposed to possess in such vast quantities. In previous speeches I have quoted various authorities who state that Canada stands, if not among the very first of producing nations in the world, at least among those who are potentially so. It is claimed that Canada possesses, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore, yet of all the iron ore used in this country within the last two or three years only five per cent has been Canadian. In 1896, the Canadian ore used in the blast furnaces and steel plants of this country amounted to 67 per cent of all the ore used; in 1897, it was 49 per cent in 1898, 42 per cent; in 1916, 11 per cent; in the last three years it has been only four or five per cent. Iron ore shipped from Canadian mines in 1920 amounted to about 120,000 tons, the lowest in twenty years. The most of this came from Michipicoten district, but some from Sellwood, Ontario, (Moose Mountain, Ltd.), and from Frontenac County and Leeds County. And during the twelve months ending November, 1920, we imported nearly two million tons valued at $5,600,000—in addition to importing 54,000 tons of pig iron—three fifths from the United States and two-fifths from Newfoundland. It might be well to state that the deposits of Wabana, Newfoundland, are owned and worked by two Canadian companies, most of their output going to Canadian plants. Since opening these deposits they have shipped, up to and including 1919, about 19,000,000 tons: 13,000,000 to Nova Scotia, 2,000,000 to the United States, and 4,000,000 to Europe. From the lake Superior region of the United States, they shipped in 1919, 49,000,000 tons; in 1918, 63,000,000 tons. That region supplies from 80 to 85 per cent of the United States requirements, and it will be easily seen from these figures that the supply is within sight of exhaustion. It might be reasonable to ask: If Canada, on the authorities I have quoted, possesses hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore, why is it that more Canadian ore is not used in the blast furnaces and steel plants in this country? The reason usually given is that the ore found in Canada is not of a sufficiently high standard of quality, and is not so easily mined as the ore of the United States or Newfoundland. And that is partly true. But there are other reasons. For instance, there are vast plants in the United States which own their own railway and steamship lines and which are thus in a position to mine their ores at a vast advantage over Canadian production. The other day I read from a financial page of one of the Toronto dailies an article dealing with this question, and as it is brief I think I may be justified in quoting it:

One of the reasons for the neglect of Canadian iron ore probably lies in the fact that two of the largest Canadian steel companies, the Dominion and the Nova Scotia, derive their iron ore conveniently from their own immense deposits in Newfoundland, a short distance by water haul from the company's mills in eastern Nova Scotia. Another large Canadian mill, that of the Algoma Steel Corporation at Sault Ste. Marie, is handily located for the use of iron ore from the Mesaba in northern Michigan, south of lake Superior. Some of the lower Ontario steel plants are also located on deep water, more or less convenient to the United States ore. Complaint has been made for years, however, that most of the large deposits of iron ore in Ontario are either unsuited for steel making by themselves, or are of a refractory nature, rendering the smelting a difficult matter.

Recently I glanced through a book written by an authority on this question in which he described the ore used in various countries in Europe, and with the exception of Spanish ore and one or two others—Swedish, I think—practically all the ores produced in many of the countries of Europe (I am speaking as one who is not conversant with the technical side of this question, although I have seen many assays from Canada) appear to me to be much inferior in quality to Canadian ore. This article goes on to say, quoting Iron and Steel, Montreal:

"The continued decline in the production of native iron ore, which now stands at the lowest point in 20 years, is disturbing, but, despite much research and many proposals for state assistance of domestic iron ore production, the problem has received no solution on economic grounds. From a patriotic viewpoint, the situation is distinctly dangerous, but, so far, the attempts which have been made by Canadian steel companies to utilize domestic ores have received the scantest recognition from Federal or Provincial Governments. On strictly economic grounds, this attitude is probably an irreproachable one, but economic considerations are only one phase of national life, and if Canada were to frame its policies entirely on economic grounds it would logically lead to placing our seat of government in that country where we get our raw materials. However, it has not yet been demonstrated that cheapness is the main reason for our national existence. It is quite possible, also, that nothing is cheap that is bought abroad when it can be produced at home. Coal and iron are two things that are cheap at any price in times of national necessity, and it may well follow that they are dearly purchased at any price abroad if thereby our own resources are unutilized and their existence practically negatived."

Now, many authorities have stated, and I have been so informed personally by men who are recognized authorities on the subject, that after examination of the formations in the United States, and the formations in Canada they find them the same, with this exception—in the United States the formations have been worked and developed and thereby have been shown to have greater deposits of iron ore than our formations have as yet been shown to contain. But even supposing, Sir, we admit that the iron ore of the United States is of a much better quality than is the iron ore of Canada, must we also admit failure in our attempts to deal with our ores commercially? It has been stated to me that the ores with a thirty-three per cent iron content are workable on a paying basis; and I have seen assays of iron ore from various parts of Canada which show a much higher iron content. But these iron ores cannot be worked without assistance of some kind. Either aid must be given temporarily, or a through investigation made, by the federal authority, or some government, into this question, to demonstrate the commercial feasibility of working these ores.

If I might interject for a moment another matter, it is to say that there is one branch of the question which is worth discussion and it relates to the Mines Branch of this Department. Unfortunately, for many years the Mines Branch has been more or less of a side issue, and the estimates which have been voted for it are, to my mind altogether too small having in view the importance of the Branch. The salaries of some of the men employed by the Mines Branch, men who are graduates of Universities with the degree of Bachelor of Science, men who have worked there for years, are less in some cases than the stipend we are paying to the cook of the Parliamentary restaurant. That, Sir, is a startling statement to make, but it is the absolute truth. I think it is false economy which permits us to pay highly scientific men such low salaries that because of it we have lost nearly fifty per cent of our scientific men from the Mines Branch, they having gone to private corporations.

During the war we spent a vast sum upon what I might term destructive processes, and I believe that the people of this country would agree to the expenditure of a reasonable amount in investigating such questions as I am now discussing. Canada incurred an immense debt during the war, built up an immense yearly charge on our people, and the only way to reduce this heavy charge is by increasing our population. If we double our population we cut our per capita national debt in two. Canada has a population of approximately nine million people whereas the United

States has a population of one hundred and ten million. One reason for the great population in the country to the South is that their natural resources have been developed and their commercial and industrial life built up, partly by our assistance. I believe it is time that we in this country endeavoured to develop our own natural resources, and not leave to posterity this development and the prosperity incident thereto.

An increase of population is one of our greatest needs, and yet our population is not growing as it should. Agnes Laut in Maclean's Magazine of January 15th, 1921 says:

> In spite of newspaper reports our Immigation is not increasing. It is decreasing. If you count up the number of Americans who registered at Ports of entry in Canada from the Klondike boom to the War, you will find the total something between one million and a quarter and one million and one-half. If you then figure up how many Americans remained in Canada you will find the total about 440,000.

There is another point which makes this question of the utmost importance, and that is the railway question in Canada. Unfortunately our railway situation forms a very important problem to the people of this country. We have built our railways twenty or thirty years in advance of our time, resulting in duplication and over-development. We have forty thousand miles of railway of which over one-half is in the hands of the Canadian people. It might be worth while to compare the figures of the Canadian railway system with those of other countries. Canada has one mile of railway to every 200 persons; United States has one mile to every 400 persons; Great Britain has one mile to every 2,000 persons; and Russia has one mile to every 4,000 persons. Canada has four or five times the mileage of railway that Japan has, with a population of 56,000,000; three times the mileage of Italy with a population of 36,000,000, a greater mileage than Great Britain with 45,000,000; or than France with 40,000,000; and equal to that of Germany with 65,000,000. These figures illustrate the over-development of our railways. We have not the population to provide traffic, that is passenger and freight traffic, for our railways. Mineral development would help us to secure railway traffic. In the United States forty-seven per cent of the freight traffic on the railways comes from the mines. In Canada the percentage is very much less. I have discussed this question with some of the higher officials of the Canadian National Railways and they are of opinion that it is of prime importance to the railways of this country. One of them, an important Canadian National Railways official, writing to me a few days ago, used the following words:

> I am keenly interested in this subject which I believe is a vital matter to the Canadian National Railways; in fact I do not know anything of greater importance to Canada as a whole than the development of our iron resources.

There is another side to this question and that concerns not only iron but coal and oil. The iron, coal and oil supplies of the world are not inexhaustible and the time may arrive when the United States may see fit to put an embargo on iron ore, as it has in the past proposed imposing an embargo on coal. If they did that the steel plants in this country would have to close down, in my opinion, with the exception of those in Nova Scotia which get their supply from Wabana, Newfoundland. That would place Canada in a very difficult position. The late James J. Hill, writing in 1910 upon the iron deposits in the United States, said they would be depleted within twenty-five to fifty years. Taking these facts into account surely it is worth while for the people of this country to endeavour to place themselves in an independent commercial position so far as the United States is concerned.

The objection is urged that we have a coal shortage in this country and that we have not the necessary fuel to smelt the iron. In answer to that I would say that Canada in the matter of coal deposits is the second richest country in the world, she is second only to the United States. It is true that it is a transportation problem to get that coal from the extreme East and the extreme West to the central parts of Canada; but I believe the day is coming when we will be able to take the coal from Nova Scotia up to the head of the Great Lakes, and bring it from the Prairie Provinces to the same point, and then we shall be able to develop our iron deposits with coal from our own coal mines. Then there is the fact to be considered that in this country there is some 18,000,000 horsepower of potential electricity of which only about 2,000,000 is now being developed. In some countries in the world electricity is being used for smelting purposes. To a certain extent it has been found expensive for that purpose; nevertheless one concern, the Canadian Steel Forgings of Toronto, and a few other firms, are using electricity for smelting purposes in this country.

In closing you may ask me what I propose after these preliminary remarks. Many schemes have been advanced for the solution of this question. I only mention some of them, as follows: 1. A tariff against the importation of iron ore; 2. A bounty on Canadian ore; 3. Financing private corporations; 4. Co-operation with private corporations; or, 5, a thorough investigation. I repeat, Sir, that no scientific or thorough investigation has ever been made that I know of into the Canadian iron ore question, and that proposition would not meet with opposition. I believe that all the parties in this House would deem it only fair for the Government to look into the question even if they spent considerable money in so doing. We have expended considerable on the lignite question in Western Canada. I commend the Government for that action and I wish them to follow the same course in regard to Canadian iron ores. In my final words I would say: Let some action be taken, for this is one of the methods by which we will help to increase our population; make a market for our agricultural products; give employment to our people; provide freight for our over developed railways; make ourselves commercially independent of the United States; and generally help to put Canada in its proper place among the advancing industrial nations of the world.

Mr. WALTER DAVY COWAN (Regina): It is with a great deal of pleasure indeed that I second the motion moved by my hon. friend from Fort William. He has descanted interestingly and well on the iron resources of Canada and he is much more competent to speak on the subject than I am. One thing however, that he said, particularly interested me. That was his comparison of the Canadian situation with the American situation, in connection with which he showed that the American corporations engaged in these industries are tremendously more capitalized than our smaller industries in Canada. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that capital plays a very important part in the development of these undertakings. A properly organized industry with a capitalization of $100,000,000 as many of these American companies are, is much more influential in the markets of the world than a less efficiently organized body with a smaller capital. As a matter of fact there is no comparison at all, and recognizing the tremendous problem that confronts us in the mining and manufacturing of our iron deposits, we must take some action as a government and try to equalize conditions as between our own country and foreign countries. Faced as we are with these enormous imports of iron and steel products from foreign countries, we cannot afford to stand idly by and allow our natural resources to be neglected while other countries prosper at our expense.

In supporting the motion presented by my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion), I wish to put the broadest possible interpretation upon the term "natural resources." I do not restrict it to the mining of iron, lead, zinc, copper or other minerals; I would so broaden our policy that we should develop to the furthest limit the manufacture at home of these and other natural resources. To me the mining of iron or any other metal means blast furnaces, refineries, rolling mills, stamping mills, and everything else necessary to carry that particular metal to its complete manufactured state. That means employment in Canada for vast numbers of expert workmen. As one who in my younger days worked with the workmen of Canada and spent my time as a workman amongst them, I came to know fairly well what they are, and my experience also covered some five years working among workmen in foreign countries, which enabled me to compare our own workmen with foreign workmen. As a result of my experience and observation I say unhesitatingly that in intelligence, application and honesty of service to those who employ them our Canadian workmen have no superiors. To-day our workmen are satisfied with the laws and the institutions of Canada, and it is their desire to remain in the Dominion. The only thing they object to is that they have not the opportunities here that they can get in a big country like the United States, which is so highly developed. Not having those opportunities at home, and desirous of succeeding in life, naturally they go to that country, as my hon. friend from Fort William has said. Therefore we need a domestic policy which will give our workmen the opportunities here which they now must seek abroad and which will give them a share in the building up of this Dominion.

Our nataural resources are not confined to minerals; they include our agricultural lands, and this is what I am most particularly interested in because in the western country these lands are our chief natural

resource. There are those who say and believe that if a man gets a section of land and raises all the wheat he can thereon, and ships it out to the head of the lakes and thence through foreign channels to the ultimate market, he is doing his whole duty by Canada. I disagree with that attitude. I believe that whatever we raise here for export should be carried as far as possible through Canadian channels in order that Canadians may secure the maximum benefit, and thereby help build up our Dominion.

We have a great many industries that ought to be encouraged to their limit. In addition to our wheat growers in the West a large number of our farmers raise stock, and they require the by-products of flour mills in order to raise their cattle. Therefore unless we mill all the wheat we possibly can we are seriously handicapping these stock farmers; and with all deference to those who raise wheat alone. I think that those who raise stock are just as good farmers and citizens and just as much entitled to consideration as the wheat growers. Lately we have developed the livestock industry in the province of Saskatchewan, and it is simply amazing to what an extent that development has been carried. We are shipping great numbers of cattle out of the province. That is all well and good. We also slaughter a certain number of cattle for our own needs. Then what happens? Take, for instance, the hides of those cattle, they are sold for a mere pittance. Why? Because our stock men have to ship those hides down to St. Paul, Minneapolis or Chicago, where they come in competition with an enormous supply of American hides; and not only are our farmers forced to be content with a mere pittance for their hides, but they have to pay the transportation charges to that market. Then when they come to buy the manufactured leather goods they have to pay the transportation charges again, and duty, and naturally they complain because the cost of those goods is so heavy. As a matter of fact we have practically no tanneries in the western country, and I submit it would be good policy for us to encourage industries of that kind in order that we may save these transportation charges and give to our farmers a better price for what they produce.

Let us go still further. I am pleased to say that sheep breeding has increased to an enormous extent in Western Canada in recent years. But what happens? The wool has to be sold for a mere pittance, and in this case too we have to pay very high prices for the articles manufactured from that wool. As far as I know there is not a single woollen mill in Western Canada. Our men and women are eager and willing to work in the factories which we should establish to manufacture these raw materials into finished articles, and we have a domestic market for all the goods which we can manufacture. Why, then, should we not develop manufacturing industries to take care of all these raw materials which we are obliged to export at minimum prices and in return pay maximum prices for the manufactured article?

The same remarks apply to our pork. We raise a great many hogs in the West, and these are shipped to Chicago to be turned into bacon, which we again import. We pay transportation charges both ways and our bacon costs us fifty-five to eighty cents a pound. This is an utter absurdity, and I cannot understand why it has been allowed to continue so long, but the fact is we are day after day losing money by this short-sighted policy.

Lest it be supposed that we have nothing but agricultural lands in Western Canada, I come now to another phase of development of our natural resources. We have in Western Canada mineral deposits of great richness. Let me take as one outstanding instance the clay deposits of southern Saskatchewan. I suppose some hon. members may think that this is not worth discussion, but I want to draw the attention of the House particularly to the non-use of our clays in Saskatchewan and to the very heavy loss this entails to the whole Dominion. I have in my hand a report issued by the Department of the Interior, its author being a Mr. Davis. I remember him coming to Regina and he appeared to me as a rather retiring young man but exceedingly bright and alert. He wanted to discuss with us what he had discovered in southern Saskatchewan. He told us that he had been sent out by the Federal Government to investigate the clay deposits of Western Canada, and he said: I want to tell you that you have in southern Saskatchewan the best clays that can be found anywhere in the world. That sounded to me rather an extravagant statement, but I am convinced that he was not at all exaggerating. The work was completed five years ago and his report was issued two years later, and in it I find the following statement:

> Saskatchewan is a comparatively new province with respect to the rest of the Dominion. Within the last fifteen years settlement has been very rapid, and the handiest and easiest materials of construction have been used. In

the early days there was a lack of stone or wood for the construction of places of habitation for man and beast, hence the settler turned to the sod, and built himself rude shelters of this material. The resources of the province were unknown, and established structural materials were looked for in the American market. In supplying this demand the American brick makers as far south as St. Louis, and east to Pennsylvania, reaped a harvest.

Our people in Western Canada are to-day and have been for years importing brick from as far as Pennsylvania, three thousand miles away, to build their houses. It means that we are paying tribute to the brick makers of Pennsylvania, it means that we are paying tribute to the workmen in that State, and it further means that we are paying tribute to every transportation agency in that three thousand miles between Pennsylvania and Western Canada. While importing millions of dollars worth of these bricks we are increasing the adverse balance of trade and as a result all of us, whether we live in Prince Edward Island, in Central Canada or on the Pacific slope, have to help to meet this adverse balance. Now, why should we continue to import brick from away down in Pennsylvania when we have in our own country the very best raw material for the manufacture of building brick? Let me quote again from this publication—and I will be as brief as I can:

The importance to the whole Canadian West, of the clay resources of southern Saskatchewan, cannot be overestimated. There is an abundance of high grade clays suitable for the manufacture of stoneware, Rockingham ware, and white earthenware. The fire clays of the Eastern section will make a No. 2 grade of refractory, while the more plastic clays should find a use as bond-clays in the making of retorts and other special refractory shapes. They are also adapted to the manufacture of architectural terra-cotta, paving brick, face brick, and all varieties of burned clay products for structural purposes.

It is evident, therefore, that we have the best of clay and that it covers an enormous area of the country. I may say that this district has been regarded or spoken of as the dry district of the West. Let me say that nature does her work exceedingly well. We have found it rather difficult in that particular area to raise the usual crops, but nature has put these resources there for our use. It is only necessary that we should establish industries in that locality for the development of these resources, so that the building up of villages around them, as is always the case; the construction of dams for the retention of water, and the growing of trees and so on, would very largely overcome the aridity of that section and result in benefit to everybody in that part of the country. I mention this only to show that there has been a grave defect in the work done by the Government. Up to a certain point the work was exceedingly well done. An investigation was made, the minerals were found, a report was issued, but so far as I know no attention has been paid to that report. In proof of that assertion I am going to quote from a speech delivered Thursday in the city of Regina. The government of our province, recognizing that a new spirit had come over the West and that we were no longer content to remain a purely agricultural country, established a Bureau of Industry and placed in charge of it a Mr. Molloy, a representative of labour and one of the most capable and energetic men you could possibly get. One of his associates is Dr. Andrews, in charge of the Research Bureau, and he, speaking on the occasion to which I refer, used these words, according to a report in a Regina paper:

Valuable Deposits of Clay found near Assiniboia.

Dr. W. W. Andrews, in speaking of the value of these recently discovered minerals, said: "The coming season promises to show much development of Saskatchewan's greatest mineral resources, viz. her clays.

What is a matter of great importance to the future development of the clay industry in this region is the existence of seams of excellent coal, 16 to 20 feet thick. These fortunately are near the railway. . . This is a very fine opportunity for the organization of a large local enterprise to supply the home market."

Now, it is three years since this report was made, but even the people resident in our province did not know until a short time ago that these clays existed. This clearly proves that we are not giving publicity, not giving effect to the reports which have already been made. In my opinion we should make this report effective through just such a proposal as is made to-day by the hon. member for Fort William; we should take it in hand as part of our government work and draw the attention of the investing public to what we have.

I may say that I have the honour of being a member of the Engineering Institute of Saskatchewan. They are a body of very capable men; you cannot talk nonsense to them any more than you can to this House. Speaking before that body last Tuesday, Mr. M. L. Moyer said:

I believe the time is not far distant when a full line of pottery and earthenware as well as floor and wall tiles, will be made in our province. I believe that the appointment of a

ceramic engineer, whose whole time would be devoted to the work, would result in an undreamed-of development of one of Saskatchewan's greatest natural resources.

I ask that we co-operate with the provincial governments in the work they are now undertaking. It is not sufficient that we should make investigations and reports, without drawing the attention of the investing public to the necessity for the development of these great natural resources. Pottery, earthenware, tile—these things we import in large quantities into Western Canada. What has been the cause? You all know that these things carry a very high freight classification, and the result is that we have to pay enormous prices for what we buy. That particularly is the case since the various bodies interested in increasing freight rates practised lynch law and strangled Canadian business, as they have done recently, by the increase in rates.

I now wish to come to another of our resources spoken of by my hon. friend—coal. We have enormous quantities of coal in Western Canada—so great that the amount is really beyond computation. Some of these coal mines—well, it is almost dangerous to speak of them, because people will hardly believe what you tell them. I have before me, however, a report issued by our own Government with respect to a mine which is on the border between Alberta and British Columbia. This mine, which has really not yet been opened up contains the finest of anthracite coal, according to a government analysis. The total amount of coal in this particular mine which has not yet been touched—and which, I believe, is the property of Pat Burns, of Calgary, and his company—the total amount of coal known to be there is 21,570,000,000 tons. Suppose there were only half that amount, or 10,000,000,000 tons. Working 313 days in the year on the basis of an output of 5,000 tons a day, there would be a total output of 1,565,000 tons per year—an amount which would supply practically all the anthracite coal consumed in Canada. At that rate we would have enough in that one mine to last 6,640 years—and this is according to the report of our Federal Government. Well, with such figures before us, what are we going to do?

4 p.m.

During the week-end I read an interesting account of a meeting of the Mining Institute held in Montreal. I quote the following from an article written by the editor of the Mining Journal, who is also, I think, president of the Mining Institute:

> That western coal is the guarantee of our national independence was the declaration made to-day at the Canadian Club luncheon by F. W. Gray, editor of Canadian Mining Journal who was speaking on "The Commercial and National Assets of the Canadian Coal Supply."
>
> Mr. Gray said that in the west lies the future workshop of Canada and that Canada had 17 per cent of the world's supply and 71 per cent of the Empire's supply of coal. The maritime provinces contained 0.7 per cent of our coal reserves, he said, all good bitimunious coal, while the western fields contained the balance.

What ground has he for making such an assertion? If we go to Great Britain, we find that she has enormous deposits of coal. I suppose the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) would say that Great Britain's industrial supremacy depends upon free trade. In my opinion, it has depended, and to-day depends, entirely upon the fact that she has enormous coal deposits, and around that coal area have been built up the biggest industries of the world. If we look at the situation in America, we find a similar condition of affairs in Pennsylvania, Montana, Ohio; wherever you find coal deposits, you find large steel plants and enormous industries growing up around them. As my hon. friend has pointed out this afternoon, in Sydney, Cape Breton, you will find an enormous industrial development. And why? Simply and solely because great deposits of coal are to be found there. Is it then unreasonable for us to say that in Western Canada, with our coal deposits, exactly the same thing will happen as has happened everywhere else? Therefore, I firmly believe that we should have some department of Government which will take a statement such as this, coming from a man thoroughly qualified to speak on the subject and give it such prominence in the various journals of the world, wherever indeed there is a body of men who have money which they wish to invest in enterprises like this, that their attention may be drawn to the matter and that we may receive some benefit therefrom.

My hon. friend referred to briquettes. Let me express as strongly as I can my appreciation of the action taken by the Government in starting a briquetting plant. I understand it is now nearly completed, and I am satisfied that the $600,000 odd spent on it is going to result in great benefit to Western Canada. Three Governments acted in co-operation with regard to that plant and that seems to be a very

proper procedure to follow. Why should we have anything but co-operation amongst the Governments of this Dominion, especially in such matters as this? But it must be remembered that the manufacture of briquettes there is only a small part of the game, and I sincerely hope that the Lignite Utilization Board continue their work of experimentation until they are able to manufacture the by-products, many of which can be manufactured there into something of value to the Dominion of Canada.

Just recently a new discovery of coal has been made at Lampman, bordering on the Moose mountains. Geologists have told me very bluntly that it is absolutely impossible for a grade of coal such as is being taken out of that mine to exist there; that it cannot be done; that the coal is not there. But the fact is that the coal is there. It is now proved to be there to the extent of millions of tons, how many millions we do not yet know. This is a high grade of coking coal. And what does that mean? My hon. friend spoke about bringing coal from the West to the head of the lakes. Through this discovery, the highest grade of coking coal has been brought, by one jump, 600 miles nearer the province of Ontario than was dreamed of a little while ago. That is a very susbstantial number of miles to knock off the haulage of coal. Two years ago the Government put a line of railway into the new coal field, and to-day the rails are being laid thereon. I hope it will be completed this summer because I am satisfied that it is going to be of great assistance in the development of the Moose mountain coal deposits.

Just in conclusion, I want to say this. While from Western Canada for many years back has come a very vigorous denunciation of everything in the shape of capitalism, big interests, manufacturers money derived in any way except by working the soil, there has been growing up amongst the young men of Western Canada an entirely different spirit and to-day they are calling for industrial development and new industries. In support of that, I am going to read an extract from an editorial from a western paper supporting what has been done by the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, both of which in the past year have established industrial departments:

> The Alberta Legislative Assembly on Wednesday unanimously endorsed the proposal of the government to aid in the campaign for the promotion and development of Alberta's industries, some members expressing the view that the sum should be $50,000 instead of $20,000 as provided in the estimates.

That is for industrial development.

> It may be taken for certain that as a result of the propaganda of Alberta, capital will be attracted to the development of her industries, and industrial population drawn to the province and more enterprise and scientific and business methods employed in the exploitation of the resources already at command. It believes the Federal government has a responsibility towards the natural resources of the country as a whole and a relationship to observe in the supply of essential raw materials within the empire. For that reason it favors the establishment of a new ministry with a national objective and carrying with it a national prestige in order that Canada may be in a position to control the home market and to enter effectively into competition in foreign markets.

They ask for a new minister, but I am not going to go as far as that; I believe that would be an unnecessary step at the present time. But our Government should take every possible means to further the development of the natural resources of Canada through some department especially instructed so to do.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to congratulate the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) for introducing this resolution condemning the Government for their inactivity and lack of policy in regard to the natural resources of the country. His resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Government should bring forward a policy having for its object the development of the natural resources of Canada.

I think that is deserving of consideration, not so much of the Government as of the people of Canada, who are waiting for an opportunity to take advantage of every means of promoting the development of the country. My hon. friend pointed out that the accomplishment of this Government with regard to the development of the natural resources of Canada consisted so far in giving a lease to a gentleman named Stefansson to raise reindeer in the far North. You will not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if you learn very soon that Mr. Stefansson's ranch will not materialise into anything of great consequence to the people of Canada. It is more probable that the Hudson's Bay Company will find themselves in conflict with Mr. Stefansson in his lease and that they will find it necessary to buy him out, and that will be last of the reindeer enterprise in this country.

My hon. friend in his good Tory way suggests that there should be a bounty. These enterprises always get back to the same basis with the Tories; they must find a way getting to the treasury of Canada for their friends. With them there is no other way of developing the country than by leading their friends to the treasury; that is the simple and easy way, and while the people, of course, must suffer, that is not a matter of any consequence to our Tory friends.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member has already made so many misstatements of what I have said that, before he goes any further, I had better correct his last one. I did not suggest a bounty; I suggested an investigation.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend suggested a bounty in a resolution which he moved last year. I suppose he has changed his mind. That is the privilege of the hon. gentleman. Before he sat down he suggested that a bounty might be a means, but that an investigation should be held. We, of course, are all agreed that an investigation of the Government should be held at any time. It all comes back to the same old plan of getting at the treasury of going to the trough.

My hon. friend was quite right in criticising the Government for the lack of an energetic immigration policy. How can we hope to develop the resources of this country with a policy of emigration, not immigration? We are spending a great deal of money on an immigration policy, and the sum total of our efforts has been that people are leaving this country faster than they are coming in. My hon. friend pointed that out in the statement of Agnes Laut in Maclean's Magazine. We are giving the people every possible assistance in leaving. We are doing everything we can in Western Canada to get rid of probably the best farmers in the country—the Mennonites. We are doing everything we can to drive them out of the country. I saw in the local press a few days ago the statement at a banquet by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) that three or four ship loads of Poles had been turned back from the shores of Canada. They had landed here and then were told to go back home. That is our immigration policy apparently. Then I notice in this morning's newspaper that some 5,000 or 6,000 of the Six Nations Indians are looking for a home in the United States because they can place no dependence on the laws of Canada. The Canadian Government is driving everybody out, and the few that are left they would tax out of the country.

My hon. friend speaks of railway difficulties in the way of the development of our natural resources. Why, the only solution of the question is immigration and production. If we have overbuilt our railways, we must get people producing on the land, and in the forests, the mines, and fisheries; but you cannot hope to get them if you build up a tariff wall against everything they would bring into this country, and make living conditions such that they cannot face the future here. You cannot tax yourself rich; you can only tax yourself poor. If you attempt to tax people to promote every kind of enterprise in the country, you get to the stage where the taxpayers are unable to bear the burden. My hon. friend is simply following his leader in promoting the idea of taxing every person for the benefit of the special interests. They have their special friends who must be taken care of, by taxation or otherwise. These special friends must be looked after because they are looking after the Government; naturally the Government in turn attempts to support its friends —to lead them to the treasury. That has always been the Tory policy in this country, and it is the policy that has brought the country to the condition it is in today, with an enormous debt and an excessive taxation. The expenditure of the Tory party since they came into power in 1911, exclusive of the war, has been greater than the total expenditure of previous Governments for forty years. But still they continue on that basis, hoping to bring people in by telling them that they are going to tax industry and everything that a man wants to use, just to bolster up their friends in some enterprise. My hon. friend knows, or should know, that his own territory of New Ontario is not being developed. Why? Because you won't allow the people who would develop it to go in there. My hon. friend knows there are only certain classes of people who will settle in Northern Ontario and develop its resources.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are they?

Mr. CAHILL: Principally the French-Canadian, and the Scandinavians. They are the only two classes of people who will go into that class of country and develop it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why are they prevented?

Mr. CAHILL: Because Mr. Ferguson passed legislation in Ontario, excluding the

French-Canadians from Ontario. They are told not to settle in that country. I see the leader of the Government would hold out an olive branch—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was only wondering why my hon. friend did not get his friends now in office in Ontario to repeal it.

Mr. CAHILL: My friends are not in office in Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Your leader says so.

Mr. CAHILL: They are the friends of my right hon. friend more than mine. They are a combination of Tories and U.F.O.—a sort of reformed Tory party in Ontario. It would not be bad business for the Department of Immigration and Colonization of this Government to try and regulate to some extent the foolish legislation that has been passed in some of these provinces. We have spent great sums of money to develop Northern Ontario, and then the Ontario Government comes along and cuts off any possibility of that investment being a success.

Mr. KEEFER: How?

Mr. CAHILL: By prohibiting the French Canadians from coming in.

Mr. KEEFER: What legislation prohibits them.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend's leader in Ontario, Mr. Howard Ferguson, prohibits any Frenchman from occupying land there. He passed a law that allowed the government to take his land away if he could not speak English, if you please, whereas English is no more the language of this country than French is. The French people have the same right to insist on their language as the leading language, as English-speaking people have on theirs. But my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) would not see that as the situation. It would suit his election purposes better to have Mr. Ferguson's legislation on the statute books, just as it would suit my right hon. friend the leader of this Government better. He made use of just such legislation as that at the last election, and he will make use of it again in the coming election. He will make use of it anywhere he can in Canada, just as he and the Tory party have done in the past.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): May I ask a question? Does my hon. friend take the responsibility of saying that Mr. Ferguson passed a law prohibiting French-speaking people settling in Ontario because they did not speak the English language?

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend is asking me to sit down so that I can stand up again.

Mr. KEEFER: When was that legislation passed?

Mr. CAHILL: If my hon. friend was asleep at the time, I was not. It was passed in 1915. If my hon. friend wants to find out about it and will come to my office, I will tell him. My hon. friend knows the legislation is there. They have made use of it. It was put there for a purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was that legislation passed in Canada or Prussia?

Mr. CAHILL: Oh, not in Prussia. I would not for a moment compare Prussia with Ontario. It would not be a fair comparison. The Ontario methods go far beyond the Prussian methods when it comes to special class legislation and special interests.

Mr. KEEFER: Would my hon. friend oblige me with the name of that Act?

Mr. CAHILL: I told my hon. friend that I would give him the information if he came to my office. For a man living in Ontario, and who took advantage of the legislation my hon. friend seems to be quite dense. If he cannot wait until I get to my office, he can send to the Library for the information, he will find it there.

Mr. Speaker, I only rose to congratulate the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River on his resolution condemning the Government. The Government has almost adopted the policy this session of allowing their followers the privilege of criticising and condemning them. It will have a good effect in the country. My hon. friend from Fort William and my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) will be able to go home to their constituents and say: We insisted on this thing on the floor of the House. That is the kind of independence they display. Why not elect them again? Of course, it does not amount to anything because when it comes to a show-down the motion will be withdrawn. This seems to be a sort of milk-and-water proposition which in any event will not need to be withdrawn. But if it were a resolution of consequence, it would undoubtedly be withdrawn so that our friends opposite would not have to vote upon it.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has delivered a tirade of destructive criticism against the Government. Well, my

experience in this House teaches me that destructive criticism does not get a man or a party very far. Constructive criticism, on the other hand, is wholesome either for an individual or for a party. I shall not follow the hon. gentleman in his peregrinations through the charges he has laid against the Government. The conditions which confront us to-day in Canada are a sufficient answer for my hon. friend; all he has to do is to look at the savings in the banks and the general conditions throughout the country, the trade we have, compared with other countries, as a result of the war, and so forth to be convinced that he is wrong. I should like to make a few observations on the motion before the House, not particularly with regard to the territory that has been so well covered by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) wherein he touched on the iron ore, the coal and oil situation, transportation, cost of shipment, manufacture, and the amount of ores consumed. There is no doubt that iron and iron products consumed in any country are a fairly good index to the development of civilization in that country. I would rather direct my remarks to what might be termed the hinterland of Canada and the resources which may be found within that vast domain. After all, these great resources are tributary to the great river St. Lawrence and the lake basins at its head, which provide the transportation for the southern portion of Canada. The coal underlying the plains of the West, if it is possible to get it, may be conveyed to the head of the lakes where the iron ores exist and the limestones are, and it is possible that within the next few years we may have great smelting works in the vicinity of the head of the lakes. I hope it will be possible, in the not too distant future, to bring coal from the eastern provinces by our waterways to the interior of our country. You have Provincial Governments stretching across the country in the southern portion of Canada, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia; but the fact is sometimes overlooked by Canadians that away to the north of these provincial boundaries we have a vast domain of country, rich in natural resources and favourable for development so far as climate is concerned, and well endowed with waterways. I refer to that vast section of our country which stretches from the western shore of Hudson bay to the Alaskan boundary, the 141st meridian west. We have there a territory which is some 1,600 miles in length from east to west, and which is approximately 1,000 miles deep from north to south, a vast domain adjoining the western portion of which is the territory of Alaska owned by the United States. Just in passing I should like to refer to that territory of the great republic in order to support the argument which I am about to make with regard to the possibilities of the territory under our own Dominion. The district of Alaska was purchased by the United States from Russia in 1867, the year our forefathers confederated Canada. The Americans paid for that territory $7,250,000, and secured from Russia an area covering some 600,000 square miles. Pessimists of that day accused Mr. Seward, Secretary of State for the United States, who made the purchase, of throwing away $7,000,000 of good American gold in the Arctic ocean. They called it the Seward Ice Box, and said it would not bring a dollar to the treasury of the United States. Well, many years have passed, years as many as this Dominion is old, and to-day the territory of Alaska is a very valuable adjunct to the United States. At the World's Fair in St. Louis, there were two pyramids, one representing the gold produced from one mine, the Treadwell mine on the coast of Alaska, and the other representing the amount in gold which the Americans paid for Alaska. One pyramid represented $7,250,000, and the other $21,000,000—from one mine alone. The amount of gold and other metals which the United States have taken from Alaska has paid for that territory, I suppose, fifty times over, to say nothing of the seal fisheries, the salmon fisheries, and other natural resources. The trade of the United States with the district of Alaska, during the year 1920, amounted to $107,000,000. Now, it would be a splendid thing if we had a territory as well populated and as far developed as Alaska, from which we could draw great natural products that could be exchanged for our manufactured goods. That is quite possible in this great hinterland about which I want to address a few words to the House this afternoon. In this vast domain, some 1,600 miles long, as I have said, and 1,000 miles deep, there is territory enough and there are resources sufficient to carve out not one province but three, each as large almost as the three prairie provinces, and perhaps as rich, because no one yet knows what the potentialities of this immense territory are. It is drained by two of the greatest rivers of this continent, and indeed of the world. The Yukon river, which

has its rise in Canada, flows through the territory of Alaska, and enters into the Behring Sea; and the Mackenzie River, having its rise in Canada, flows for its whole length through our own territory into the Arctic Ocean. Both of these rivers are similar to the St. Lawrence, and dissimilar to the Mississippi river. The Mississippi river and the country around it are of such a character that from time to time the river overflows its banks in very destructive floods. Nothing of the kind occurs in the St. Lawrence for the reason that at the head of the latter there are great lake basins, which the Mississippi lacks. There are lake basins at the source of the Yukon, and also of the Mackenzie which control the flow of these great streams, producing an even flow throughout the summer months. And this is a great potential fact in the development of our north country.

Some people here think that the climate of the north country is not suitable for either man or beast. Some years ago the Senate instituted an inquiry into the climatic conditions of the North Land. I have here a report of that inquiry, and I propose to quote from the evidence of Dr. (now Sir) Edward Stupart, the head of our Meteorological Branch, as the climate, and particularly the sunshine of the North Land, and more especially that section of country that is in the valley of the Mackenzie river. He says:

For the three summer months—

That is the three growing months—

—a vast area which includes western and northern Alberta, Northern Saskatchewan and the basin of the Mackenzie, almost to the Arctic Circle, lies within the isothermal lines of 55 degrees and 60 degrees. Throughout this whole region the percentage of the possible amount of sunshine seems to approximate 55, and as the hours of possible sunshine at midsummer range from 17 hours the latitude of Edmonton to 19 hours 30 minutes at Fort Simpson, it may be surmised that growth of plants and cereals may be even more rapid in the northern than in the southern districts.

My own experience in the Yukon bears that out: The growth of vegetables in the Northland is surprising to people who have not been there. Throughout the valleys of the Yukon and Mackenzie Rivers it may safely be said, Mr. Speaker, that we have a salubrious climate, a climate where people live and where they have been living for a hundred and fifty years, a soil which would produce the vegetables and the cereals to support a very considerable population. The natural wealth of Canada is drawn from four sources—the forest, the farm, the fishery and the mines. All these sources of our national and our natural wealth, Mr. Speaker, are to be found in this great domain of which I speak. Cereals grow well in the Yukon. The report also shows that cereals grow well in the valley of the Mackenzie. It may be interesting to the House to know that wheat will grow and mature and ripen in the valley of the Yukon, as it does in the far north section of the valley of the Mackenzie. On one occasion I brought to the House of Commons and placed upon the table for members to see a sample of wheat that had matured in the Yukon. After they had inspected it I sent it to the seed analyst or expert at the Farm here in Ottawa. When the return came back to me this gentleman informed me that he had sown one hundred seeds taken at random from that sample of wheat. I was very much interested—and I am sure the House will be equally interested—to know that one hundred seeds germinated—they were one hundred per cent virile. I do not know that all the wheat that could be grown in that Northern country would be so virile, but I am sure that it would be true of a very large proportion of it. I would like to place upon Hansard a few more extracts from this interesting report of the Senate which bears the title "Canada's Fertile Northland," and particularly with regard to the Mackenzie basin. The report shows that this basin is capable of sustaining a very large and prosperous population, that it has great possibilities as an industrial country; and says:

According to one witness, who has had exceptional opportunities for familiarizing himself with the country and its resources, there is in the Peace River section of this country as much good agricultural land fit for settlement, anad yet unsettled, as there is settled in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Albert to-day.

That is a very striking statement. The report continues:

At Fort Providence, latitude 62.30, about 400 miles north of Edmonton, splendid crops of excellent wheat, barley, oats, peas, and other vegetables are raised, while as far north as Fort Good Hope, within fourteen miles of the Arctic circle, or latitude 66.16 and 970 miles further north than the city of Edmonton, cabbages, onions and other garden vegetables are raised.

So much as to cereals. Now I come to touch on the forest resources of the Northland. On this point the report says:

The various sections of the Mackenzie basin possess great forest wealth, the spruce areas in the North extending to the Arctic sea.

This constitutes a tremendous reserve which may yet be tapped and developed, particularly now that we know that pulp and pulp products are such important commodities in the industrial world. The report goes on to deal with animal life and mineral wealth and, Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that it is not the country at the head of the Great Lakes that we are dealing with; it is not in northern Ontario, or in Nova Scotia, or in British Columbia. The area which is capable of producing so much national wealth is hundreds of miles north of these great sections of our country. What does the report say about the Mackenzie river basin in that regard? It says:

> The mineral wealth of this region is undoubtedly considerable, including deposits of coal, oil, copper, silver, gold, native salt, sulphur, ochre, sand suitable for glass making, tar sands, etc.

Some people wonder why it is that in those northern latitudes we have a climate such as we have. I am frequently asked how much snow fall we have in the Yukon, and frequently my questioners are surprised when I tell them that we have not much more than two feet. They wonder why it is. It may be interesting to the House to know that the climate of the west coast is governed by the Japanese current, the same as the climate of the British Isles is governed by the Gulf Stream. This current comes along laden with moisture. There is no part of the Pacific coast from Alaska to Mexico in which the mountains are more than six hundred miles from the sea. The moment that moisture laden current strikes those high mountains precipitation occurs and the result is we have very heavy snow falls and rain falls on the seaward side of that mountain range, and conversely on the landward side you had a dry belt and small precipitation in winter, and a small rain fall in summer. The same condition prevails in the Mackenzie valley with one other factor added, the Chinook wind, which tempers the winter climate there. Wheat grows there as well as in the Yukon and perhaps even better.

The first great wealth of that country to be developed will be its mineral wealth, and it was so in the Yukon. While the Yukon is capable of supporting a very considerable population, its great wealth so far has been mineral wealth. I have no doubt that in the valley of the Mackenzie, that section which lies between Hudson bay and Mackenzie river, the oil and the asphalt taken from the tar sands will be the first products to any extent. I say that the mineral wealth will probably be the first to be produced. Mr. Speaker, within the last twenty-five years—which is only a short time in the history of a nation—many important things have happened in connection with minerals in Canada. It is quite possible history will repeat itself in the next twenty-five years. It will be twenty-five years ago, on the 17th of August next, since gold was discovered in the Klondike. Since that time the Klondike has produced $200,000,000 of the yellow metal which has come out in a continuous stream and has enriched the countries to the south and particularly the western provinces of Canada. The finding of that gold opened up to us a storehouse locked, padlocked, by nature. But the finding of the gold caused an influx of people into the Yukon, and notwithstanding that the gold development has been lessened there is still a considerable population there. Within the past twenty-five years the Cobalt field was discovered in Ontario, a field which has given to Canada and the world about $200,000,000 of silver wealth. I suppose within the last fifteen years the Porcupine field has been discovered, and it still continues to pour out annually enormous quantities of wealth in the shape of gold. Our geologists tell us that the same rock which underlies the Cobalt and Porcupine regions extends to the far north, and it is quite possible that there may be other Cobalts and other Porcupines within the Arctic Circle. Even another Sudbury may be discovered there, because I am informed that as far west as Manitoba nickel deposits are found. There is no doubt that there are many other Klondikes in the Yukon, but whether they will be discovered in our time or not is in the lap of the gods. But inside twenty-five years, only two and a half decades, there must have been pretty nearly six hundred million dollars of wealth produced from these three camps.

If the oil discovery which was made last summer at Fort Norman is half as good as we are led to believe, it is quite possible that that immense wealth which I have mentioned may be trebled or quadrupled in oil.

I shall not detain the House to refer to the authorities I have in my desk, but Mr. Camsell, of the Geological Survey, states in his report on the tar sands of Alberta that there are at least 150,000 square miles overlaid with these tar sands, rich in asphalt, rich in oil, and rich in tar. The potentialities of mineral wealth of this great north country are almost beyond belief.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): Alberta coal, for instance.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): Alberta has a great coal area. It is said that that province has more coal within its four corners than any other area in this sphere on which we move and live. I think that is true, but I am speaking of the country beyond the northern boundaries of Alberta and the other Western Provinces, and in asking the Government to consider the evidence that I am submitting to the House and to them, I hope they will not confine their investigation altogether to the southern portion of our country. We are often told that Canada is broken in the centre, it has a weak back. You have your coal resources on the Atlantic, you have your coal resources in the West, you have your settlements in Quebec and in Ontario, and on the plains, but in the centre where you should be strong you are weak. And if you look at the map, Mr. Speaker, that is only too obvious. But I say to you, Sir, that within the lifetime of men who are in this House there will be a new territory opened up away beyond the borders of the Western Provinces to-day which will produce great national wealth and will strengthen the backbone of Canada where it is now weak.

I suppose it is likely that the mineral wealth of this country is the first that will be tapped. The discovery of minerals has had a very potent infl.uence upon the movements of the human race. I will not go off our own continent to prove that, Sir. When gold was discovered in California in 1849, I think I am safe in saying, there were not 10,000 white people on that coast between the Arctic ocean and the Mexican line. That was only seventy years ago, and to-day California is one of the great states of the commonwealth with a population of 3,500,000 or 4,000,000. Washington and Oregon were forests and British Columbia was a desert so far as the occupation by whites was concerned—it was certainly given over to the Indians at any rate, and there was not a soul north of that province. In 1856 gold was discovered in the upper regions of the Fraser river, which led to an influx of people into the north, and the great province of British Columbia was carved out of the wilderness. We all know what a strong support it has been to Confederation since that time. Forty years later gold was discovered in the Klondike, and the influx of people established that territory and gave to that wilderness in the north a great people with a stable government. Since 1849 until to-day instead of only 10,000 people between the crests of the Rocky mountains and the Pacific coast there are I presume about 10,000,000 people, in three states one province and one territory very largely because of the discoveries of these precious metals in the rivers and valleys of that territory. All of this is quite possible to be duplicated in the far north in these river valleys which, I have not the slightest doubt, contain vast mineral wealth, because those regions have been examined by our geologists in a very slight way and they come back with reports that indicate the great potential wealth awaiting development.

I do not desire to dilate upon this subject. I just want to touch the mountain peaks, as it were, and in closing my remarks I wish to be consistent with what I said in opening, that a purely destructive criticism is, I think, rather negative, but that a constructive criticism is a wholesome thing either for an individual or for a government. Therefore I propose to make a few suggestions in the hope that the Government may take cognizance of them, examine them and if they think them worthy adopt them.

I have a great deal of experience, Mr. Speaker, in living in frontier countries and in framing legislation for them. In my time I have had a good deal to do with giving to the Yukon territory, which I have the honour to represent, a set of mining laws. A former minister of the crown, Hon. Mr. Oliver, for whom I have a profound respect, was a frontiersman and realized the necessity of having stable laws if the mining industry of the Yukon was to be developed, and during his regime I submitted to him certain suggestions, which were subsequently incorporated in the Yukon Placer Mining Act. Before that Act was passed there was no stability of title for the great basic industry there. Title was based on regulations passed by the Cabinet and capable of being changed by that Cabinet or by succeeding cabinets. Consequently we found it difficult to get capital to invest in our great mining industry, gold. The same condition exists to-day in connection with the oil regions in the Mackenzie river basin and all the other territory which is north of and in fact held by the provinces as part of the public domain. It is not good business for a government to grant oil leases based solely upon regulations. I hope as soon as the Government have the information necessary

they will frame an Act of Parliament which will give stability of title in oil leases. You will find, Sir, and our Government will find, that you cannot get capital to invest in an industry unless you have a good stable title, and that stability can be given only by Act of Parliament. So I hope the oil regulations which were recently suspended, but which I believe are now in force, will very shortly be incorporated in an Act of Parliament.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): No Act of parliament fixing regulations—not in their present form.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): I am not sufficiently acquainted with the oil business to criticise the oil leases. If they were gold leases perhaps I could. But I notice my hon. friend from Edmonton has a resolution on the Order Paper, and I hope that when he discusses it he will suggest where the weak points are in the present oil leases. What I want is security and continuity of title, because oil mining is a little different from placer mining; it requires a very considerable expenditure of money, a good deal of time, and a high degree of skill to locate and develop these oil prospects.

We have here a Geological Survey which, I think, should be recruited up to full strength. I quite agree with what my hon. friend from Fort William said with regard to the depletion of the personnel of that scientific body during the last few years. I hope it will be recruited to full strength as soon as possible and that every man whom the Director of the Geological Survey can spare will go into that north country this summer and commence a survey of the territory which extends, as I say, from Hudson bay to the Mackenzie river. I know it is not possible to do this all in one summer, but I hope the work will be started at once, because it is of the first importance that prospectors going into that country should have geological maps so that they may know where to go to prospect for oil, and where not to go.

Here is another aspect of the question. We developed during the war some of the most famous airmen in the world, some of the most capable topographers and photographers in the world. We all know of the work, which they did in France and of the extent to which that work was valued by the military chiefs. These men are here, and if they are not in the Geological Survey we should get them, equip them with topographical and photographic instruments, send them and their planes and their equipment to Edmonton or wherever the base is, and have them make aerial topographical maps of that vast country. It is of great importance that this should be done, because the eyes of the mineral operators are upon us to-day. Oil is king. We have struck oil in the north, and we want all the reliable information we can get for the people who are turning their attention to these nothern oil fields. It is necessary, therefore, that our geologists should go to that country this summer—and when I say this summer I do not mean that they should leave Edmonton in June when the river opens, go in there and stay from three to six weeks, and then have to start the return journey in time to come out before the river closes. That is what we have done in the past, because we could not do anything else; but we can do otherwise to-day. We are going to vote a considerable amount of money for our air services.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): The river opens in May, not in June. They are ploughing in Alberta to-day. Do not give our country a bad reputation.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): I thank my hon. friend for the correction. Whatever may be the case in regard to the upper reaches of that river, I think there is a lake between the upper reaches and its mouth which does not open until June, and the oil fields are north of that. However that may be, what I am desirous of impressing upon the Government is this: I want these scientists whom we have, or whom we can get, to go there and make a geological survey of that country, make a topographical survey and a photographic survey. And in doing so I hope they will not altogether neglect the Yukon.

Before I take my seat I should like to tell you about the new discovery of silver ore in the Yukon at a place called Kino Hill, 175 miles northeast of Dawson—a place which you will hear of during the next few years. Enormous deposits of silver ores have been discovered there as the result of the operations of geologists in that country a few years ago, whose reports indicatted the possibility of the discovery of silver ores. The facts have borne out the truth of that prediction.

We know nothing about the fisheries of this nothern country of ours; yet we have in the employ of the Fisheries Department one of the greatest living scientists, a man

who knows more, perhaps, about fish than any other man in the whole world—Professor Prince. I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) to sent Prof. Prince into that north country this summer to make a survey of the fisheries and to tell the people what the fisheries of that vast country are worth. We have had very assuring reports concerning them, but whether or not the conditions are as stated in the reports, I do not know.

Let me point out also that when you place a community in one of these northern countries, a community whose members live upon the natural resources, you have a community which consumes the best goods that the Canadian people can produce, and who pay well for them; because in the early stages of every frontier settlement the people of these newly opened districts are great consumers. This is particularly the case in a mineral country and in an oil country such as we expect to be developed up there. So I suggest that our Government do these things with the idea of opening up that vast country, because if they do they will considerably enlarge the map of Canada; they will bring about the establishment of communities which will be continuous in their life, which will produce their share of the commodities which we use, and consume their share of the things which we produce, and, generally, be a prop and a support to Canada in peace or in war.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is one of the most important questions that could be discussed by Parliament at the present time, because it is linked up with some of the other problems which confront us—the problem of unemployment; the problem of our national debt. If it is possible for Parliament and for the Government to bring about a great development of our natural resources, the enormous latent wealth of the country, we would not need to be so much concerned about the future.

I might criticize the resolution as worded, for this reason: the natural resources of Canada are largely under the direction of the provincial authorities. In the Prairie Provinces, however, the Dominion Government still controls the resources, and I feel there cannot be a settled policy in connection with the development of our natural resources until it is finally decided whether the

5 p.m.

control of these resources shall in the future be with the Dominion or with the provinces. As matters stand at present, there is an uncertainty that holds back both the Dominion Government and the provincial governments from action that would help to bring about the necessary development.

Now, I am going to deal with two or three of what I consider to be the most important problems in connection with the development of our natural resources in the province of Alberta. A question was put to the previous speaker (Mr. A. Thompson) about the coal resources of Alberta. I asked the Director of the Geological Survey to supply me with the latest information as to the actual resources in coal of that province. He has furnished me with some figures that are startling, and I think the House would benefit by having them placed on Hansard. I quote from the statement:

The following table shows the coal reserves of the province of Alberta as calculated by the Geological Survey:

These reserves include coal seams of one foot or more in thickness to a depth of 4,000 feet.

Coal Reserves of Alberta.

Actual Reserve in million tons.

Anthracite	669
Bituminous	3,224
Sub. bituminous and lignite	382,500
Total	386,393

Probable Reserve in million tons.

Anthracite	100
Bituminous	182,183
Sub. bituminous and lignite	491,271
Total	673,554

Grand total of actual and probable reserves 1,059,947 million tons.

The total area underlain by coal in Alberta is reckoned to be 81,675 square miles.

These figures will give you some idea of the immense possibilities of coal production in Alberta. It may not be known to this House and to the country that Alberta contains about 86 per cent of all the coal resources of Canada, 61 per cent of the coal resources of the British Empire, and over 14 per cent of the coal resources of the world. I make that statement on the authority of the Director of the Geological Survey.

Some members of the House might like to have an idea of the actual production in Alberta. During 1920 Alberta produced over one-third of the coal produced in this Dominion. It produced 6,859,346 tons, while Nova Scotia came second with a production of 6,395,545 tons. I have quoted these figures in order to give the House some information about one of the great natural resources of Alberta, but

probably during the session there will be an opportunity to enlighten the House further upon this question.

We have heard something about oil during this session, and from all that can be gathered, I think it is quite possible that one of the greatest oil fields in the world may have been discovered in the country to the north of the capital of Alberta. It may not, however, be known to this House and to the country that efforts to obtain oil are not confined to one section of Alberta, but that efforts are being directed in all parts of that province to discover oil. There is no wild-catting, no careless movement at all; men are putting up real money and making a real effort to discover oil in that province. In the neighbouring state of Montana a great oil field has already been discovered within a very few miles of the southern boundary of Alberta, and that discovery is lending encouragement, to prospectors and actual companies for exploration purposes operating in the southern part of the province, that oil will be discovered there.

We have every reason to be hopeful in connection with those two great resources in Alberta particularly. What I want, however, to direct the attention of the House to is a question that I have frequently brought to the attention of Parliament but which to-day, I consider, is much more important than it has been at any previous time. It relates to the development of our natural resources. It is known to this House, and largely to the country now, that great portions of the southern part of Alberta and the southwestern part of Saskatchewan have been settled, and the problem faces the people to-day whether they will be able to remain and make an existence upon the land, that is, in what is known as the semi-arid or arid belts of those two provinces. In the light of history, I think it can be established that a mistake was made, in the first place, in opening up certain of the southern parts of those provinces. But they have been opened up; practically the whole of the country is settled; but through crop failures every few years, caused largely by drought, those people are not able to eke out an existence, and the governments of the Dominion and of the provinces have to come to their relief every few years. On account of the assistance that has to be granted occasionally by the Federal Government and on account of the fact that the settlement of that country was due to the activity and policy of the federal power, this matter has become a question of federal importance. At this time, it is most important that the Federal Government should co-operate with the governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta in appointing a commission to survey the agricultural resources of the southern parts of those two provinces and to decide what sections of them can be held for settlement and what sections should be opened up for other purposes. There is a solution of this problem, and it lies in the provision of irrigation, wherever that is possible, for the dry areas. We have had experience for many years with irrigation in Alberta, and wherever it has been utilized in those dry sections of the province, it has been a success. I hope to establish to the House this afternoon the real importance of irrigation in connection with the salvation of those areas in the southern parts of Saskatchewan and Alberta that are to-day facing practical destruction as agricultural areas. We have at the present time in Alberta alone one million acres actually irrigated or in a position to be irrigated from works actualy constructed; 130,000 acres will be irrigated from works already designed and authorized, and 550,000 acres are believed to be susceptible to irrigation by works which have been planned and the construction of which may be authorized as soon as the necessary financial arrangements can be made. I do not want the House to gather the idea that it is possible, by means of irrigation, to reclaim all the dry land area in these sections of the two western provinces, because that is not the case. In the first place, there is only a certain quantity of water available for irrigation, and in the second place there is only a certain area of land that can be irrigated. It is estimated that, in the two provinces, it is possible to irrigate or reclaim and make sure of success for agriculture, 5,000,000 acres. I believe, with this area of 5,000,000 acres put under irrigation, a safeguard would be offered to dry farming on bordering lands. As the matter stands at present, when a drought strikes those sections of the West, there is no possibility of carrying along the stock during the fall, winter and spring months, because there is no feed; but with irrigation districts adjoining those areas, it would be possible to provide the feed and save the livestock, and that in itself is important in retaining the people on dry land areas in certain sections of southern Alberta, although I maintain there are other

sections where it is impossible to retain them even with irrigation or with irrigation adjoining.

The problems that face Alberta, particularly in relation to irrigation, I can outline in two or three paragraphs. First, there should be the most complete storage of high water and flood flow of all streams in southern Alberta and southwest Saskatchewan. Second, there should be an interpretation as soon as possible of the Waterways Treaty in order to ascertain the water that is available from international streams for use for irrigation purposes in the Province of Alberta. The other problem is that of finance. I might be asked—What business is it of the federal power for me to bring up this question of irrigation? Even if the federal power has no responsibility whatever in connection with the actual development of irrigation districts, the federal power is, at the present time, responsible for the surveying of those lands in order to ascertain whether they can be irrigated or not, and it is also responsible for the streams which would be used to water those lands. So, in that respect, the matter is one of federal importance, and it is of the utmost importance to that part of the country that the federal power should continue these surveys until it finds out how much of that country can be irrigated and how much water is available for irrigation purposes. The question of financing has reached a stage where the Dominion has placed the responsibility on the local authorities, and the question of finances is the most serious matter at the present time. Districts have been formed in southern Alberta, and they are in a position now that they can proceed to construct irrigation works if they can find the money to pay the contractors. I am not presenting a case for help from the Dominion, because the people who want these systems are prepared to pay for the construction of them with their own resources, but the trouble is that on account of lack of information about irrigation systems on the part of investment markets in Canada it is impossible to sell those irrigation bonds without some help from either the Dominion or the provincial authorities, and the Provincial Government of Alberta is being urged at the present time to guarantee the bonds in order that the money may be raised for this particular purpose. These districts are formed in a similar way to municipalities, and they can be bonded in the same way. I shall attempt to establish that it would be in the interest of the country that these areas should be irrigated as quickly as possible in order that they might be made productive, and in order that the people there might be able to meet their obligations as citizens of this country.

In 1919 in the southern part of Alberta and the southern part of Saskatchewan, and in many other sections of Western Canada, practically no crop was raised on what we call the dry lands. Adjoining the city of Lethbridge there is the oldest irrigated section in Alberta, a territory that was irrigated by the old Galt Land and Irrigation Company, and afterwards taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In 1919 all the lands adjoining that irrigation district were burnt absolutely dry; there was no crop whatever. In the irrigation district the value of the crop raised on irrigated lands, good, bad and indifferent, was estimated by the Canadian Pacific Railway officials to be $54.71 per acre. I would like the House to keep that figure in mind, and remember at the same moment that on the adjoining dry lands there was nothing raised at all. If we could extend irrigation to the districts where it is possible to bring water and irrigate the land, these areas would produce agricultural wealth year in and year out. I might say that one section of country that had been formed into an irrigation district adjoining this Coaldale district of the Canadian Pacific, if it had had water in the dry year of 1919 it would on the same basis have produced $7,000,000 of wealth, but without irrigation it produced absolutely nothing.

This matter is of importance to this Government and to this House as it would remove the necessity for assistance to the settlers in these dry areas in the dry years by providing seed grain and relief to the settlers when they have no crop at all. It would also settle the question of mixed farming in that part of the country, because on irrigated land practically all classes of farming can be carried on successfully. There are members in this House from the province of British Columbia who know what it has been possible to do with irrigation in the arid sections of that province, and those of you who have followed the development of the arid regions of the United States know that there great areas of desert lands have been reclaimed by irrigation and are to-day producing great wealth. I have in my possession figures to show that in the case of certain of the irrigated projects of the Middle Western

States, the value of the irrigated crops in 1919 alone was greater than the cost of the construction of the particular project. One of these I want to mention because it borders on the province of Alberta, and is situated in a very similar territory, and that is the Minidoka project in Idaho. In 1919 they produced irrigated crops to the value of $5,926,000, and the project only cost $5,820,000, so that one year's production was greater than the cost of the project.

Now what does irrigation mean to the land out there? Even in the very best of years in southern Alberta, with plenty of rainfall, the irrigated land has surpassed the dry land in production per acre. I have the figures from the Experimental Farm at Lethbridge, where both dry farming and irrigated methods are pursued. I will take what we have called the particularly dry years in that district. The year 1910 was one. Wheat on dry land at the Experimental Farm at Lethbridge produced in that year 11 bushels to the acre, and on irrigated land 25 bushels to the acre. The year 1914 was another dry year. Wheat on dry land at theExperimental Farm produced 24 bushels to the acre, and on irrigated land 54 bushels to the acre. The year 1916 was a really good one throughout the whole of southern Alberta, but I want to give the figures for that year to show that even in a really good year irrigated land produces better than dry land. In that year the average per acre on dry land at the Experimental Farm was 48 bushels of wheat, and on irrigated land 71 bushels. Now 1918 was a dry year in southern Alberta, and in that year on the Experimental Farm 14 bushels of wheat were produced on the dry land and 62 on the irrigated land. The average over this period was 30 bushels to the acre on dry land, and 53 bushels to the acre on irrigated land. I think these figures will prove that irrigation is of the utmost importance to what has been called the semi-arid areas in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

But there is one problem we must consider in connection with irrigation development. This Government and the Provincial Governments were responsible for bringing into these western provinces thousands of settlers. They came in there from many sections of the United States and from across the ocean. They brought all the wealth they had, and they spent it in developments on the land they took up. To-day they are practically worthless, and they consider it is the duty of these Governments to come to their rescue, not by giving them money, but by assisting them in constructing these irrigation systems in order that the land they have taken up may be made to produce wealth, and in order that they may be able to meet their obligations of the past and any other obligations they may have in the future. This can be done under irrigation, and I would urge this Government—I am not criticising the Government for what it has done in the past—to do its utmost in the future to attempt to solve this matter, or they will be compelled to assist these people to move out of that section of the country into other sections where these difficulties do not exist. I say that these sections can be made to flourish by the expenditure of money on the construction of irrigation systems. Might I mention in this connection the fact that during the past year the value per acre of the irrigated crops in the irrigated section of southern Alberta was $49.31 per acre. I do not believe that the dry land on an average will produce much more than a third of that amount this year, taking the whole southern territory and striking an average of the dry land production. The point to be kept in mind in connection with irrigation—and I want to mention it before I close—is the fact that there has been some criticism of the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway system along the main line of that railway. It should not be forgotten that that system was constructed solely for colonization purposes. They brought the water onto the land there in order to induce people to settle upon the land, because they knew that without an irrigation system they could not settle that particular district, and for a great number of years while dry land was in demand and was producing heavy crops, people could not be attracted to the irrigated areas and consequently the Canadian Pacific Railway system on the main line of the railway did not develop to any large extent. But in recent years it has been developing quite rapidly and producing a great amount of wealth. But in the areas I speak of, and this is an important fact in considering this proposition, the people are already on the land. They have their homes already established, with stock and machinery, and their farms are fenced. All they need is a guarantee of moisture, and if they can get that they can make agriculture a success. The only way they can make it a success year in and year out is by the extension of irrigation to all lands

that are fit to be irrigated. This is a problem that is very much similar to the drainage problem in the province of Ontario, in the province of Manitoba, and in northern Alberta. In connection with drainage we have to find means of removing water from the land. In the matter of irrigation, on the other hand, it is a case of putting in ditches to bring the water to the land. I am quite sure that hon. members from the province of Ontario appreciate what taking water from the land means, and if they were in southern Alberta they would appreciate the significance of bringing it to the land. This question of natural resources, considered from all angles, is, as I said in the beginning, one of the most important subjects we can deal with in this Parliament; and it should be the business of this Government, as well as of the Provincial Governments, to do all they possibly can to develop our resources, so that we shall create wealth and satisfy those people who are looking for employment. There is no need to be pessimistic in Canada at the present time. It is true we are faced with many financial problems that are extremely serious, but we have immense wealth in this country and all that is necessary is to develop that wealth. If we do that, all will be well with Canada.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I desire, in the first place, to congratulate the mover of the resolution on having brought it to the attention of the House, and also on the able manner in which he handled the subject. In considering what branch of this manifold subject I should speak on myself, I found a good deal of difficulty. The resources of Canada are so numerous, so wonderful, and so great in extent that it is hard to decide, on a motion of this kind, to which particular resource one should confine discussion. However, as I am particularly interested in fisheries I thought it would not be out of place for me to offer a few remarks on that subject.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any policy brought forward by the Government for the development of the natural resources of Canada should cover the question of greater efficiency in the development of our fisheries, for they are worth the most earnest consideration. In 1919, the fishery products of Canada amounted to $61,363,502, and in 1920, $56,508,429. You will observe there was a decrease of some millions in 1920 as compared with 1919. The fishery exports of the Dominion in 1919 were $37,137,102, and in 1920 $42,285,055, an increase of five millions. It seems to me that where we have a resource which gives rise to such a large percentage of exports we should do something to develop it. In British Columbia, the fisheries constitute a very important part of our natural resources. In 1919, the value of the fisheries production was $25,301,607, or 44 per cent of the production of the entire Dominion. You will agree with me, then, Mr. Speaker, that, representing as I do a British Columbia constituency, I have a peculiar right to speak on this important subject. I do not agree with the hon. member for Pontiac, (Mr. Cahill), in the view that in speaking on this resolution I am in anyway criticizing the Government, nor do I think that it was the object of the resolution to provoke criticism. I think that as members, on private members' day, we have a perfect right to bring to the attention of the Government such matters as we think worthy of consideration. I do not agree with another thing which was mentioned by the hon. member for Pontiac. I took it from his remarks that he is in favour of an open door for immigration. I certainly agree, as I suppose all other hon. gentlemen will agree, that immigration should be encouraged, provided we get the right kind of immigrants. I think it is important at this time, when there is so much unrest throughout the world, when the eyes of the world are turned towards Canada, and when we may expect large numbers of people to come into our country, that we should see that the right kind of people come to Canada. That is very important, and I entirely agree with the policy which the Government has adopted in that respect of strictly examining all those who wish to enter this country. Now, it may be that my hon. friend desires that certain classes of people should come into Canada who would not be wanted here; and I have in mind that possibly he may desire that certain immigrants from a part of the Empire where there is a good deal of trouble at the present time and who are going in such large numbers to New York and other American ports, should be given free entry into Canada. If that is his idea I certainly do not agree with him.

Now taking up the question of the fisheries I wish to say that I do not desire in any way to criticize the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). As a matter of fact I would congratulate him upon the manner in which he is carrying

out his duties, and upon the attention that he is giving to this important industry. I think I can tell him that those who are interested in the fisheries in the province of British Columbia appreciate very much indeed what he has done and is doing to encourage the fishing industry. Shortly before I left New Westminster I had the privilege of attending a meeting of white fishermen of the province, and at that meeting the president of the association stated that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries had done more for the fishing interests than had any previous minister. I have no complaint to make either about the fishery officers. I believe that they have been efficient, that they have been doing good work, and that they are good and capable men, but I think that something may be said as to the system under which they have been operating. It is generally conceded, for instance, that on the Fraser river, which at one time was the greatest salmon fishery river in the world bar none, the salmon fisheries have depreciated to such an extent that the people of that country gravely fear that unless something is done the Fraser river will cease to be a salmon stream of any consequence. In fact as one of the fishermen at the meeting I have referred to put it: "If things go on as they have been going, in a short number of years there will be nothing but bullheads in the streams and boneheads on the banks." On a previous occasion I gave some details as to the decrease in the pack of salmon on the Fraser river and I do not intend now to repeat them. I shall, however, offer a few suggestions for the consideration of the minister.

My first suggestion has reference to the propagation methods which have been in use, in the province of British Columbia at all events. Results are what count. The important point is not the output of fry, but the number of mature fish that return. The hatcheries have been operating in British Columbia at the expense of many thousands of dollars a year for many years past. Millions of fry have been turned out at these places with the expectation that they should go out to sea and in due course return as fully grown fish, but unfortunately no results have been obtained. Therefore there must be something wrong with the system. What I submit—and I think I have a good deal of authority for my contention—is that the whole system of hatchery operation has been carried out on the wrong basis. The operation of hatcheries and the propagation of fish has not been according to natural methods—it has been entirely artificial. Now I submit that what is required is a combination of artificial and natural methods, and there should be a return as much as possible to nature. I have before me an article which appeared in the Canadian Fisherman, of September, 1919, which I think sets out the situation better than any words of mine could. I therefore, with the indulgence of the House, propose to read this article:

A NEW ANGLE TO THE SOCKEYE SALMON HATCHERY QUESTION.

Mr. Henry Doyle believes Hatchery Methods can be improved on.

The following statement and interview by Mr. Henry Doyle of the Northern B.C. Fisheries throws new light on sockeye salmon hatchery methods, and opens up an altogether new angle to this important question. Mr. Doyle's ideas will be read with great interest, as he is a pioneer in the salmon canning business of British Columbia and has made a careful and exhaustive study of salmon and their habits.

Mr. Doyle believes that hatchery operations on the Fraser River have been mainly responsible for the depletion of the sockeye salmon.

That fry liberated in rivers and streams that are lake outlets, have been a total loss. Reforms in hatchery operations, modelled more closely on nature's own lines, would, he believes, aid the increase of the sources of supply in the fisheries of the province.

With due respect to the men who believe otherwise and have made statements on the subject recently, Mr. Doyle said he believed sockeye salmon hatcheries operating upon the right lines would prove successful.

"Just because there has been an apparent failure in sockeye salmon hatchery operations under present methods, does not necessarily mean that the entire system is worthless," he said. Mr. Doyle does not think that hatchery work should be discontinued until the improved methods have been tried out. He suggests that officials in charge of hatchery operations sometimes lack efficiency. He said. "The failure of hatcheries to procure any augmentation in the number of sockeye salmon in areas where the hatcheries are situated, is probably very largely due to those in charge lacking appreciation of the necessity of employing distinctive methods for each individual species of fish. One who makes a success of whitefish hatching and applies similar methods to salmon propagation would make a mistake, and even in salmon culture the method of treatment for spring salmon must differ materially from that employed with the sockeye species."

Mr. Doyle's statement on sockeye salmon hatchery methods follows:

"Spring salmon deposit their spawn in streams which flow directly into the sea. A sudden transmission from fresh to salt water would be fatal to the young fish. Nature, therefore, endows them with size and strength to maintain themselves in the blackish water at tidal levels until sufficiently acclimatized to exist in the sea. Sockeye salmon on the other hand, spawn only in rivers having a lake source, and generally then in the small streams by which the lake is fed. This distinctive feature in the natural laws governing the spawning habits of the two

species indicates that different methods should be employed in artificial propagation work, but in the past this very important factor has been almost completely ignored.

"Sockeye salmon propagation on the Fraser river commenced in 1884 and year after year eggs were secured from Silver and Morris creeks and other tributaries of Harrison lake. When the fry were being planted they were mostly deposited in the Harrison river, which is the lake's outlet, where the current of this and subsequently of the Fraser river would carry them to the gulf of Georgia before they found suitable currentless water in which to remain while attaining greater growth. In the fry stage sockeyes lack sufficient strength to hold their own against the sweep of the tides, and doubtless practically all perished from too sudden change from fresh to salt water.

"Dr. Charles H. Gilbert, of Leland Stanford University, is unquestionably our greatest authority on salmon life, and his investigations have shown that practically no sockeye, reaching the ocean as fry, return to the rivers as mature fish. It therefore follows that sockeye fry liberated in rivers and streams that are lake outlets have been a total loss.

"Hatchery troughs", continued Mr. Doyle "have smooth sides and bottom and offer no opportunity for the young fish to hide, and Mr. A. Robertson, officer in charge of the Harrison lake hatchery, has pointed out that fish raised therein at least partially lose the natural instinct to bury themselves under gravel when danger threatens. Indeed, he says, they come to know the attendant that feeds them and swim toward him when he appears with their food. It stands to reason that such fish, even when deposited in the waters of a lake, will fail to protect themselves against their natural enemies, and, lacking the instinct to seek shelter, would doubtless swim around until entering the current of the lake outlet, they would be swept seaward and likewise perish in their fry stage upon reaching salt water.

"Practically all the fish reared in the Harrison lake watershed have been liberated as fry in either the lake or the lake outlet. Few, if any, were planted in the streams flowing into the lake from which in the past the parent fish were secured. If my theory is correct, it follows that practically all those produced by hatchery operations have been lost, but in addition, and more important still, stripping the spawning streams year after year of the parent fish, with no attempt made to replace them with hatchery fry, has eliminated natural propagation as a factor in those streams.

"Years ago the Harrison lake watershed was the main spawning area of Fraser river sockeye; to-day its spawning beds are deserted while mature fish pass them by to ascend the Lillooet and Berkenhead; and I believe the depletion of these streams and the consequent diminution in the quantity of salmon in Harrison lake is largely, if not entirely, due to hatchery operations.

"But while the past has been disastrous, the future seems bright. The spring salmon hatcheries of the Columbia and Sacramento rivers have been successful in restoring the runs on those rivers, and all conversant with conditions in those waters know this to be the case. It only remains for us to ascertain the proper procedure for sockeye propagation when success with that species will likewise surely follow."

Mr. Doyle refers to the success which has been had in the Oregon fisheries. As a matter of fact, on the Columbia river they had almost the same experience that we had on the Fraser river, and in 1895 they were practically in the same position there as we are on the Fraser river to-day, that is, their run of salmon had decreased to such an extent that everybody was alarmed and it was feared that the whole stream would be depleted. The Oregon authorities have been studying the subject for some years, and they have worked out a system which, it seems to me, could be very well applied to the Fraser river; and not only to the Fraser river, but also to all the other rivers and streams in British Columbia where the sockeye runs. Their scheme was the building of retaining ponds. According to our methods of hatching salmon, the fry was turned out after a very few months when it was very small and not able to protect itself from its natural enemies, or to withstand the action of the salt water. In Oregon they built a very large retaining pond—of course, a great many of these retaining ponds were built—and then the small fish were kept in those ponds until they were a year and a half old.

Mr. DUFF: Were they fresh water or salt water ponds?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Fresh water. Then the fry were turned out to sea. They were turned out not into an outlet of a lake, as was the case with us almost universally, but into a stream—a gravel stream preferably—which led into a lake. The fish were at an age when they knew something and were able not only to protect themselves, but their instinct was sufficiently developed to prompt them to go out to sea and to come back. The fisheries on the Columbia went from bad to worse until very lately—I think it was about a year or so ago—and a great deal of discontent followed as to the method which they were trying to work out there. But when sufficient time was allowed for these small fish to come back, they found that they did come back in the shape of larger and better fish than they ever had there before, and in such increased numbers that the run approached the greatest run ever known on the Columbia river. At the present time that river has come back to its own, and other rivers and streams in Oregon have also come back to their own, so that the fisheries of that state have been restored almost to normal. What has been

done by the Americans surely can be done by us, and I submit to the minister that the system in use in Oregon should be studied very carefully by his staff, with a view to its application to the province of British Columbia.

Another point in connection with the hatcheries is that it seems to me where we are hatching out fish, as we do on the Fraser river, while the Americans in the state of Washington are doing nothing in the way of propagation and are getting our fish, they should be required to assist us to some extent in maintaining our hatcheries. I think that is only reasonable, and I believe if suggested to them in the right way they might be prepared to assist us.

Another suggestion which I should like respectfully to make to the minister is that the administration of the fisheries should be reorganized. At the present time everything is run from Ottawa. Now, although they have competent men here, they are a long way from the Pacific and they are a long way from the Atlantic. I submit that we should have both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific local boards which should act in an advisory capacity, and, if possible, have executive powers. This is not a new suggestion; the matter has been put before the department more than once. It was discussed very thoroughly before the Royal Commission appointed by the Government in 1917 to investigate fisheries conditions on the Pacific Coast. In the report of that commission the matter was dealt with as follows:

> Your Commissioners are of opinion that the plan of organization of the administrative system should be reconsidered with a view to making it more effective in dealing with the important problems of the Pacific fisheries. The outline sketch of the present system, given in the introduction, does not reveal practical co-ordination among the various related services under the control of the Dominion, and there is, moreover, the problem of the overlapping activities of the Dominion and the province. The system is characterized by extreme centralization at Ottawa, and yet only in the Minister of the Naval Service does it there find unity, there being no one official in Ottawa, exclusively assigned to fishery problems, in whom centre all the administrative activities directly affecting the fisheries. On the Pacific Coast there is no connection at all between the different services and the powers of local officials are strictly limited. In the inspection service, for example, although the local inspectors may issue renewal licenses to licensees in good standing, apparently almost everything else must be referred to Ottawa for decision.
>
> The fishing interests have made many representations in favour of more immediate access to executive authority. What is now known as the Pacific Committee of the Advisory Board does not meet the particular need felt. This Pacific Committee consists of the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, chairman, the Commissioner of Fisheries, the General Superintendent of Fisheries, the Assistant Superintendent of Fisheries, the General Inspector of Pickled Fish, who are all officials of the Department at Ottawa, and the Chief Inspector for British Columbia and a representative of the provincial administration, the Deputy Commissioner of Fisheries; and there has recently been added one non-official member, a resident of the northern part of the province. In so far as this committee makes an occasion, once or twice a year, for certain higher officials to sit in conference, it is valuable, and the presence of the representative of the Provincial Department of Fisheries is of importance, but it is, in the main, only a method by which these officials work out their problems; it does not bring together all the higher officials of the services bearing on the fisheries; and it does not alter the general nature of the system nor create a local organ.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose, I was reading from a report of the Royal Commission on Fisheries, 1917, and I would like to read just this further short extract from that report:

> The Pacific fisheries have been producing about 40 per cent in value of the total fishery output of the Dominion, and are capable of great further development. The administrative system clearly should be so adjusted as to operate directly, comprehensively and effectively on the spot; for, as has already been emphasized, the fisheries are a great business and the constitutional position is such that the administrative system must determine, almost from day to day, the conditions under which the business can be operated. Mere changes in organization will not, in themselves, ensure constructive and efficient action and those responsible for results can best shape the instrument they will use. If a local organization is created it might centre in an individual who under the authority of the minister could co-ordinate and direct the local operations of all the different services related to the fisheries, or in a commission, which might include in its membership one or more capable business men with local knowledge.
>
> Larger expenditures will be required even under the most efficient organization, but any wise expenditures will be comparatively small outlays to bring about the increasing national returns, which this highly productive industry can be made to yield. Increased provision should be made for scientific investigation, and it would seem most desirable that the scientific experts should be brought into more direct relationship to the practical daily problems. The present inspection staff is undermanned even for the work now undertaken.

In this report other matters are dealt with, but as I have now taken up a little more time than I expected, I shall not refer to them particularly. They all tend to

point out that the fisheries of the Pacific coast can be greatly developed, and, I presume, the same thing would apply to the Atlantic fisheries, and also, no doubt, to the inland fisheries.

The request for a local board on the Pacific coast is very general; it is advocated by the fishermen, boards of trade, business interests, cannery men and, I might say, practically the whole community. We feel we are so far away, that it is very difficult under present conditions to make the necessary progress. The feeling which exists at the present time amongst all those interested in fisheries is a very good one, and I think they are all working and striving towards the same end, which is to increase the fishery output of the Pacific and also to improve the methods of propagation.

The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) last session made some remarks derogatory to the cannery interests. He stated, I understand, that they constituted a big monopoly, and from his remarks one would infer generally that they were rather unfair in their operations. This is the first time that I have had an opportunity of saying anything on the subject, and I simply want to put myself on record as being opposed to the views which the hon. member for Skeena apparently holds. The cannery men have invested in that business a large sum of money running into something like fifteen million dollars or so; they are good businessmen, good citizens; they are carrying on legitimate businesses, and I do not think they should have been subjected to the criticisms which the hon. member made last session.

I have said that the request for this board is backed by practically the whole community. In April of last year, a delegation representing the Vancouver Board of Trade and the British Columbia fishery interests came to Ottawa and presented to the minister a memorial in favour of this board, which memorial I would crave the indulgence of the House to read, because it states the situation very well and gives the views of the people of British Columbia. This memorial, which is dated April 30, 1920, and addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) reads:

> For years those interested in the fisheries of British Columbia have urged your department to appoint a local board to control and administer the industry. It is felt that many of the problems which have given your officials great concern, and have been very disturbing factors to all engaged in this branch of our natural resources, might easily have been adjusted if dealt with by a competent local board that was familiar with all the various phases which entered into the questions requiring adjustment.
>
> The lack of such a local board compelled the submission of these matters to Ottawa, where only the leading aspects of the case would be known to your officials and their decisions, based on those leading issues, only partially dealt with the trouble. Adjustments which ignored the minor features of these problems often opened the door to a host of small complaints which grew in volume the longer they were neglected, until eventually they constituted grievances which affected the whole province.
>
> In asking for this board, we do not wish to cast any reflection upon the officials of your department. We believe their decisions were only arrived at after giving the question deliberate and painstaking investigation, and that they honestly believed their findings were in the best interests of the fishing industry of British Columbia. We submit, however, that their lack of familiarity with all phases of the issues was bound to have an adverse influence on their judgment, and that this is always to be expected when questions of this nature are settled by parties living three thousand miles away from the seat of operations.
>
> You as a successful business man of large affairs know, from your own experience, how much better results are obtained from personal interviews than from letter-writing. You can appreciate how points of major importance will be brought out in conversation which it would never occur to a correspondent to mention. Mail order houses unquestionably do a large business, but there is more satisfaction and less complaint when buyers and sellers come into personal contact.
>
> In dealing with Ottawa we must necessarily rely on letter-writing for the presentation of most of the matters affecting the fisheries of British Columbia which require adjustment. Personal interviews involve the loss of too much time and the expenditure of money which often cannot be afforded. As an illustration of this we would mention the British Columbia Fisheries Protective Association and the soldiers' associations wished to send a delegate on this present occasion but were prevented by a lack of funds for the journey and because the loss of earnings for their delegate would also have to be compensated for.
>
> As corrobation of our contention that your officials are not fully cognizant of all the points involved in our fishery question, we would point out that your predecessors have, on at least five different occasions, sent commissioners out to investigate, report, and make suggestions for the guidance of your department in devising regulations for the British Columbia fisheries. We submit that this in itself is a confession of weakness in the present system.

I might mention, of course, that these commissioners were not all appointed by the present Administration, or by the Conservative Administration which preceded it.

The States of California, Oregon, Washington, and the territory of Alaska, all have fisheries problems similar to those of British Columbia. In the cases of California and Oregon control is vested in fishery commissioners

possessing full administrative powers, and the industry in these two states is flourishing. Not only are there no contentious questions requiring settlement, but through intelligent, artificial propagation work the fisheries in their waters show actual increases. Shad have been introduced into the waters of both states and to-day California annually ships many carloads of shad to supply the demands of the eastern markets, while Oregon has worked up a successful business in canning this species.

As to salmon, California, after sixty years of strenuous commercial fishing produces more than it did in the beginning, and the Oregon Fish Commission advise us that "Columbia river and several of our coast streams have been holding their own, due to no other reasons, except that there has been a large number of good, healthy, advanced fingerlings turned into the same annually."

The State of Washington has the control of its fisheries placed in the hands of one fish commissioner. This man voluntarily asked that his office be made subservient to a fisheries commission "empowered to regulate fishery operations to the extent of saying how, when and where they may be carried on, and with ample authority to enforce such regulations." He adds: "This commission should take the place of a fish commissioner, for the power to be delegated by the legislature should be to three or four men rather than to a single individual. It can be elective or appointive, and should be apart from politics or partisanship; free to act solely for the interests of the state in rehabilitating and perpetuating a great natural resource now approaching destruction."

I might say here that the State of Washington has now placed its fisheries under a local board.

The laws and regulations governing Alaska's fisheries are in the hands of the Federal Government. The law provides that before any change of regulations are made, public meetings must be held at Seattle, San Francisco, or in Alaska as best suits the convenience of those directly interested, and the subsequent requlations are based on the evidence submitted at such meetings. In addition, the newly prepared Alaska Fisheries Bill was determined and drafted by a local board appointed by the Federal Government for that specific purpose.

In New Zealand, in Scotland, in Norway, and we believe also in France and Portugal, the control and administration of the fisheries is vested in local boards. Not only have these boards become strong factors in fostering and building up the industry, but in all these countries the operations of the industry are carried on much smoother and more effectively than is the case in British Columbia under the methods in vogue there at present.

As previously mentioned, California and Oregon, operating under local boards devoting all their time and energies to the purpose, are showing increased production through artificial propagation accomplishments. Washington is asking for a local administrative board so as to secure the same effect. Washington's case is similar to ours, except that their propagation work is farther advanced and their methods more efficient. Artificial propagation in British Columbia has been a notorious failure; the methods employed are obsolete; and instead of making efforts to modernize the system, more money is now being spent to perpetuate the old policies.

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

British Columbia has a coast line of over 7,000 miles. Along this coast are over 1,000 streams, each possessing its individual runs of salmon. Excessive fishing in each and all of these streams means extermination of the runs unless the commercial depletion is offset by re-stocking each stream with fish secured through artificial propagation. It is not in the public interest to confine the industry of the future to Fraser and Skeena rivers, Rivers Inlet, and a few isolated points on Vancouver Island, where all your hatcheries are at present located. We must be just as particular to build up the thousand small rivers and streams, from which, in the aggregate, the most of our production is obtained. This means more extensive securing of salmon eggs; the building and upkeep of retaining ponds for the resultant fry; some methods for properly distributing the young fish and some authoritative body that will oversee their subsequent development and welfare. It is out of the question for such work to be administered from headquarters three thousand miles distant; the present Vancouver staff have too many duties of their own to undertake work outside of their present sphere; the local administrative board has been found successful by our American competitors and we believe is the only feasible solution of the British Columbia fisheries problems.

It has been suggested you might be adverse to voluntarily handing over to such a local board as we ask for, the administration and control of the fisheries of British Columbia. We do not believe, however, you will view this question so narrowly. You have already demonstrated a broader-minded policy by diverting some of the Ottawa work and responsibilities to chief inspectors in Vancouver, Halifax and other points. This is the first step in the direction of the goal we are seeking. You have also divested yourself of the administration of operations of Vancouver harbour. It is only reasonable to suppose that if the direction of Vancouver harbour matters warrants the establishment of a local administrative board to operate and control them, an industry so vast and with such diverse and intricate problems as our fisheries contain, would be still more in need of local administration.

The board we are asking for is one that would be as fully administrative in every respect as is the Vancouver Harbour Commission. It would be non-political, and should consist of commissioners whose term of office would be sufficiently long as to give the industry the full benefit of the knowledge and experience they acquire. These commissioners should be three in number, one a bona fide experienced fisherman, one a practical cannery man, and a third, who would also be chairman, a returned soldier of qualified legal attainments. Neither the fisherman or canner commissioners should be permitted to remain interested in the commercial industry, and all should be provided with sufficient salary to make them independent.

In asking for the appointment of this board we are voicing the desires of the vast interests represented by the Vancouver Board of Trade; the interests of those engaged in the fishing industry in any and every capacity; and we are acting in the interests of the public at large. We do not wish you to look upon it as a plea from the salmon industry alone, for development upon proper lines, and under proper control, is just as much needed for our herring, pilchard, halibut and other deep sea fisheries, as well as our shell fishes. A local board dealing with this

newer development can avoid much of the mistakes which have led to friction in the salmon industry, and by carefully studying the situation from the beginning, can so regulate matters that the industries will be protected and production of new fish will keep pace with commercial demands.

The other fisheries referred to, cod, halibut, herring, whales, and all the other fish we have there, are of course very important. In British Columbia we have practically every kind of fish except lobster. We have no lobsters in British Columbia.

Another suggestion I would make is that something should be done to eliminate the natural enemies of the salmon, and in this connection I wish to refer to the report of the Fisheries Commission before mentioned. I shall quote just a short extract:

> The destruction of salmon, in various stages from the egg to the mature fish, by seals, ducks, eagles and trout is very great in the aggregate. Trout are very plentiful in the streams where the salmon spawn and consume large quantities of the eggs and the fry. The checking of this wastage is obviously in the interests of conservation. Witnesses before the commission did not, however, suggest very definite methods of dealing with the problem. Restrictions on the taking of trout for the market might be removed from salmon streams and the fishing of sportsmen encouraged; and at some expenditure by way of bounties, or otherwise, it is believed methods could be found for reducing the number of seals.

The most dangerous enemy of the salmon is the seal, particularly on the Fraser river. There are at the present time on the sandbars at the mouth of the Fraser thousands of these seals, and I am told that they are taking more fish than the fishermen themselves, and that they even take the fish out of the fishermen's nets. This condition is not a new one, but I am sorry to say that nothing has been done of any practical value to meet the situation. Various half-baked schemes have been tried, but without any practical results. The seals are still there and, if anything, in greater numbers than ever. Something like two years ago the Department of Fisheries did try to do something in the way of destroying seals. They mined one of the sandbars, but it was very difficult to do much in that way, because as you all know, a seal is a very wise creature and it is difficult to put up any job on him. But after taking weeks, the officials finally succeeded in mining this sand bar. They were able to set off the mines when there were a good number of seals there, and according to their report they killed about 500. I might mention that there was for a time a bounty on seals, but it was not large enough to encourage anyone to get after them for the reason that when you shoot seals the majority of them sink, and it is only once in a while that you can get one. In order to secure the bounty, you must produce a part of the seal—I think, one of the ears—in order to substantiate the claim that you have actually destroyed it. So that that arrangement was not very satisfactory. Now the fishermen have suggested that the proper method of meeting the situation would be the use of cross lines. These lines are, of course, dangerous to other species of fish, particularly to sturgeon. We have still some sturgeon in the river and in the lakes adjoining it, and some of these fish sometimes attain a weight of 1,500 pounds. This may possibly be regarded as a "fish" story, but it is true, nevertheless. The department has gone so far as to accept the suggestion of the fishermen, but in such a restricted way that it was considered by the men rather in the light of a joke. The department offered to put on two crews of two men each, and allow them to use cross lines for one week. The fishermen do not consider that good enough; they are of the opinion that nothing can be accomplished thereby. They suggest, however, that during the months of December, January, and February they be allowed to use cross lines, and in addition, that they be given a bonus of $5 per seal. If that is not satisfactory to the department, then they urge that the department put on a number of crews and allow them to work there for three months. They claim that they would undoubtedly catch quite a number of seals and this would have the effect of intimidating other seals and inducing them to leave that district, because, as I explained before, the seal is very wily, and when he finds that the Government is really after him I have no doubt he will quit. I think that this is something that should be seriously considered. There is no question that the menace exists; and there is also the trout menace to cope with. This is serious, and nothing is being done in the matter at all. As a matter of fact, I think that trout eggs have even been placed in some of the lakes and streams in that district.

I would also suggest that something be done to build up a Canadian fishing community. This is something we have not got at present. On the Atlantic coast there are, of course, a great many fishermen who are good citizens and who help to build up the resources of the country, besides contributing to its population. In our country, unfortunately, the Japanese pre-

dominate; and although the Japanese fisherman is an industrious worker, he does nothing towards the building up of the country. Unquestionably he makes money out of the fishing industry, but most of it he sends away to Japan. Most of the Japanese keep themselves and their families on their boats. Of course, they can never be assimilated in this country.

According to the list which has been given me, a great many nationalities are represented in our fishing communities, but very few of them are Canadian; indeed, very few are British. This, I think is wrong. I think we should have a fishing community there composed of our own people, for Canadians should be given the advantage of our own natural resources. Of course, I understand that there is great difficulty in eliminating the Japanese, who apparently are there to stay; but it does strike me that it is not right that conditions should be such as prevail at the present time. If a number of Canadians went to Japan and predominated in any industry, as the Japanese predominate in the fishing industry in British Columbia, there would be some trouble over there, and it is safe to say that some means would be adopted to alter that condition. I am convinced that the fisheries of the Pacific Coast, of the Atlantic Coast, and of the interior, can be greatly developed under a proper system of control; and if you can double or treble the fishing products of the Pacific Coast, for instance, you will help your railways as well as your steamships, besides assisting a great number of our people. The bulk of our fish is exported. I have in my hand a card sent me from Prince Rupert, showing the number of fishing craft there at the docks, and on the back of it is written the following:

> Halibut is marketed in Prince Rupert three times weekly. This photograph represents one day's arrivals. This shipment represents $17,000 to transportation companies and requires exactly one-third of the available express refrigerator cars to handle.

If you take the whole shipment of halibut from Prince Rupert alone, you will find that many hundreds of cars are required during the course of a year from our national railways to take care of the transportation of this product. A large number of our ships could be used to take our canned salmon to other countries. I say, therefore, that to encourage the fisheries of Canada is to help in no small way to meet the situation with which the Government is now faced,—a large deficit in the operation of its railways and steamships.

Mr. John A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): The importance of the subject covered by the resolution cannot, I think, be over-estimated. This fact has been demonstrated in the annual meetings of corporations such as banks and other financial concerns during the past few years. At almost every one of these meetings presidents and managers have given considerable attention to the question of the development of our natural resources. By way of illustration I would quote from a statement made by the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway at an annual meeting, I think, in 1919, as follows:—

> With the vigorous development of the country's natural resources and the necessary extension of the markets of Canada, we have every reason for confidence in the future prosperity of the country.

This subject is one which, possibly, has been as widely discussed as any other before the people at the present time. It has furnished a prolific crop of speeches at general meetings of boards of trade, Canadian clubs, and public associations generally which have met during a number of years past in Canada. The question arises first as to the extent of our natural resources. We are accustomed to hearing the statement that our resources are unlimited. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether we know very much about what our natural resources really are; and it is doubtful also whether in some cases statements on the subject have not been very much exaggerated. At any rate, we know that our natural resources, whatever they may be, are of no use to us unless they are developed. They are no more useful to us than is a withered arm to a man. They do not provide work for the people; they do not provide wealth with which to discharge our national debt; nor do they in any other way assist us. Instead of having a policy for the development of these resources, we have at present a policy—if there really is one—which tends rather the other way. There are now handicaps that prevent the proper development of our natural resources. For instance, the present tariff, in my opinion, has the effect of retarding such development, rather than of assisting it. The importance of this development is set out in an article appearing in the Toronto Saturday Night:

> Our resources are now our reserves. Not only are they owned by the citizens of Canada, but they must be employed to lighten the bur-

den of the war.* * * How all this is going to work out may only be imagined, but one would think that even if the state does not set up businesses for itself, it will have to reach down into business and see that our "great natural resources" are developed into profitable enterprises, to the end that all the people will not go broke paying war taxes.

Now this is the sentiment which has been expressed far and wide. It is the sentiment which has been expressed already in this House and we shall hear more of it; but the point is that the expression of the sentiment has not got us anywhere up to the present time. What we now want is some active, definite policy which if pursued to the end will result in the development hoped for.

Before I enter further upon the consideration of this subject in a general way, I would like to bring to the atention of the Government a matter in regard to which I asked a question last year. The answer to that question was rather general, and in the light of information subsequently obtained, inaccurate. The question I asked had reference to the Economic Development Commission. I inquired when the commission was appointed, what work had been done and what its cost was. The answer given to me was:

No report has been made but the duties of the commission being largely suggestive and advisory, their views on certain subjects have been discussed informally with the Government for the purpose of advising or assisting the Government touching many subjects upon which it has been advisory to take action by legislation or otherwise.

The cost of the commission to that date was given as $23,200.48. The answer being so delightfully general, inconclusive and unsatisfactory I set myself to find out if I could not get information in regard to this commission from some other source, and I obtained a copy of the Order in Council appointing it. The Order in Council is dated 28th June, 1915. I will not read it but merely mention in a general way what appeared to be the intention in the appointment of the commission. In the preamble it is stated:

The Prime Minister observes that the need is everywhere recognized of stimulating greater production in Canada.

A little further on there is this clause:

That before export the product should be converted through manufacture in Canada into the form in which it is proposed to be consumed or used.

Further on the question of the marketing of our food products is recommended to the commission; and later the question of opportunities for a vigorous and effective policy of immigration is commended to the commission's consideration. Still further on it is set out that "transportation whether by land or water carriage, for reasons above indicated, is closely connected with the problems under consideration." It would appear from this Order in Council that the commission when it was appointed was given a sort of roving commission to investigate matters generally in connection with production and distribution.

To obtain further information I searched Hansard and found that the matter was brought up on May 9th, 1916. In reply to a question on that date the then Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, said:

There have been reports made to me some times written and sometime oral.* * * I do however believe that a good deal of really important and interesting work has been done.

In conclusion Sir Robert Borden said:

I believe they will have a full report before next session.

The question again came up in 1917 in connection with an item in the estimates to provide for the expenses of this commission, and particularly in regard to the sum of $750 voted to Mr. E. H. Godfrey. In reply to a question by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) the Minister of Railways made this statement:

They have reports ready and these reports have been edited by Mr. Godfrey who was paid $750 for that work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although I was informed last year that no reports had been furnished, yet at an earlier period two members of the Government stated that reports had been supplied and the gentleman referred to had been paid $750 to edit those reports. It would now be in order for the Government to explain these contradictory statements, give us the information asked for regarding this Economic Development Commission, and produce reports which are stated to have been made.

It may be that the commission in question was appointed to arrive at some policy along the lines of the resolution we are discussing. If that is the case nothing of the kind seems to have resulted from its activities. Surely the House is entitled to be furnished with some information as to how the $23,000 mentioned has been spent. It would appear to me that if we want an example of how not to do a thing we have a very fitting illustration in the case which I have cited.

The objects to be achieved by the development of our natural resources are briefly as follows: To create wealth; to provide raw materials for our industries and to adjust trade balances, I am not one of those who believe that the matter of exchange depends very much, if to any extent, upon the situation relatively regarding trade balances; but still it is always advisable to increase our exports as much as possible, and the development of our natural resources will help, to a large extent, to bring that result about. Another reason is that such development would have a tendency to put the West and the East in a similar position. I do not think that even in this event the West would depart from what it thinks is the proper policy to pursue in the interests of the whole country; but if manufactories spring up in the West and develop our natural resources, then the situation there would be similar to that in the East. And the West could not be accused of advocating a policy solely in its own interest.

The resolution calls for a definite policy in connection with our natural resources. I have not the temerity to formulate such a policy and hand it to the Government; but there are a few matters that I might briefly mention which I think should be taken into consideration in connection with any policy upon which the Government themselves may determine. In the first place I would advocate a systematic survey of the territory wherein lie these natural resources which await development. As I intimated previously we really do not know what we have in the way of natural wealth, and such a survey should necessarily precede the actual development. Already in this debate mention has been made of the work which the Geological Survey has done in this connection, and I desire to emphasize the remarks of the hon. member who made that reference—I think it was my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson).

Unfortunately the Geological Survey Department at the present time is very much undermanned and underpaid. It has been doing a great work, particularly in connection with our mineral resources, in the way of pathfinding or pointing out where such resources may be found. But the staff of this department is very much below its normal strength, and in my opinion, not only should the staff be brought up to normal, but it should be greatly increased and the salaries increased also, because there is no question that more men are required to carry on the survey, and by reason of the inadequate salaries many of the best qualified members of the staff have left the department to take more remunerative positions elsewhere.

Another illustration I might give is in connection with forestry. A little while ago in one of the forestry journals I read a statement to the effect that: There is no use at the present time trying to take up the subject of reforestation. The first thing we must do is to endeavour to protect the forests we have. We have immense stretches of timber and pulpwood, especially in the northern parts of Western Canada, and the amount of destruction by fire each year is really criminal. In my opinion the only way by which we can prevent this destruction is by the use of an aeroplane fire protection service. I will not go into details, but this work has been done very efficiently and very satisfactorily in the United States. I am corresponding at the present time with a young Canadian who had been in the Canadian Air Service overseas, but who when he came back to Canada found no opportunity of continuing his flying activities in Canada, and so took a position in the United States Air Service. He is now doing excellent work in California. He has told me what the Air Service is doing there in the way of fire protection—work that it is utterly impossible to accomplish except from the air. In northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan where there are hundreds of thousands of acres of pulpwood and timber only a few men are employed in the summertime in fireranging work, and it is utterly impossible for them to cover the ground thoroughly or to do anything in the way of controlling or extinguishing fires when they do break out. As many as a dozen fires are sometimes raging in a district extending over a distance of a few score miles in area, and the fireranging staff is utterly inadequate to cope with even one of those fires. During the past twenty-five years one-half of the timber resources of that north country has been destroyed.

But a necessary prerequisite to any plan of developing these natural resources is the transfer of those resources in the western provinces to the provincial authorities. I do not propose to discuss this question at this time as there is a resolution on the Order Paper covering the point, but until it is finally settled we cannot expect to have any definite policy agreed upon. The Federal Government has intimated that it proposes to transfer those resources to the

western provinces, and, of course, if that is done there would appear to be no particular reason why a definite policy should be formulated by the federal authorities in respect to such resources and naturally the provincial authorities must wait until the natural resources are under their control before they can decide what policy they will pursue.

Another point that has already been touched upon is co-ordinating the development of our natural resources with the upbuilding of our National railway system. As an illustration I might mention that last year the Canadian National Railway built a branch line twenty-five miles northeast of Melfort, Saskatchewan, through a well settled country. Beyond this district is another area of good land which is not so well settled, being subject to flooding at certain periods of the year. This is known as the Moose Range area comprising about one hundred and nineteen thousand acres. When the railway is extended the best route will be through this area. The natural thing to do in connection with the extension of the railway and the development of the country would be to drain that area, and it could be done at a cost of about $2.50 an acre. When drained the land will be just as good as that through which the railway is already built and which is well settled. I understand, however, that although this project had been practically decided upon, the Estimates have been cut down so that it is not possible to undertake the work this year. Here is something which on the face of it the Government should take in hand in the interests of the whole country. This is a case where the expenditure of a few dollars will be returned a thousandfold, not only directly in the upbuilding and development of the country, but indirectly, which is just as important, in the furnishing of traffic for that railway; and with the extension of the line through this district it will be eventually well settled, and justify still further railway development. I will not pursue this illustration further, but it seems to me that at this particular time it is important to point out that we must co-ordinate the development of our country and the development of traffic for our railways. It is far more important that such development work as this should be taken in hand than that some other public works such as drydocks or canals be constructed.

I had intended to take up at some length the question of the development of our mineral areas, but I shall content myself with merely referring to the anomaly that arises from the fact that although the Department of Mines is divided into two branches—the Geological Survey and the Mines branch—neither of them has anything to do with the actual mines or mineral areas, these being looked after by the Department of the Interior. Besides there is no mining law so far as the Dominion is concerned. Those who engage in mining have to depend on regulations which are subject to change from time to time. The situation is entirely unsatisfactory, and until the Federal Government enact proper mining legislation there can be no satisfactory mining development in the territory which is owned by the Dominion Government. The provinces of Ontario and British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces, and the states to the south of us, all have mining laws; but the federally owned areas which are known as mining lands are governed entirely by mining regulations which, as I have said, may be changed from time to time. Some one has said: it is better to have a poor mining law than good regulations, because then there is the element of permanency and the miner can govern himself accordingly. I might continue indefinitely on this subject, but I shall content myself by emphasizing the fact that one of the first things this Government must do if they wish mining to be developed in the territory over which they have control is to enact mining legislation along the lines pursued in Ontario or in British Columbia.

Last year I mentioned another matter which is of great importance not only in the interest of mineral development but to the returned soldiers, namely, the question of prospecting by means of parties of returned soldiers. It was stated by the Minister of Mines a year or so ago that such a scheme would not be feasible, but since that time it has been worked out in other countries. I understand that in Australia a scheme of that kind is now in operation; British Columbia also has a similar plan. I am not sure whether it is in force as yet, but in any case it looks feasible and I have no doubt that if it is not already in operation it will be put into effect very shortly. There would seem to be no reason why an interesting and profitable occupation should not be afforded our returned soldiers in that way, with the result not only of discovering but also of developing our mining areas.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) has mentioned the scheme in connection with reindeer outlined by Mr.

Stefansson. Great credit should be given to Mr. Stefansson for the information which he has given to us in connection with the north country. We now know that the map of Canada has been rolled back many miles; that the north country, which has hitherto been looked upon as a vast, barren waste, is capable of supporting a considerable population and of producing as much meat in the way of reindeer and caribou as the southern country is producing by its cattle and sheep. I understand that Mr. Stefansson has already secured from the Government a lease or concession of some kind in respect to the southern half of Baffin island and that he is now purchasing reindeer to put on this territory in order to demonstrate the feasibility of the project.

I might continue indefinitely on this subject, Mr. Speaker, but I intimated that I would not take up very much time, and as there are other speakers on the programme and it is the desire, presumably, to conclude the debate this evening, I shall give way to the others.

Mr. T. E. SIMPSON (West Algoma): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this motion I desire to compliment the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) for bringing the matter before the House and affording to hon. members an opportunity to discuss the development of our national resources, a subject which, to my mind, is one of the most important that can be considered at this time by Parliament or the Canadian people.

I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson) describing in a splendid manner the natural resources of that country situated so far to the north. I could not help being impressed by the great possibilities that lie before this country in the proper development of its natural resources. But vast as they may be, these resources are of no real value in their undeveloped state; only as we develop them and bring them into use can they contribute anything toward the comfort or sustenance of man or toward the liquidation of our national debt. Take for example, the great basic industry of agriculture. We have approximately 450,000,000 acres of land in this country suitable for agricultural purposes, but only about one-tenth of it is at present under cultivation.

9 p.m.

From this vast area that is not being cultivated no wealth is being derived. Only by pursuing a proper policy of immigration, a policy of encouragement to emigrants who are familiar with agricultural pursuits, can we hope to increase very materially the acreage under cultivation. I want to commend the policy of the Government in that regard. They have been trying to encourage the coming to Canada from Great Britain and the United States of persons who have had agricultural experience and who are willing to come to this country and settle on the land.

The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) this afternoon made some reference to the immigration policy of the Government. He said that he had read in the press an item in which it was stated that two or three shiploads of emigrants—I think they were Poles—had been refused admission to this country by the Immigration Department, and he expressed his regret on that account. But, Mr. Speaker, unless those immigrants had agricultural experience and were prepared upon entering this country to go on the land, the immigration authorities were perfectly right in refusing admission to them. We do not want shiploads of immigrants coming to Canada at this time to compete in the labour market with our own Canadian citizens, many of whom are out of employment.

We have also heard it stated, not only in this House but elsewhere, that the policy of this Government was not in the best interests of the farmer; that it made his agricultural implements dear and did not provide a proper market for his products, and that as a result it was militating against agricultural development in this country. I would like to quote some figures which I think should set hon. gentlemen right on this question. In 1914 the number of acres in farm crops in Canada was 33,436,675; in 1917, 42,602,288; in 1919, 53,049,640, an increase in area under crop of over 10,500,000 acres in two years and of almost 20,000,000 acres in five years. Then, let us compare the values of the farm crops produced in these different years. In 1914 the value of the farm crops produced was $638,580,300; in 1917, $1,144,636,450 and in 1919, $1,452,437,500. This, I submit, does not indicate any serious set-back to this great natural industry under the policy of this Government.

It has been stated also that farms have been abandoned in Ontario. Let us look into the figures for Ontario as applying to the period to which I have just referred. The acreage under cultivation in Ontario in 1914 was 8,973,700; in 1917, 8,233,500; in 1919, 9,915,884. The acreage under cultiva-

tion in 1917 was a little less than it was in 1914, but in 1919 there were 1,682,384 more acres under cultivation than there were in 1917. This, I think, Sir, should be a sufficient answer to the statement that farms in Ontario are being abandoned.

With some of our important natural resources, such as coal, fisheries, and oil, I shall not deal to-night; they have been referred to at length by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I should like to refer briefly to our timber and mineral resources. The forest area of Canada is estimated at nearly 600,000,000 acres, about two-thirds of which is covered with marketable timber, so that the House will realize the great wealth producing possibilities of this national asset. What I should like to impress upon the Government is the necessity, not only of preventing wastage by fire of this great national asset, but of seeing that the timber is manufactured into the finished product in Canada, in Canadian mills, and with the employment of Canadian labour. In order to see the benefits which would accrue from a policy of this kind, let us look for a moment at the pulp and paper industry. A few years ago there were practically no pulp and paper mills in Canada, and practically all the pulp wood that was cut in our forests was exported to the United States. The provincial legislatures, however, yielding to strong representations that were made to them, placed an embargo on the export of pulpwood from crown lands. What was the result? To-day, we have many pulp and paper mills in operation in this country. In several instances, flourishing towns have grown up in Canada as a result of industries having been placed in those particular localities, and I will cite just two or three instances in northern Ontario. The town of Espanola, with a population of 3,500 people grew up solely as a result of a pulp and paper mill having been placed there. The same thing is true of Iroquois Falls, with a population of about the same number, and Smooth Rock Falls, where the mill has not been in operation so long, with a population of about 1,500. There are other places where mills are just being erected and not yet put into operation, such as Kapuskasing. I believe a mill is operating at Timiskaming in the county of Pontiac.

But there is another important result. Instead of exporting all our pulpwood, for which we receive a very small amount, we are exporting finished product, and for the first ten months of the present fiscal year, exports of pulp and paper amounted to the splendid sum of $142,579,053, as compared with $83,576,178 in the first ten months of 1919-20 and $67,403,247 in the corresponding period of 1918-19. This is, I submit, a sufficient argument to prove the wisdom of home manufacture, even without our taking into consideration the effect of this export business on the balance of trade and on the stabilizing of our Canadian dollar. But while there is an embargo on the export of pulpwood from crown lands, there is no embargo on the export of pulpwood cut on lands that have been alienated from the crown, lands that are owned by private parties. What do we find? We find that in the first ten months of the present fiscal year, 1,243,112 cords of pulpwood were exported, in its natural state, to the United States, with the result that we receive only the sum of $16,396,940 for that vast quantity of pulpwood, whereas, had it been manufactured into the finished product, into newsprint, in Canadian mills, we would have received approximately $85,000,000 for that same amount of pulpwood. In addition to that, we had employment only for the lumberjacks, or what might be termed the lower class of labour, in cutting that wood, whereas United States mills provided the artisans or the highly-skilled workmen, and the wages to those highly-skilled men were paid in the United States. This is not the way to build up our country, and I would strongly urge that an export duty be placed on pulpwood cut on lands that have alienated from the crown. If that is done, this vast quantity of pulpwood will be manufactured in our Canadian mills and will provide employment to Canadian workmen instead of to workmen in the United States.

I had intended to deal at some length with the iron ore industry; but it has been gone into and dealt with very thoroughly by the hon. member for Fort William, and I will make only a few brief observations. We have in Canada some twenty blast furnaces, some of which are not at present in operation; but those that are operating, are using only a very small percentage of Canadian ore, only about four or five per cent, the reason for this being that, while we have vast quantities of iron ore in this Dominion, that ore is of a low grade, low in iron content and high in sulphur and other deleterious matter, and in order to bring this Canadian ore up to a marketable condition, it is necessary that it be given certain treatment which is

termed "beneficiation." It requires roasting or briquetting, and different methods of treatment. The capital expenditure for the plant necessary for this process and to develop the power necessary to operate such a plant is such that marketable ore cannot be produced cheaply enough to compete with United States ore. It is, therefore, necessary, if we intend to develop our iron and steel industry, to have it grow and expand in this country to a sufficient extent to take care of our requirements, that some assistance be given to its development.

This afternoon the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) took a pretty strong crack at the system of bounties, stating that this was a good old Tory policy; that it was the same old Tory plan of letting your friends get into the trough or the public treasury. I should like to remind my hon. friend that it was not the good old Tory party that gave the iron and steel bounties, as he said, but the Liberal party. It was the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency of Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who was then Finance Minister, who was largely responsible for those bounties being given, and I want to commend him for that because I think I can convince my hon. friend that it certainly was a wise policy to pursue at that time and has proven a success. I think all will admit that as a result of those bounties on iron and steel, which were given between the years 1896 and 1912, it was possible for the steel industry to become established in this country—an industry which now plays such an important part in the industrial life of Canada. I want to point out that the Dominion treasury did not lose one cent through giving those bounties, but on the other hand has received directly from the steel industry a greater sum than was ever paid out in bounty.

I have been able to obtain the figures covering only four large steel industries operating in Canada, and covering only the four years from 1915 to 1918 inclusive. In this four year period these four corporations paid directly into the Dominion treasury in customs duties $9,327,377, considerably more than one-half the amount paid out by way of bounty in the whole period, and when you take into account the customs duties that the other steel companies operating in this country have paid during the whole term of their operation I think all will admit that in that way alone much more has been returned to the Dominion treasury than was ever paid out by way of bounty. In addition to that, many employees of these steel corporations are drawing good, substantial salaries, and during the last three or four years I have no doubt that a nice snug sum has been paid into the treasury by way of income tax from these employees. But in addition to the amount that was paid directly into the Dominion treasury, we must take into account the general benefit to the country of these steel corporations. Let me give, for example, the amount that these four companies paid in freight during the four-year period to which I have referred. No less a sum than $30,625,323 was paid by these four corporations in freight in the four-year period from 1915-1918. These concerns employed during that period an average of 20,000 men and paid out in wages in that time $85,269,075. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this country lost nothing, but on the other hand, has been the gainer by a very large amount, through the bounties which were paid during the 15-year period from 1896 to 1912. I submit, further, that if it was a good policy to render assistance to the steel industry at that time, is it not worth while considering whether a similar policy would not be in the interests of the country in connection with our iron ore development at the present time?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in listening to the very able speeches that have been delivered in support of the resolution proposd by my hon. frind from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), and I wish to congratulate the mover for the non-partisan spirit which he displayed in presenting his views to the House. His motion reads:

> That in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Government should bring forward a policy having for its object the development of the natural resources of Canada.

That is a large order for the Government, and you will note in the language of the resolution an implied condemnation of the Government which my hon. friend supports so steadfastly. It is not so much a policy that this country wants at the present moment for the development of the natural resources of Canada; it is an up-to-date Government that is required. The present Administration has been in office ten years, yet the resolution as drafted by my hon. friend implies that in all those long years they have done absolutely nothing to develop the natural resources of

this country. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak this evening in any carping spirit.

I agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Simpson) that the policy of the Mowat Government for the development of the pulp industry in the province of Ontario has been an excellent one. It has been followed in my native province, thanks to the wisdom of the late Premier, the father of my friend, the present member for West Quebec, Hon. S. N. Parent, confirmed since by Sir Lomer Gouin. As a result of that policy, we have seen a great development in the province of Quebec. Cities and towns have sprung up on the St. Maurice river, on the Saguenay river, and on the St. Francis river. The present prosperity of the province of Quebec, from an industrial point of view, is largely due to the wise policy of the two heads of the local government —the late Hon. S. N. Parent and Sir Lomer Gouin. By that policy we have forced the Americans who heretofore had come to Quebec, depleted the Crown lands of pulp wood, and manufactured the finished product in the United States, to transplant their capital and their factories in the province of Quebec, and we now have a population of skilled working men, who in the next few years will make our province prosperous in a still greater degree.

As I stated a moment ago, it is a very large order which my hon. friend has placed in his resolution, viz., the development of the natural resources of Canada. It seems to me that it should be the A. B. C. of the policy of any Government to develop the natural resources of this country. After this terrible war Canada, above all things needs development to meet the problem of unemployment which remains unsettled. We must also attract capital into this Dominion, and favour sound immigration. I regret, by the way, that the Government has deemed it proper to abolish that excellent body which has done yeoman service during the last fifteen years; I mean the Conservation Commission. I am not aware that the United States have abolished their Conservation Commission, which has been of such great service in that country. The Conservation Commission was started under the Roosevelt administration, and it was because of the urgency of the question that the Laurier government instituted a similar commission in Canada. From the returns published from time to time, the Conservation Commission of Canada has been of great assistance to our industries generally. Through its activities and research work we have learned what immense natural resources we have in Canada.

One of my friends this afternoon spoke of the rich coal deposits in Alberta and in British Columbia. Through the Conservation Commission an estimate has been made of the amount of coal in Canada; and we have also seen by statistics published what inexhaustible resources we have in the water powers of this Dominion. It was my good fortune to visit the province of Alberta during the month of September last, and I must confess that I was amazed to find that that province contained such untold wealth in coal deposits. Indeed, I believe that if we can solve the transportation problem and the intricacies of the labour question in western Canada, this country, with its immense coal deposits in the East and in the West, can, and should, be independent of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, as Kipling says: "East is East, and West is West." I am not on my feet to speak of the West. Other speakers have extolled to the seventh sky the potential wealth there is in the Yukon Territory, in British Columbia, in Alberta, in Saskatchewan, in Manitoba, and in Central Canada. I intend to say a good word this evening for the dear old province of Quebec, and incidentally, for the Maritime Provinces. In the old province of Quebec, and especially in the district which I have the honour to represent jointly with my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and my hon. friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier), we also have great natural resources which are only awaiting the action of an up-to-date government to take hold of and fully develop them. The Gaspé peninsula is the oldest section of Canada. When Jacques Cartier sighted the shores of this country, he planted the cross at Fontenelle, near Gaspé basin; therefore, that is the gateway of Canada. It is a very picturesque country. The mountains remind one of the Alps, and the Baie des Chaleurs is reminiscent of the blue waters of the Mediterranean sea. But there is something else besides the picturesque in that country. We have natural resources. In the interior of the peninsula, we have nearly three million acres of virgin timber lands which are awaiting the opening up of that country through the construction of a railway. Now, I am not pleading for a government railway in the interior of the peninsula; far be that from my mind. I am only recalling to the House of Commons the fact that last year my good friend from

Matane introduced a private Bill with a view to obtaining a charter for the construction of a railway from Amqui on the Intercolonial railway, to the harbour in the Gaspé basin, through the interior of the peninsula. The best evidence was adduced before the Railway Committee in favour of the construction of that artery, and yet, in spite of our efforts to convince the majority of the committee that the charter should be granted, we were defeated by a few votes.

Mr. PELLETIER: One.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, one. But a few days before, this Parliament had renewed about forty charters for the West. I do not begrudge my western friends the support which they obtained from the majority, but I claim that they should have had the generosity to favour the project which was presented by my hon. friend from Matane. If this railway were built, the three million acres of virgin timber lands would immediately become of very great value, and we should witness a repetition of that industrial progress that has taken place in other parts of the province of Quebec. There are water powers which could be harnessed in the various rivers which traverse this peninsula. We have also in the interior very rich deposits of zinc, of lead; and traces have been found of shales, asbestos, silver and even oil. Yes, I can invite all my hon. friends in the House to "strike oil" in the peninsula of Gaspé.

Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that the railway which was projected by the legislation presented last year by my hon. friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier) would start at a point called Amqui on the Intercolonial and would run through the peninsula as far as Gaspé basin. Gaspé basin is a land-locked harbour, open practically all the year round. It is the nearest point between Canada and Liverpool, shortening the round trip by 1,100 miles. I say this in all sincerity in the presence of my hon. friends from Halifax and even from Sydney. Gaspé, Mr. Speaker, is destined to be the national harbour of Canada.

I was referring a moment ago to the vast mineral deposits which have been found in the interior of that peninsula; and in this connection let me say that I am always somewhat humiliated that some points of our country are better known and better appreciated by foreigners than by Canadians. It is true that as far back as 1844, investigation in the interior of the peninsula was started under Sir William Logan, but since that time very little has been accomplished by the Geological Survey of Canada in that oldest section of our Canadian territory, and the reports we have are from foreigners. I will make an exception in one case. I refer to Mr. Mailhiot, a young engineer of very brilliant parts, who published not long ago a report of the mineral resources of Gaspé. I shall not weary the House by reading the whole of the report but will simply read a few sentences.

> The whole of Gaspesia offers a vast field for prospecting. No systematic work of that kind has yet been done and the rudiments of its geology are barely known. In a word Gaspesia, with its many peaks of igneous rocks, its batholithic and laccolithic masses, is a field which has a future before it of tremendous possibilities.

I have the report of J. C. Beidelman, mining engineer, on the zinc and lead deposits found in the interior of Gaspé:

> Mr. Walter Harvey Weed, mining geologist of New York, and for over 20 years with the United States Geological Survey, examined the district in detail. I have taken the liberty of quoting from his report on the main property as follows:
>
> "The ore occurs in well defined fissure veins whose outcrops on the cleared tract are distinct and traceable across the plains . . . while no definite statement as to the genetic relation of ore and rock is perhaps warranted, an experience of many years in the mining fields of North America makes me feel positive that the observed geological relations are extremely favourable.

He says further:

> The geological evidence indicates that the ore will extend a great distance downward a depth of 1,500 feet or 15 years supply for a 200-ton mill from this one ore shoot is quite possible.

Then I have the evidence of Dr. Coleman, professor of geology in the University of Toronto, who says:

> Some veins. . . have been followed for distances of about 3,000 feet, and it is probable that they extend still further under the cover of superficial deposits.
>
> From what I have seen of other zinc fields, I am strongly of the opinion that the present area will prove on development to be one of the few zinc and lead fields of the world producing a high grade zinc-blende, minus the usual complex ores, and if the depths are sustained, as I thoroughly believe they will be, then this field has a future before it of tremendous possibilities.

You have there, Mr. Speaker, the evidence of three of the most renowned engineers in America—two from New York and the other from Toronto—about the zinc and lead deposits in the interior of the Gaspé peninsula. Mr. Coleman further says that:

> One must compare those mines with the famous Joplin mines of the United States.

He goes on to say:

The ore assays about 8 per cent of zinc and 4 per cent of lead, and the association of minerals permits an easy separation of the two metals. It is compared by Weed to that of the Joplin district of Missouri, and in general character it is surprisingly like the ores of that famous zinc mining region, in spite of the fact that the geological features of the two districts are as different as possible.

Dr. Coleman suggests that for the development of these mines the railway project which was presented to the House last year should be realized. He goes on to state:

Many years ago it was suggested by a geologist who was working in the region that the best route for a railway to the seaport of Gaspe basin would be across the tableland south of the Shickshock mountains, but the present railway follows the coast and does nothing to open up the interior. A railway through the heart of the peninsula would disclose important ore deposits, like that of the Federal mine, as the Canadian Pacific caused the discovery of the Sudbury nickel ores and the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario opened up the Cobalt silver region.

As I stated a moment ago traces of shale, asbestos, silver, oil, and various other minerals have been found in the interior of the Gaspé peninsula. But Mr. Speaker, the wealth of that region is not only to be found in land. Its wealth also lies in the adjacent waters of the Baie des Chaleurs and the gulf of St. Lawrence.

We have our fisheries, as I stated a moment ago. I shall not weary the House with any figures. Suffice it is to say that the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and especially the Gaspé and Magdalen fisheries, are renowned the world over. It is always a matter of regret to me that even in centres, such as Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers and Ottawa, we have on our tables every Friday fish caught in the Baie des Chaleurs or the gulf of St. Lawrence, but which has come back to us from Gloucester in the State of Maine. As your are aware, Mr. Speaker, by the Treaty of 1818 the Americans are allowed to fish within the three-mile limit in the Magdalen Island district. I do not understand why we should import any fish at all in view of the enormous supplies which we could get from our own seashore. This brings me to a very annoying neglect—the lack of attention given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the great fisheries of the gulf of St. Lawrence and of the Pacific ocean. I am not speaking without warrant. I have under my hand the organ of the fishermen of Canada, the Canadian Fisherman, and I read in its issue of February last the following headlines:

Strangling an industry.
How the Fishing Industry of the North Pacific is being Bluffed and Humbugged by the Canadian Government railways.

The article severely condemns the attitude of the Department of Railways and Canals for not providing refrigerator cars for the transportation of fish from the Pacific coast. The same reproach applies to the Department of Railways and Canals as regards at least the section of country which I represent. I do not know how the Maritime Provinces proper are treated in that respect by the Department of Railways and Canals, but I know that the people of Gaspé have for the last ten years been clamouring for refrigerator cars to facilitate the transportation of fish from the seashore to the cities of Quebec, Montreal and Toronto and the other centres of Central Canada.

Not long ago a delegation from Gaspé met the Premier of Quebec and presented a petition to the Provincial Government on behalf of the Gaspé fishermen. This was the language used by the gentlemen who accompanied the delegation:

You are doubtless aware, Sir, of the very large part that the fisheries used to play in maintaining the settlers on the North Shore of the river and gulf of St. Lawrence, and particularly the Gaspesian coast and peninsula. Through a lack of proper appreciation and encouragement, the fisheries no longer afford a remunerative livelihood to the inhabitants of those regions, and skilled and experienced fishermen are abandoning the industry for work in the logging camps and pulp mills and other industries. But the worst feature, Sir, lies in the fact that the boys and youths of the coastal settlements are not engaging in the fisheries and we are in grave danger of losing a class of workers whose particular vocation requires a training from childhood. A fisherman can become a lumberman, but a lumberman cannot become a fisherman so readily, as there are certain features in the fisherman's work which call for a certain skill acquired only by long practice.

We are impelled at the present crisis to approach your government with some suggestions to remedy the unfavourable conditions hindering the development of the Quebec sea fisheries. The worst of these conditions may be summed up under three heads—First, lack of adequate transportation facilities to carry our fish to market. Second, lack of the means to provide fishermen with the bait necessary to carry on an uninterrupted fishery during the short season of open water. Third, lack of modern facilities to increase the average catch of fish and lessen the hazard and uncertainly of the present methods of fishing.

I shall not dilate on those grievances. But, Mr. Speaker, you have there notice served on the Government of what are the present requirements of the fishing population of the Gaspé peninsula. We should have proper transportation; and I have a motion on the Order Paper under which this

feature of the fishing industry will be considered at the proper time. But at the moment I wish to call the attention of the Government to the necessity of providing the fishermen with freezers in various local centres; and I would suggest that those freezers should be organized on the co-operative system. That system has been adopted in the Old Country and is working very satisfactorily there. I again ask the Government to look into this matter and to establish for our fishermen these local freezers to assure them a continuous supply of the necessary bait.

Coming back to the question of natural resources in general, Mr. Speaker, and to the remarks I made at the beginning of my address this evening, namely, the opening up of the interior of the Gaspé peninsula, I claim that in my humble judgment the best asset in the natural resources of Canada it not to be found in the fisheries or the mines, but in the population itself. The best asset of Canada is its population, particularly if it is a population of settlers. Now, Sir, the opening up of the interior of the peninsula of Gaspé would add to that district at least fifty large centres. Many years ago that country was surveyed by engineers and traversed by missionaries and voyageurs, who were unanimous in their view that we had between the two ranges of mountains a splendid valley, with good soil, where there could be planted at least fifty parishes, that could attract settlers and maintain them on the land. Mr. Speaker, is it too much to ask that the pioneer population of Canada, which has shown so much attachment to the land of its ancestors, should be favourably considered in connection with the railway policy of the Government? After all, Canada is the greatest farm on the continent of America, and we must look to the farmer as the mainstay of our country. I claim, Sir, with some pride, that the race to which I belong is above all a race of farmers. Think, then, what the result would be if by the construction of a railway in the interior of the Gaspé peninsula fifty parishes were established; think of the industry of that population, of the increase in its numbers, and of the national wealth it would represent. Leroy-Beaulieu, the great economist—and many who came after him have said the same thing—once stated that the capital value of a man, a woman or a child could be placed at one thousand dollars. Mr. Speaker, I want to help my good friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in the dilemma in which he finds himself to-day. He has to find a means of raising revenue to meet the financial condition of Canada, the serious railway problem of Canada, the interest charges on the national debt. The greater the population of the country the greater will be his revenue, because the country is developed in proportion to the extent and activity of its population.

Now, Sir, the fifty parishes which I would like my hon. friend to establish in the interior of Gaspé will soon increase their numbers, because the race from which I spring has demonstrated that, once given a start, it never stops. At the time of the cession of the country to Great Britain the census of Canada showed, according to our historians, a population of 60,000 or 70,000; to-day the French Canadian population of the province of Quebec only is, if my information is correct, about 2,500,000. The same economist, Leroy-Beaulieu, stated a few years ago that the rate of increase in the French population in Canada was unique in the history of the world; that the population was doubling itself every thirty years. Well, that means that in thirty years the French Canadian population of the province of Quebec will be 5,000,000, and in sixty years, 10,000,000. And what is sixty years? Even a century is but a moment in the history of a nation. Now, I come back to what I said a moment ago: the best asset of Canada, its greatest wealth, is its population—and, I may say, its farming population. Let the Government develop a policy of expansion; let the Government encourage colonization, the taking up of farms, and we need not worry about the future of Canada. These are my last words, Mr. Speaker; I did not intend to speak at such length, but as I was speaking of the population of the province of Quebec, I could not but give a few facts which are in themselves quite illuminative.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a first duty to perform in coming to the defence of the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) after the onslaught that has been made against him during his absence by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). If I may judge by the gentleman's prophecy, I doubt very much that he would be a better minister of immigration than the present minister; for in Saskatoon, when the hon. member for Pontiac was there during the boom days, this is what we found on his barn door sign:

Frank S. Cahill says Saskatoon will have 100,000 population in 1920.

The population of Saskatoon at that time was about 40,000; it is now about 20,000. I wonder whether the other 20,000 pulled out with my hon. friend from Pontiac and followed him to his constituency, or whether in the manipulation of their affairs he drove them out of the country. That is a matter for him to answer, but in view of that record and that prophecy, I say that the Minister of Immigration has nothing to fear.

Next, Sir, I would like to say a word in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who says that what is wanted is a government. I always thought that you could judge people by their works; and if I read aright the political history of this country, during the period of fifteen years that hon. gentlemen sitting opposite were in power, they were quite as impotent as any administration that is known in the political history of Canada in taking any initiative in developing our natural resources. This Government has gone through a period of great difficulty, it is now about to adopt policies of development and settlement, and it is not amiss that the members of this House should, from time to time, bring to the attention of the Government the various matters which agitate us personally in our provinces. Kipling has been quoted this afternoon on iron ore. We have in Alberta 360,000 Kiplings who say that that province, properly treated in the development of its natural resources, will rival any other province in the Dominion in fifteen years. Those are the Kiplings we have.

I intended to take you this evening from Athabaska Landing on the river Athabaska down to the Mackenzie basin and back and tell you what is disclosed to the eye in that province; but all the various matters which I could speak of on that trip have been spoken about by members of their respective provinces, and it will suffice for me to say that all that has been said by the respective members for their respective provinces—we have all those things included in the province of Alberta. I will, therefore, dispense with going through the itinerary. I intended to take you down to Pelican Rapids, a water-power which rivals many of the water-powers to be found in other provinces. I intended to take you down to Pelican gas wells where they pick the ground with a stick and light the gas which flows to cook their meals. I intended to take you down to Grand Rapids which, if harnessed, would rival the Niagara Falls, and I intended to take you down to McMurray where you have 500 times the world's normal consumption of oil to be taken from the tar sands. I expected to show you what wonderful wealth we had in the development of the timber of that country. I intended to pass you on the Mackenzie basin where 4,000 square miles of oil have been discovered by the Imperial Oil Company and others. But I will refrain from going into those matters tonight, because the subject has been covered so well by other members for their provinces, that it suffices for me to say that we have everything you have spoken of and it only remains for you to come and make the trip which I have made in a canoe and you will see all this exposed to the eye, it only requiring somebody to tell you what you do not know yourself or for you to see what you do know yourself.

My complaint is a real one and I join with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I want action. But there is a difficulty which has been brought to the attention of this House, one that is real, and it was brought to our attention by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) who, by the way, finds himself in a very awkward position to-day by having the farmers from his constituency coming to Ottawa to ask him to protect them on their hay. He did bring to the attention of this House that, so far as this resolution deals with the western provinces, a great difficulty stands in the way of the adoption of a policy by this Government, in that the western provinces are clamouring for their natural resources. It seems to me that if we have reached such an impasse between the provinces and the Dominion in dealing with that question, we had better slit the Gordian knot in two and have done with it and then let the provinces adopt whatever policy they like with regard to their mineral resources, or else the Dominion of Canada should take a stand and immediately make it possible for us to have both population and the wealth taken out of the country which is teeming with it and which can be seen by anybody as he who runs and wishes can see.

The transportation difficulty is one that is always thrown up to us in the western country and it is a real one, but it is one that ought to be solved in the course of a few years if any of those natural resources are given a great impetus by this Government. The labour question is one that has

been solving itself very rapidly within the last couple of years.

I should like to assist the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) in his railway project in Gaspé and in the development of the natural resources of Gaspé; but it strikes me that there is only one question in which the Dominion Government has any jurisdiction in the province of Quebec and that would be the fisheries, except for tidal waters. If I am mistaken, I may be corrected by the hon. gentleman, but I assume the natural resources of Quebec belong to that province, and that question is one for Quebec to deal with except as regards such assistance as the Dominion Government is actually giving to-day to the various provinces in a general way, being a plan more to co-operate or co-ordinate with the provinces than a plan to develop as an initiative from the Dominion itself. My hon. friend's speech, therefore, this evening would have been better delivered in the Provincial Legislature than in the House of Commons.

I have one subject about which I am extremely touchy, and it is the oil question which I hope to be able to speak upon this evening, under the heading of another resolution. I should like to see the question of our natural resources settled as soon as possible or this Government take a stand in the development of our natural resources. The resolution, therefore, is one that I am prepared to support if it comes to a vote, because I think it is time that some action should be taken. For instance a great deal has been said as to the coal resources of Alberta. Let me tell the House that the coal resources are not entirely confined to Alberta; you will find coal deposits at Birch mountains in the Mackenzie district, Cariboo mountains, Norman, Great Bear lake, Peel river; and the same belt extending from Fernie to Brazeau and Yellow Head pass continues on the east of the Rockies up to the Laird river. None of those deposits have been discovered by the Dominion Government or by any effort of the Dominion Government whether under this regime or any other regime; they have been discovered by prospectors who have gone through this country and who have made their reports which have been generalized by some department at Ottawa. The central plain of the Mackenzie has oil, gas tar sands, gypsum and anhydride, marble, limestone, salt, coal and brick slate. To the east are all the minerals usually found in metamorphic rock such as gold, cobalt, nickel, iron, maganese mica, copper, etc. All these again have been discovered by individual prospectors and there has been no policy by this Government or any other government to assist in their development. What we are asking under this resolution is that this Government should announce its policy in regard to these natural resources. That cannot be done very easily unless you determine first of all whether the western provinces are entitled to their natural resources or not. Personally, I should like to see those natural resources passed over to the western provinces as fast as possible. We have a great deal of difficulty, being 3,000 miles away, in getting the attention we should have. If we write a letter, it takes two or three months before we get a reply and before the red tape has been done away with in this city, we are handicapped by finding that we have to start all over again in some other department. We should, therefore, like to see the natural resources handed over to the provinces so that we could give those natural resources the attention they deserve. It is not for me to say to this Government what it should do. One of two actions should be taken—the natural resources should be transferred to the provinces or the Dominion Government should take action in developing them.

Before taking my seat I wish to make one observation upon the criticism which has been offered by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) in regard to the railway charter which the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) sought to get before the railway committee. If I remember rightly, the attitude of the railway committee was this: that the hon. member for Matane should produce evidence that the incorporators or directors of the company were men of means, financial men, that they did not want a charter merely for exploitation purposes, and that the railway which they proposed to build would not at some time or another be foisted upon this Govcernment as other railways have been from time to time, making public ownership in this country merely the taking over of defunct railways instead of railways constructed by the people for the people. That evidence was not produced before the committee by the hon. member and as a consequence the charter was refused.

Mr. PARENT: Does my hon. friend know of a single case in which evidence was produced before the railway committee as

to the financial standing of the incorporators?

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): I do not know of any such case but I do know this, that after private individuals have embarked on a railway enterprise in this country to which the Dominion Government was not a party in any shape whatsoever, and after people have settled along that line of railway, these individuals and the people who have so settled have come to this Government and said: It is your moral duty to take over this road. We say to-day in the face of the fiasco which has been permitted in this country by all Governments in their railway policy that this Government should put its foot down on granting charters to private individuals who may open up the country and after people have settled along the line tell this Government "it is your moral duty to take over the road."

Mr. PARENT: Does my hon. friend not know that there is a general law applicable to every citizen of this country?

Mr. MACKIE: A general law to what effect?

Mr. PARENT: The Railway Act under which the holders of charters are required to fulfil certain obligations and under which the public interests are protected, a general law stating the conditions by which a company shall be incorporated and shall fulfil its obligations to the country.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): I quite agree that that might be a solution. The Railway Act might be amended in such a way as to say who shall and who shall not get a charter and if that is a solution I shall be very glad to assist my hon. friend in bringing it about. We have in Alberta the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway. The Provincial Government came down here and begged the Dominion Government to take over that road because it was in a state of liquidation, but there was only a small population at the end of the steel at McMurray, nevertheless the people said: Since you got us to come here and promised us a railway we are entitled to have the Dominion Government take over the road, so as to keep faith with the people. It is true it was not your promise but itis your duty to take over this road as part and parcel of the National Railway System. The same thing happened with the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway and it was only after refusal upon refusal that the Canadian Pacific took over the road under a working agreement for operation only. And so it has been all along. We are told by the Minister of Railways demand after demand is made upon his department that certain private lines should be taken over by the Dominion Government as a moral obligation so as to give service to the people along these lines that were built by private enterprise. Hon. gentlemen opposite should remember these things when they have an opportunity to speak on the railway Estimates, when they will no doubt be castigating this Government for its policy of public ownership. As a matter of fact the only policy of public ownership that we have is the taking over of defunct private enterprise, not because we want to but because of mistakes of past administration to which the railways are a living testimony. The Government has no alternative but to take them over. The Government therefore should put its foot down on that sort of thing. If the hon. member for Matane or any other hon. gentleman can produce the evidence required I would support him as a member of the Railway Committee, or if any hon. gentleman is willing to come forward and suggest a remedy that is feasible the difficulty can be solved.

In conclusion I wish to say that the resolution has my hearty support. I hope the Government will take heed of it and adopt a policy of either giving over to the provinces their natural resources or taking some step themselves to develop them so that the provinces will benefit directly and the Dominion indirectly.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I do not intend to take up a great deal of the time of the House, but I could not sit in my seat without expressing an opinion or two on the important question now before the House. I think every hon. member will agree with me that the question of the natural resources of this country is one of the most important that this House could discuss now or at any other time. I could spend the whole time which I intend to take in discussing the natural resources of only my own province, the province of Nova Scotia. We have in that province our great coal mines in the island of Cape Breton, in the county of Pictou, and in your own county of Cumberland, Mr. Speaker. We have also our great lumber industry, our great fishing industry, and

our great agricultural industry. But it is not my intention at the present time to discuss the natural resources of my own province, because they are well known not only to the people of Canada but to the whole civilized world and also because there are other hon. gentlemen who can discuss them a great deal better than I can. I intend to spend a few moments in going further afield. I think it was the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who said that East is East and West is West, and I intend to go west for a little time and speak on the natural resources of the far western province on the Pacific coast. I had the pleasure during last September, October, and November of spending about eight weeks in the western provinces, and it was certainly a most interesting trip. One reason, no doubt, why I found it so interesting was because it was my first trip west of Toronto, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, as I passed through the great province of Ontario and the Prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, and came at last to British Columbia, I was seized with the idea that Canada certainly was the greatest country in the world, a country of which every man, woman and child in this Dominion may be justly proud. My only regret was that I had to spend such a short time in the different great cities and towns in those western provinces.

During my visit to the great province of British Columbia I was struck with the immensity of her natural resources. Owing to my early training I was perhaps impressed more by her great fishing industry than anything else. During the time at my disposal I had the opportunity of discussing first hand this great industry with people who were interested in it. I heard what they thought of it and of its great future if proper steps are taken for its development. But most of all I was struck by the fact that the present Government was not doing its full duty, or its partial duty, by the people of British Columbia, in the matter of the fisheries of that province.

We had the pleasure this afternoon and evening of listening to the speech of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). I followed it with attention, and I must congratulate him on his grasp of the situation with respect to the salmon industry of that province. I agree with him that that industry is capable of much greater development, and I hope that his prayer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) will be answered but I have no faith that it will. I noticed that when he first rose to speak he endeavoured to eulogize the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He said there never was such a minister in charge of that department before. I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not present to hear what I have to say. However, I will not speak for myself, but will use the words of the hon. member for New Westminster himself. As I said, he began by eulogising the minister, declaring that he was the greatest man that was ever in charge of that department in Canada. If this is the fact, why is it that two years ago the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. McQuarrie), found it necessary to bring to the attention of the minister a state of affairs in his province which was anything but creditable to the department? On looking through Hansard I find that the hon. member made a very excellent speech in this House about two years ago on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, and in the course of his remarks he referred to the great salmon industry of British Columbia, calling to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the same gentleman who is at present in charge of that department, certain grievances in British Columbia, and in no uncertain tone informing the minister what he expected to be done. Now, it seems to me that if, after two years, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not heard the cry from Macedonia, it is not competent for the hon. member for New Westminster to get up in this House and congratulate the country upon having the best Minister of Marine and Fisheries with which this great land has ever been blessed. What did the hon. member for New Westminster say on the occasion to which I refer? I read from Hansard of 1919, at page 426, the following:

> "I am very sorry indeed that he did not find it convenient to come to our province. All the signs point to trouble in connection with the British Columbia fisheries. In connection with those fisheries we have had Royal Commissions, we have had International Commissions, we have had investigations of all kinds; but the situation does not appear to have yet been cleared up. Great dissatisfaction exists not only in connection with the Fraser river fisheries, but also as regards the whole of the fisheries of British Columbia, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the fisheries of that province amount to something."

The rest of the hon. member's speech this evening, after his preliminary re-

marks eulogistic of the minister, was only a criticism of the Government and the Marine and Fisheries Department. After bestowing some praise on the minister, he began, as he did in the speech from which I have just quoted, to criticise the administration. His whole speech, of something like an hour and a quarter, was critical of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his department at Ottawa. The only good thing he could say in reference to the officials of the department was the fact, in connection with the great salmon industry of British Columbia, that they were getting rid of the seals in the waters of the Fraser river because, he said, the seals were destroying as many salmon as the fishermen were catching. I presume the hon. gentleman was speaking from the book, and from information given him by one of the officials of the department. But I should like to know, and I am sure you would be interested to know too, Mr. Speaker, how in the name of all that is good and great any official of that department can tell how many salmon the seals destroy, or how they can establish the fact that the salmon industry has been injured by these aquatic enemies of theirs. I admit that the seals must feed on some kind of fish, but the hon. gentleman will find that in addition to salmon they have other varieties of food. He said that one of the good things to the credit of this department in connection with the salmon industry was its endeavour to blow up the seals on a certain reef in the Fraser river. It seems to me that if that is all that we can credit the department with, so far as this great industry is concerned, they are condemned out of the mouth of the hon. member for New Westminster.

My chief reason for rising to-night was to say a word or two on behalf of the great halibut industry of British Columbia. During my tour in the West, in company with my distinguished leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the two other hon. gentlemen, who were of the party, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), I had the pleasure of staying for three days in the city of Prince Rupert, and whilst there, not only members of the Board of Trade and citizens generally, but fishermen of the district, interviewed me and stated their grievances, requesting that not only I but the other members of our party would take up their case on the floor of the House. The halibut fishery of British Columbia is a very important one and is capable of great development, and I say without hesitation that it is a public scandal that the present Government, especially that of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should treat the fisherman of Prince Rupert in the way they have been doing. I repeat, Sir, and emphasize this statement, that it is a public scandal and a disgrace for these two hon. ministers to treat the fishermen of that city in the manner complained of, and if they cannot better conditions there, I think it is their bounden duty to resign their portfolios and let others take charge of the affairs of their departments. What has happened? As I say, the halibut industry of Prince Rupert is a highly important one. For instance, on the first of this month no less than 415,000 pounds of halibut were landed at that port. But what did the fishermen find when they came to the city of Prince Rupert to land and sell their catches? They were told by the business men of that city, the men who handle fish and ship it to points in Canada as well as to Chicago, Boston, and other ports in the United States, that there was no means of transportation to cope with their catch. This quantity of fish, as you will readily realize, Mr. Speaker, would require something like about 150 refrigerator cars, but the Department of Railways had no cars, or practically none, to handle this great catch. And that has been the case for the last three or four years. Now, is that the way for a government to treat people engaged in a great industry like the halibut industry of the British Columbia coast? It certainly is not, and the Minister of Railways merits condemnation for the manner in which he has dealt with this industry.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) referred to an article in the Canadian Fisherman. In order that the House may appreciate the exact condition of affairs, I should like to refer to this article. It appears under the caption "Strangling an industry," and the sub-head reads: "How the fishing industry of the North Pacific is being bluffed and humbugged by the Canadian Government Railways." Now, Sir, this House was startled a few days ago, when the Estimates were laid on the Table, to find what the deficit on the Canadian National railways would be this year. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that there should be deficits in the affairs of the country, and particularly in the Department of Railways, when the present Minister of Railways is handling the great transcontinental system of Canada as

we have witnessed. What the Government should do, if they desire to administer the affairs of the railways properly and to secure traffic, is to see to it that every day all this abundance of fish that comes to Prince Rupert is properly taken care of in the way of transportation. I am told that the daily freight would amount to something like $24,000, and it seems to me that the Government and the people in charge of the railway system, should see that better transportation facilities are available. I presume that this article which I shall read, is written by the editor of the journal in which it appears. It is as follows:

> In all our experience of the many drawbacks which militate against the proper development of our Canadian fisheries, we have never seen anything to equal the nonchalant manner in which the officials of the Canadian Government Railway Systems have treated the urgent needs of a great industry, and the whole story is one of "passing the buck," unfulfilled promises, humbug and absolute indifference.

That is what the editor of the Canadian Fisherman says about the way in which the present Government and their officials are handling the railways of this country. The article goes on to say that for some years Prince Rupert has been suffering from a shortage of express cars, and the people and business men of that city have done everything in their power to direct the attention of this Government to the necessity for better transportation facilities, but without avail. At the meeting of the Canadian Fisheries Association, held in Vancouver in June, 1920, this matter was thoroughly discussed by hundreds of delegates present, and the following resolution was passed:

> Whereas the matter of providing adequate refrigerator car facilities is of the greatest importance to the fishing industry, particularly at all points of production furthest removed from the markets.
>
> "And Whereas a shortage of such facilities has for some time seriously interfered with the proper marketing of Canadian fish, especially at the port of Prince Rupert,
>
> Be It Therefore Resolved, that the Canadian Fisheries Association in convention assembled, requests its executive to communicate with the Hon. Minister of Railways setting forth these facts and respectfully urging that he take immediate steps to provide additional refrigerator car space sufficient to take care of the needs of the port of Prince Rupert and other shipping points on the Canadian Government railways.

Although this resolution was forwarded to the Minister of Railways and to the president of the Canadian National Railways at Toronto, nothing was done, and on July 8, of the same year, the Prince Rupert branch of the Canadian Fisheries Association passed another resolution as follows:

> Whereas at the Annual Convention of the Canadian Fisheries Association at Vancouver a unanimous resolution was passed urging upon the executive to press the matter of providing an adequate supply of express refrigerator cars for the fish business,
>
> And Whereas the general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific in an affidavit has stated that one hundred additional cars are required to take care of this service,
>
> And Whereas announcement has been made that an order has been placed for an additional thirty cars for this service,
>
> Be It Therefore Resolved that we urge upon the executive to press this matter before the proper authorities with a view to relieving the present very inadequate facilities at an early date.

The article in question goes on to state that both resolutions were placed before the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was a matter that affected the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as much as it did the Minister of Railways, and if the Minister of Railways was negligent in his duty in seeing to it that a sufficient number of cars were provided for this business, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the interests of this great industry, should have urged the matter upon his colleagues and endeavoured by every means in his power to have the situation remedied.

But nothing was done. All they did was to promise a certain thing was to be done and the promises were never fulfilled. Now, what happened? Owing to the fact that the Government Railways refused to, or at least did not, provide the people of Prince Rupert with refrigerator cars a great number of the boats which always came in the past to that port to land their fish were compelled to go to American ports. I think the members representing British Columbia constituencies will bear me out when I say that a number of these boats, finding insufficient refrigerator cars at their disposal were compelled to go to Seattle and other ports in the United States in order to sell their catch. Consequently the Government Railways lost all that business and the Canadian people lost in a variety of other ways. Now, Sir, the progressive people of Prince Rupert were not satisfied with the way things were going on. Although they telegraphed and wrote the Minister of Railways and his officials they still kept after them. It seems that some official of the Government wrote to Prince Rupert and said: "The Government had ordered one hundred cars to be built at the works of the National Car

Company at Hamilton." The people of Prince Rupert never placed too much confidence in the word of that official and they asked the Canadian Fisherman to send a representative to Hamilton and see if these cars were being built there. Here is what that paper said:

A representative of the "Canadian Fisherman" was then sent to interview the National Car Company at Hamilton to find out what progress had been made with the construction of the 100 long promised cars. He went there on February 9 (of the present year), and interviewed one of the highest officials of the Car Company and his report is that—

"The Car Company has been and is at present closed down. It is expected to resume operations in a week or so. No start has been made on the construction of the promised cars, and the only information adduced is that the Car Company expect to start work on an order of 1,000 freight cars for the Government and that it was hoped that the thirty refrigerator cars would be put through at the same time."

The article goes on to say:

To sum it all up: there is certainly no chance of these thirty express refrigerator cars being delivered in March and the promises of the railway officials amount to nothing but bluff and humbug.

This statement is made by a responsible newspaper, Sir, the Canadian Fisherman, a journal that is interested in the fisheries of the country. It certainly would not use such strong language unless the conditions warranted it. The people of Prince Rupert had been waiting two years for refrigerator cars in which to ship their fish and they got no satisfaction from the Government of Canada nor the Minister of Railways nor the officials of the Canadian National Railways. The article from which I have been quoting goes on to say:

The whole matter reflects the spinelessness of the present Governmental Administration. There seems to be no backbone to it and no definite policy appears to have been worked out to pull the country up from the mire it has sunk in through the ravages of war. A huge debt hangs overhead but no effort is made to nullify it and instead of confining expenditure to the development of remunerative natural resources the Government in power has incurred still greater obligations by the purchase of duplicating railroad systems and the building of steamships which could have been constructed elsewhere at lower cost. One would have thought that an opportunity to control the haulage of a huge fishery would have been seized upon by the Government in an effort to make their railroad system pay. But that common axiom of plain business has been ignored by the present Government who are really to blame for the state of affairs existing in their own railroad system.

It is no use blaming the minor officials for negligence in the Prince Rupert affair. The blame lies on the men higher up and we do not hesitate to name the Minister of Railways, Hon. Dr. Reid for his indifference to the request for more equipment, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, for his lack of interest in the development of a great fishing port. If the latter had given more time and thought to fishery matters, his influence in the Cabinet could easily have secured action in the matter of supplying Prince Rupert with more refrigerator cars.

The whole fishing industry of Canada will suffer from this species of humbug until we get a Department of Fisheries with a responsible official at the head of it and a minister who will give ear and action to the plain suggestions of the industry along the lines of sane development.

The foregoing are not my words but the utterances of the Canadian Fisherman and I am sure they must impress every member in the House. As far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, how can we expect him to give the time necessary to the administration of his department, and to the promotion of one of the great industries of this country, in view of his business affiliations? "A man cannot serve two masters." The minister candidly acknowledged in a speech he made last week that he was interested in a great many other concerns. I say, Sir, that any member of the Cabinet who is interested in many other concerns outside his own department cannot give that attention which is required of him to the business of his department and the affairs of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I only rose to say a few words in regard to the Prince Rupert fishing industry. I do hope that the Minister of Railways and the Government will see that these people get the necessary refrigerator cars to handle the fish which goes into that port three times a week. The fishing industry of Prince Rupert should be encouraged. There is no reason why the Government should not give Prince Rupert the proper accommodation. If they do so the population of that port will increase by leaps and bounds, and it will be a most advantageous thing for the section of the Canadian National railways connecting with that port.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): I would not venture to intrude in the debate at such a late hour did I not wish to point out to the House that pertinent suggestions, and I think constructive suggestions, have already been made which might aid in solving some of the questions which have arisen in the course of this debate—not indeed that they could hope to solve anything like all of them, because, as you well know, the debate has ranged over a wide field. I do not think, for instance, that any of the suggestions made could

solve the question of the shortage of refrigerator cars; but in other respects I believe the establishment of a National Research institute would be a start towards solving the problem of the utilization of our natural resources. I do not pretend to traverse the ground which has been covered in former sessions in this respect, but I would just like to recall very shortly what has been done up to date and what remains to be done.

Four or five years ago the Research Council, an honourary advisory body, was appointed to look over the field to see what could be done and to advise the Government on action. Their report—and I will not delay the House longer than to simply mention the final conclusion—was in favour of the establishment of a research institute. Subsequently parliamentary committees sat during two sessions to consider this question, and then brought in a unanimous report in favour of the establishment of such an institute. That report was debated by hon. members on both sides of this House, and I think representatives from seven provinces spoke in favour of the report, which was unanimously adopted by the House. I am bound to say, Sir, that my disappointment last session was exceedingly keen when Main Estimates and Supplementary Estimates appeared without one copper being provided for the establishment of such an institute. I am perhaps the more delighted after such a disappointment to see in the Speech from the Throne this session, the, to me, two magical words, "Scientific research;" and my reason for rising tonight is to urge upon the Government, and particularly upon the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) speedy action along this line.

It may be asked how such an institute would help in the development of our natural resources. The Research Council prepared, and the Parliamentary Committee considered, a Bill to be brought before the House looking to the accomplishment of the purpose I have mentioned, and the very first function of the institute as stated in that Bill is as follows:

> The Institute shall have charge of:
>
> (a) researches undertaken to promote the utilization of the natural resources of Canada.

Such an institute would undoubtedly be the rallying point where all such matters could be referred, to be discussed and upon which appropriate action might be recommended. Because in such an institute not only would laboratory tests be carried on, but when those tests showed that a certain process was technically successful, the Institute would apply a commercial test as well to determine whether such a process would be profitable.

Not only has this House, but I think it is fair to say that the country at large, has approved and applauded the establishment of a research institute. I have had occasion to go through several provinces since last session, and in more than one of them I was asked to give addresses on this subject. I found an exceedingly lively interest displayed in the question, and even in those provinces where perhaps the predominating industry is agriculture the members of various clubs and other institutions appeared to be fully awake to the importance of this movement. And our manufacturing industries as well are alive to its importance and are anxiously looking forward to a step being taken in this direction. Only the other day I noted, as perhaps some other hon. members may have done, the discovery that pitch pine could be made into excellent pulpwood for the manufacture of paper. Heretofore pitch pine if mixed with spruce spoiled the pulp, but by scientific research, carried on in the laboratories of the pulp and paper companies, a method was discovered of treating it alone, when it was found that not only was its fibre somewhat longer than that of spruce, but that properly treated it made an excellent grade of pulp. What does that mean? It means, as I understand it, that in the limits already handed over to operating companies the supply of pulpwood has, through this discovery, been increased from twenty-five to forty per cent. So there is a natural resource of our country put upon the market simply by scientific research. "Well," it may be said, "that was done by a private concern. What need is there of a research institute?" It is only a week ago that I received from the Pulp and Paper Association a strongly worded resolution in favour of the establishment of a research institute so that their members might take advantage of its work and go further afield into discoveries such as I have just mentioned.

I want to close my remarks with a personal appeal to the veteran Minister of Trade and Commerce under whose immediate control this matter comes—and I regret that at this late hour he is not present—so that he may give his personal attention to the proposed Bill and perhaps see his way clear to introduce it into the House. Not long ago my hon. friend from Red

Deer (Mr. Clark) termed the right hon. minister the Nestor of the House—and rightly so—for of whom could it be more truthfully said in the flowing words of Homer?

> The smooth tongued chief from whose persuasive lips sweeter than honey flowed the stream of speech.

I trust that he will add to his many honours by this piece of progressive legislation, and then would we, in classic phrase, wish that his years should be as his eloquence, Nestorian.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil-Soulanges): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much pleasure to the speeches that have been delivered on this question of the country's natural resources. We have heard about coal mines and gold mines, about colonization and fisheries; in a word, about all those things which, if systematically developed, would give birth in Canada to an era of still greater prosperity. But of all those natural resources, one seems to have been forgotten—I mean the most natural of all natural resources, the maple industry from the standpoint of maple sugar and syrup making.

In 1904 I had the pleasure to speak for the first time about this industry which had been neglected and seemed likely to disappear. That first speech had aroused some hilarity in this House. Honourable members did not at that time attach any importance to the serious side of this question; however, the following years awakened public attention and both the Dominion and Provincial Governments—especially that of the province of Quebec—after taking hold of the question, made quite a success of it.

In 1904, the revenue derived from our maple industry hardly amounted to $1,200,000. Last year, it is marvellous, we must acknowledge it with pleasure, the maple products have increased remarkably in quantity and yielded more than nine million dollars. I think that of all the natural resources of this country there are none that pay more than this one, taking into account the short space of time required to produce and its amazingly easy sale.

As I have said, when this question was raised for the first time in this House in 1904, it was not taken in earnest. In the following years I brought up the same question and finally succeeded in getting an amendment to the Food Inspection Act which to a certain extent prevented the adulteration of sugar and syrup.

This amendment was not sufficient yet to give all the required protection to the farmers, to the sugar and syrup producers, but at last in 1913 or 1914 the government of the day thought proper to listen in earnest to the request of the sugar producers of Quebec and Ontario, and they altered to a large measure the amendment to the Food Inspection Act. Since then we have seen all the provinces, encouraged by this protection, give more serious attention to this industry. In the past the farmers produced a pure maple syrup which they would send to the cities, and this the manufacturers would compound with other syrup or sugar, or other ingredients, and out of a gallon of pure syrup they would manufacture ten or fifteen gallons of this spurious article, which they would then sell for the pure product. The name was all that remained of the genuine article. Large quantities were thus made which were sold at the same figure as the pure maple product. With the help of societies established in the province of Quebec, we succeeded in a large measure in stopping this adulteration, I do not say that the present Government have done all in their power to have the law observed, but I must render justice to the late government, especially to the present Postmaster General, who then did his utmost to have the amendment that I had suggested to him, accepted. Now, these city establishments, where pure maple sugar and syrup were turned into compounds, and which were sold for the genuine article have disappeared.

Last year the Montreal Bank of Commerce made a report whereby the value of the total output of this article was stated to be worth nearly a million dollars.

At the present time, I must add, that if that industry was developed on a larger scale, if the farmers would apply themselves to this industry as they do to all the others, they could not even yet with all their united efforts turn out enough maple sugar and syrup to meet the demand. We have an enormous demand from the United States, we also have much demand from European countries where our product has only been known for four or five years. Unfortunately we can not meet all the needs. Yet we have in the province of Quebec and in a part of the province of Ontario, a large number of maple groves which might be worked to advantage. We have in the province of Quebec admirable sugar bushes which might be worked with larger profit; but they are left idle. There are in the country about 55,000 owners of

maple bushes who could carry on this industry, but barely 15,000 do so. Now, when I see that this industry brought last year nine million dollars to the producers, I feel convinced that no industry could pay better than this one, not even excepting dairying, which is nevertheless reputed to be our national industry. And why? Because the maple sugar and syrup crop is gathered in a short time, barely three weeks, during a season when the farmer has almost nothing to do, and from bushes generally growing on rocky land which would otherwise give no return. Even now, many farmers—notwithstanding the possibility of a good yearly return, and attracted by the high prices for wood owing to the dearness of coal, cut down their maple trees for fuel. They thus destroy a capital which could give them a yearly income of much greater value than could the return from the capital represented by their sales of fuel wood if invested at six per cent. They realize at one time more than the sugar and syrup would bring them, but it is once for all, never to be repeated, for what is destroyed is destroyed for ever, and is a dead capital.

This motion gives me the opportunity to call the attention of the House to this eminently national resource, essentially ours. Apart from the Eastern States of the American republic, and some parts of the province of Ontario, nowhere in the world can such a succulent product be found as our maple sugar. Our syrup and our sugar are not known. When they become a thing of ordinary consumption, no one will want to use any other sugar than ours, I mean as a sugar de luxe. That is why the Government should undertake an educational campaign.

Both the Federal and the Provincial Governments have done something for that industry. In the subsidy given to the provinces, the Federal Government has allowed a small amount which the latter are to distribute according to their judgment. The province of Quebec has made the most of this small grant.

I claim that the Dominion Government, while they have done something in the right direction should do more. They should increase the subsidies of the provinces for the encouragement of agriculture.

I believe that the Government should give larger grants and impose more rigorous conditions. The Quebec government have made a good use of what has been given to the province; and I believe the Dominion Government should be encouraged by the results obtained and might increase the subsidies.

Now, with a view to securing results from the help granted this industry, it would be well to apply the Adulteration Act very vigorously. I know that during the last six years, the enforcing of this Act has been much neglected. During the war, the general food commissioner had called to Ottawa the president and directors of the Pure Maple Sugar Co-operative society and had asked them not to be too exacting, not to require the strict enforcement of the law, for, as he said, sugar war scarce and people had to be rationed; representing to them that it would be better not to make complaints and allow the work of time to better the situation. We were agreeable to this request, but unfortunately as usual tolerance bred license. To-day it has become necessary that the law should be enforced rigorously and that all those who adulterate maple sugar or syrup should be very severely punished. Should the Government be willing to return to the very good practice of treating the offenders with severity, we would have increased production. If the farmers accomplished anything in that industry these last year, it was because the prices were very high, and they felt themselves protected. The price for sugar has even been excessive, I admit: sugar has been as high as 35 cents a pound and syrup $3,00 a gallon. This was due to the circumstances, and we understand that this can not continue. The farmers realize thoroughly that they will have to return to more normal prices, and that the industry will not suffer thereby, for the consumer has also to be thought of. The reverse would be detrimental to the producer, for should the prices remain at the high level, consumption would likely decrease considerably, because everybody would not be able to pay such prices. The farmers are very reasonable; they are ready to admit that the prices might come down and yet afford a sufficiently remunerative profit. However, prices must not fall disastrously low, as happened in 1914; for in that case the farmers would give up sugar-making. I believe that if we encourage the farmers, if we show them that we mean to encourage them, they will persevere in this industry, and it will be all benefit for us ali, as a large output will tend to regulate the prices. I deem that the Dominion Government, along with the educational propaganda in favour of agriculture which they

carry on with such good results, should also do their share in this campaign and not leave it all to the provincial authorities. All the provinces have not the same degree of interest in this question. The Federal Government, who know the needs of each province, since they make a constant and thorough study of them, should give the Department of Agriculture all necessary authority for the spreading of knowledge useful to this industry, and to impress the farmers with the idea that instead of being cut down, as they are too extensively now, the maple bushes should be preserved with care. The Conservation Commission aims at reforesting certain parts of the country. It is much easier to preserve our forests than to do any replanting. In certain parts of the country our beautiful forests are being destroyed without mercy, without judgment, without purpose, I make bold to say. Our maple forests are precious not only from the viewpoint of what they are worth as timber or fuel, but also from that of the benefit they can annually yield to the gatherer of the sap. They should be husbanded with judgment.

I am very much pleased that this motion should afford me an opportunity of speaking on this question. I have often addressed the House on this matter, and as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, the first time I did so, it was not without causing some hilarity.

Hon. members were not accustomed to hear about maple syrup and maple sugar, but later on they ascertained that this industry was flourishing in the country. Who would have thought it, Mr. Speaker; a commodity that was yielding only $1,200,000 two decades ago, yielded as much as $9,000,000 last year. The dairy industry, the returns from which amount to millions and millions of dollars does not yield one-tenth of the profits accruing from this industry, if the amount of labour and the season at which the work is done are taken into account.

I think the Government should see to it that this natural resource be taken care of. Our coal measures, our gold mines, our fisheries, all those natural resources must be developed, the future of this country is dependent upon it; however when since creation we have at hand an industry whose development is so easy and which is a gift of God, let us try to get from it all possible returns, not only for ourselves, but for the country as a whole. Having developed that industry upon a large scale, we shall be able to make the most of the good name of our maple sugar and maple syrup abroad, where it will be said: Here is a product peculiar to Canada. We received lately from France orders for the shipment of tons of maple sugar. From Chicago we were asked for twenty-five thousand pounds of sugar in one pound loaves, for sugar yellow in colour so that they might call it "Golden Sugar." We could not fill those orders. Production is too meagre yet.

At this time, the United States are coming into Beauce to get hundreds of thousands of pounds of sugar and yet I must state that sugar is carelessly manufactured in the county of Beauce. I see that the hon. member from Beauce (Mr. Béland) is here; I am pleased to make these remarks in his presence. There are some parts of the province of Quebec where some splendid sugar is manufactured—sugar of the first quality. In the county of Beauce, there are localities which turn out good sugar, but many places where bad sugar is made in the province of Quebec are to be found in Beauce. We have done our utmost in that direction, however that district is so large and the producers are so numerous that they could not be taught in a few years. With the help of the hon. member from Beauce, of the local newspapers and of the schools which were opened in that district, we are in hopes that the farmers there will eventually occupy a foremost place in that industry. The county of Beauce alone turns out as much maple sugar and maple syrup as all the rest of Quebec and that part of Ontario where there is sugar-making, and the producers of that district will presently be in the forefront of that industry as they are in other farming activities. When we read history, when we learn in what manner our fathers endeavoured to develop that industry, tapping the maple trees with axes and letting the sap flow into wooden buckets we acknowledge their process was a very primitive one. However they have not yet reached that point in Beauce; they collect the maple sap in very small vessels while it would be much advantageous to collect it in larger ones. Yet, I do not wish to speak ill of Beauce whose progressive inhabitants will discard ere long the ways of the past, and I shall proceed with my disquisition. Americans are coming into that county to get a dark sugar we would not place upon our table and we do not like to see manufactured

any longer in the province of Quebec. The association I just mentioned to you is above all an educational association. We advocate betterments which ought to be introduced in the sugar industry. What we succeeded in doing elsewhere for butter and cheese with the result that we now have good butter and good cheese, we would like to do for maple sugar; our desire is that good maple sugar be turned out in every part of the country. Americans are coming into Beauce to get dark sugar for which they pay as high a price as they would pay for good sugar. The sales of these products in that district amounts to seven or eight hundred thousand dollars. That sugar is shipped to the United States where it enters into the manufacture of chocolates and especially into the making of chewing tobacco. Why do they use that dark sugar which has not undergone all the changes which good sugar has to undergo? It is because that sugar, although not in such a condition as to be placed upon our table, still preserves the original taste of the maple, all the relish of the sap. Such is the reason why. But that is only fortuitous and should not be our ultimate aim.

The county of Beauce is one of the most beautiful districts of the province, and it is the duty of its inhabitants, who are in many respects, a very progressive people, not to be content with present satisfactory prices, but to endeavour to improve their products; not only would they get the same fair returns, but they would also add to the good reputation of their province. It is a very large district, containing immence forests, and therefore, we would not be justified in charging its people with apathy. There are great handicaps which prevent the proper development of this vast territory and its progress is retarded by the high prices which are being paid by the adjoining country for inferior products.

Our observations, however, do not apply to all producers in the district of Beauce; on the contrary, there are some who could teach a good many things to the other manufacturers of the province.

I trust that my hon. friend from Beauce will take my remarks in good part and that he will communicate them to his constituents in the same spirit as I have given them.

In the county of Vaudreuil, which is very small as compared with the county of Beauce, we have but a few sugar factories. But our products are of the highest order and they always command the maximum prices. Why? It is because our farmers are using modern and national methods. They are well rewarded and very much encouraged thereby. I have seen in my constituency, maple bushes of only a few acres, to give their owners a profit of six or seven hundred dollars.

I am calling the attention of the House upon this matter and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is present, will understand what I mean, because he has in the person of his strict and official representative, the Deputy minister a man who knows particularly well the maple sugar industry.

I was pleased to notice that the Hon. Minister of Justice has listened to my remarks. He belongs to the province of Quebec; he knows what our maple sugar is and I am sure that his thought will not concentrate exclusively on coal or gold resources, which are sometimes very disappointing, and that he will devote a little of his influence to the development of the maple sugar industry.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I promise that at this late hour I shall occupy the attention of the House for only a few moments. I do not intend to go fully into the subject matter of the resolution; I rise only to reply to the hon. member for Lunenburg, who, I regret, is not in his seat. I regret also that I have not been able to follow the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Boyer).

The hon. gentleman for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) made the bald statement that he spent eight days in British Columbia. I assume that he spent probably one day in Victoria and two in Vancouver. He said that he spent three days in Prince Rupert; the remainder of the time would be occupied in travelling between these three points. Having spent this much time in our province, the hon. member assumes that he knows the fisheries of British Columbia. Well, in my opinion the hon. member knows very little of the fisheries of British Columbia. It might be as well for him to give his attention to the province from which he comes; I hope he knows more about the fisheries of his own province than he does of those of British Columbia.

The hon. gentleman indulged in a tirade against the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid). He laid great stress on the shortage of cars at Prince Rupert, and he discussed the halibut situation and the salmon situation in British Columbia. Why, one would think that the hon. gentieman had been

raised in that province. I should like to discuss the natural resources of British Columbia and those of the Dominion generally but time will not permit. I want to say, however, to the hon. member for Lunenburg and to all hon. members of this House that the late Liberal government from 1895 to 1911 had created the greatest combine in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia that ever existed. I represent probably three-quarters or more of the total fishery districts of British Columbia, the remainder being represented by the membr for Skeena (Mr. Peck). Let me say to the member for Lunenburg that in 1911 when Prince Rupert budded out as a growing town, having been practically planted by the late government—I lived in Prince Rupert and I know the conditions—a merchant or a hotel keeper could not buy a single fish in Prince Rupert for home or hotel use. That condition was the result of the combine brought about by the late Liberal government so far as the fishing interests of the province were concerned. When the Government of 1911 took office, through the efforts of hon. Mr. Hazen, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of myself as a private member, regulations were put into force with a view to breaking up the combine in British Columbia, and Prince Rupert was put on the map as a fishing town, being allowed the privilege of having American and foreign fishing boats unload their catches, take on bait and buy supplies and equipment. That was accomplished by the present Government.

Now, so far as the canning industries were concerned, under the old conditions it was useless for any individual fisherman to apply for a cannery license or a seining license—and I am speaking of purse seining or drag seining; even gill-net seining—the whole thing was controlled by this combine. But things were changed when the Liberal government went out of office in 1911. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne)—all credit to him—threw the fisheries of British Columbia absolutely open so that any one might, by paying the necessary fee, obtain a license to can or to fish. The present Government and the Union Government absolutely broke up that monopoly which had been created by the Liberal government prior to 1911, and to-day we have absolutely open fishing in that province.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity of listening to the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). Since 1911 I have had the honour of a seat in this House as a representative from British Columbia. I have always, from that time up to the present, advocated that the rivers and streams leading up to the natural spawning grounds of the fish in that province should be cleared and the natural spawning grounds preserved so that the fisheries could be kept up and maintained. But, Sir, from 1895 up to 1911 practically every stream entering into the natural spawning areas of the fish in that province had been jammed, and not a dollar had been spent in clearing them or providing for the care of the natural spawning grounds. But I want to give the present Government credit for spending a good deal of money in this connection. Since 1911 steps have been taken to remedy this condition, and so far as I know the great majority of these streams to-day are cleared so that the fish can ascend to their natural spawning lakes and areas.

I suppose my hon. friend from New Westminster has discussed the hatchery situation in British Columbia and in the Dominion. We have always maintained—of course there have been arguments pro and con—that the hatcheries of British Columbia—and I suppose the same would apply to the Atlantic coast—have not been rendering the service which many of the cannery men would like to see rendered. But I agree with some of the professors and some of the cannery men that large rearing ponds in connection with our hatcheries in British Columbia would be a great asset.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg censured the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the neglect of the halibut fisheries of British Columbia, stating that they had been depleted and were practically lost to the fishermen. Well, I venture to say that if the hon. member were in his seat he would not be able to tell me where the halibut grounds in British Columbia are. I say that in all sincerity, and without any desire to reflect upon the hon. member in any way; I want to be as kind to him as I possibly can. Now, many who know the situation better than I do have always contended that Hecate straits belong to the Dominion. But that area, as many hon. members will know, lies between the mainland and Queen Charlotte islands, and by all natural events and observations, that water, in my opinion at least and in the opinion of many experts, belongs and always did belong to the province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada. The late Government—and I am sure the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)

knows the situation as well as I do—knew that all that water of Hecate strait was fished out by the Americans, and the immense halibut banks which existed in those waters have been absolutely destroyed. The halibut which is brought into Prince Rupert to-day is all caught beyond the three-mile limit and many hundreds of miles from Prince Rupert and, indeed, there is a little halibut caught on the west coast which finds its market in Prince Rupert.

I regret the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) is not in his seat. There is no doubt there was a few months ago a certain shortage of cars in Prince Rupert to handle the fishing trade, and I say, in all sincerity, that if I believed the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) was deserving of censure in that regard, I would certainly give it to him; but so far as I can judge the situation, the minister is not to be censured at all. Last session, orders were given for refrigerator cars; I think money was voted for the purpose, and if the car companies fell down in the delivery of those cars, it seems to me that the matter was entirely up to the management of the railways and not to the Minister of Railways. The number of cars which were ordered had not been delivered, but the management of the railways divided up what cars they had throughout the Dominion; Prince Rupert received its fair share of refrigerator cars, and so far as I know to-day no great complaint is coming from Prince Rupert as regards any shortage of cars in that city.

I rose simply to answer the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) in regard to the fishery question. I would certainly like to have had the opportunity and pleasure of discussing many of the natural resources of Canada and especially the pulp industry, because I have many large pulp concerns in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and there is room for many more. I hope I have not censured the hon. member for Lunenburg too much, but I trust that before he rises again in this House to discuss the fisheries of British Columbia he will get a little better posted upon the subject. If he does so, it will be more in his interest and the interest of the province from which he comes.

Hon. Mr. BELAND (Beauce): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend taking part in the discussion this evening, had it not been for the rather unpleasant remarks made to the House by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer). It is always a great pleasure for me to hear the hon. member. The House at least the hon. members who are acquainted with the French language, are aware that he is a splendid speaker to whom one could listen for hours. My hon. friend, in his speech, has, to a certain degree, established a few indisputable facts, but on the other hand, he tarnishes unnecessarily the reputation of a district, a reputation earned by years of intense production of our truly renowned maple sugar and maple syrup which are known not only in Canada, but also throughout Europe.

The last part of my hon. friend's speech might be described an advertisement for the electoral district which he represents so well in this House; but when the hon. member attacks the county of Beauce and its maple products, and seems to complain of the superior qualities of these products, which according to him, are superior in appearance only—instead of taking our farmers to task, he should remember that Providence herself has willed it so. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the quality of the maple sugar and the maple syrup which is produced in Beauce is mainly due to the special qualities of the maple trees of the county, qualities such as cannot be claimed for the maple trees in Vaudreuil. This is due to natural conditions, Mr. Speaker, to those fine hillocks and rolling lands which gather and above the sun's rays in greater abundance that could be expected in a flat country, like Vaudreuil.

My hon. friend referred especially to the methods of sugar making in the county of Beauce. He has given us to understand by his transparent, though veiled remarks, that the methods in use in Beauce were old fashioned ones. This proves but one thing, and that is, that the hon. member for Vaudreuil is not acquainted with the Beauce district. If he had taken the trouble, or rather if he had given himself the pleasure of visiting our splendid rural district, when the sun is fast melting the snow, and its warm rays are causing the sap to ascend and the buds to burst forth he would have found that sugar and syrup in Beauce are manufactured by methods as perfect as science can teach in these days. I fear he has not however visited us for a quarter of a century.

But let us say no more of this rivalry between the member for Vaudreuil and myself. I will only add that, if American manufacturers of maple candies, toffee, or the so-called maple syrup, give the pre-

ference to the Beauce products, it is not because it is darker, but because it is sweeter, if I may say so, than the syrup that comes from the Eastern townships and the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. With a pound of the Beauce maple sugar, the Chicago manufacturers can make a greater quantity of maple candies than he could make with one pound of sugar bought from my hon. friend the member for Vaudreuil.

There is in Canada an enactment known as the "Maple Products Act." This Act forbids all manufacturers, whoever they are, to mark their products as maple, when they contain any substance other than the condensed sap of the maple itself. Several members who spoke in the House last year and this year have approved of this special provision of the law, Mr. Speaker, I have come to doubt its usefulness.

That is not the point. The law is useless because, on account of the high prices of pure sugar and syrup, it is impossible to find a sufficient number of consumers to dispose of all the maple syrup and maple sugar produced in this country. Now, let me point out that, some years ago, there was in certain states of the Union, a legislation similar to that which is in our statutes, concerning maple products, and the American producers almost unanimously requested their respective Governments in each one of the states, to repeal the Act. In the province of Quebec, and particularly in the county of Beauce, there is a movement on foot—and one that is taking considerable proportions, as evidenced by the petitions signed by thousands of syrup and sugar manufacturers, which I have already laid before the House—in favour of amending or repealing this Act. Of course, the manufacturer has no kindly feeling towards the city producer who may place on the market a so-called maple product which is distinctly a fraud. But the producers of Beauce, at least if I understand rightly the petitions I have had the honour of laying before the House, are willing to have their pure products altered, that is, mixed with cane sugar or syrup which are selling at a much lower price, provided that it would be specified and specifically marked on the container that it is a mixed maple product.

You can obtain—and it has been scientifically demonstrated—just as wholesome and nourishing a syrup as the pure maple syrup by mixing the latter with cane sugar; that mixture will keep a long time and that is very difficult in the case of pure maple sugar. One of the reasons why we cannot sell an unlimited supply of our excellent and delicious maple syrup of Beauce, is that it cannot keep indefinitely. Unless you have a small refrigerator at home, the heat in the summer will cause a fermentation of the syrup. The consumers in the cities who are aware of this fact, buy only a small quantity of maple syrup in order to avoid the trouble of having it spoil by fermentation. That is why it is difficult to sell any large quantity of pure maple syrup, unless it should be for industrial or manufacturing purposes. To-day, petitions are being circulated throughout the county of Beauce and are being signed by thousands of people, asking the Government and Parliament to either amend or repeal the existing Act. I do not know whether the Government will give their consent. Of course there may be room for argument against the proposed amendment, because it would always seem very nice to say: Maple syrup is such a dainty thing, so fine and delicious and precious, that we must not allow any alteration of it. But we must also consider the mercantile and industrial point of view. For instance, you will realize that if you allow maple syrup manufacturers in Montreal, Toronto or Quebec, to make a syrup containing, let us say only 25 per cent of pure maple, provided that it would be specified on the container, whatever it may be, there will not be the same objection to the placing of that product on the market and it will have the advantage of keeping indefinitely and could be sold at a much lower price.

Mr. Speaker, I need not say any more. Whatever may be said against the maple sugar of Beauce, either by people settled in the west end of the province of Quebec, Vaudreuil, for instance, or in the eastern townships where my good friend who is sitting beside me (Mr. Robb) resides, they may say that it is black, red or brown, or anything else, but the fine connoisseur who wishes to taste the real thing, the real maple sugar or syrup, will pass through the counties of Vaudreuil and Huntingdon and through the Eastern Townships to land in our own district where he can find a product to which nothing in the world can ever be compared.

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): (Translation.) I would like to say a few words on the subject, but it is rather late and as we have done a good deal of work to-day—I am not speaking of myself but of other hon.

gentlemen who took part in the debate—I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would submit that we have exhausted about as much time on this motion as surely to satisfy every hon. member. I know the subject is of importance, but really we cannot afford to talk day after day in a more or less aimless discussion so far as any specific object is concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would submit that the discussion to-day has not been aimless, as my right hon. friend has suggested. I think this is one of the most important questions we have had before Parliament, and I do not think it is unreasonable at 15 minutes to 12 o'clock—within a few minutes of midnight—to ask that we should have an adjournment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I knew just what the aim was I would withdraw the word "aimless." I know some good can come from the discussion; I am not disputing that, but what more good can come from this discussion I am at a loss to understand. I only want to get through with the discussion so that we can get down to the business of the House.

Motion (Mr. Casgrain) for the adjournment of the debate negatived.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that having moved the adjournment of the debate, and that motion having been lost he is now precluded from taking part in the debate. Any other hon. gentleman, however, who has not done so has the right to speak.

Motion (Mr. Manion) negatived.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING OIL AND GAS PERMITS AND LEASES

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Regulations for the issue of oil and gas permits and leases in the Northwest Territories of Canada approved by Order in Council dated February 11th, 1921 (P.C. 331), are detrimental to the development of the oil industry both in law and equity and the purport thereof is to unduly discourage private initiative and unduly protect large financial interests by allowing the same to take full possession of the oil fields of the Territories.

He said: I regret having to speak on this matter at this hour, more particularly as hon. gentlemen who are absent from the House intended to participate in this debate, but I cannot allow this opportunity to slip by in view of the urgency and importance of this matter to those who intend to avail themselves of the opening of navigation in the northern portion of the province of Alberta to go to the northern fields of Mackenzie. Prior to December last, oil regulations for the unsurveyed territory of Mackenzie permitted an individual to locate 1,920 acres of oil lands. In the month of December an Order in Council was passed changing those regulations. This Order in Council became effective on the 27th day of December, and the regulations were so amended that any locator might take 640 acres of land, and, upon discovery of oil, he had the privilege of choosing 320 acres, the other 320 acres remaining the property of the Crown. That was called in the province of Alberta the "checker board" system, but was not looked upon as very unfavourable to the locator. Then, without any warning whatsoever, an Order in Council was passed in January, 1921, suspending all oil regulations in the North West Territories. A new set of regulations was promulgated by another Order in Council, No. 331, assented to on the 11th day of February, 1921. At the time I put this resolution on the order paper there were four distinct objections which I intended to take, two of which, however, have been removed by a subsequent Order in Council. One objection which I intended to discuss was the retroactive effect of the Order in Council as contained in clause 51 of the present regulations, but inasmuch as an amendment has been made and the retroactive effect has disappeared, it is useless for me to enter into a discussion of that feature of the regulations.

Another objection which I intended to discuss at the time the resolution was placed on the Order Paper was contained in section 44, which made it impossible for provincial companies already incorporated to maintain their holdings and develop as they had intended to, but since the resolution has been on the Order Paper that has also disappeared so far as all applications which have been received in the Department of the Interior are concerned. There is an objection, however, still remaining. I must read the section at the pain of occupying a considerable length of time, because I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, there are very few members of the House who are acquainted with the regulations, not being particularly interested in them, and I wish

hon. members to understand them so that the House may receive the benefit of their opinions for the special benefit of the people in the province of Alberta, and also for the general benefit of the whole Dominion. Section 44 of P.C. 331 reads:

> Any company acquiring by application, assignment or otherwise a permit or lease under the provisions of these regulations shall be a company incorporated under part one of the Companies Act, chapter 79, R.S.C., 1906, and amendments thereto, and the charter of such company shall provide for the issue of the shares of the capital stock of such company without any nominal or par value, in accordance with section 7 (B) of the said Act.

Now any application or assignment of location in the Northwest Territories can only be made under this section to a company holding Federal letters patent. I say that this is an indirect way of amending the law of the various provinces, because the object of the Government in passing this regulation is stated to be the prevention of speculation. If that is the only object of the Government they have not succeeded because the law can be circumvented. For example, a person possessing one location or holding by assignment, say, eight or ten locations in that country, can easily assign to a company incorporated by federal letters patent for one million dollars more than he otherwise would, and that one million dollars can be used for bonusing or for purposes of speculation, as the case may be. In some of the provinces the speculative aspect has been absolutely wiped away by the appointment of boards. The regulation obliging a company to incorporate federally merely retards the development of that country. Another reason given for imposing this regulation is that a provincial company has no power to hold lands in the North west Territories. I have been unable to find any decision bearing on the point. I submit that the regulations should be altered, and that it should be permissible for any provincial company to hold those oil locations situated in the Mackenzie district.

If the Minister of the Interior framed these regulations with a view to preventing speculation, he had in mind what he called "wild-catting;" but I understand that that has already been provided for in the Criminal Law. If he had in mind swindling, that is also provided for in the Criminal Code. If he meant unlicensed or uncurbed selling and watering of stock, that too has been dealt with in different laws; and if he meant the prevention of vending of prospective oil properties, or of promoting companies and securing capital for their development, then I say that he has been ill-advised in passing this regulation. If by this section, the prospector is not permitted to have the expert or specialized aid of a broker to find a market for his holding when he wants to cash in, or if he is deprived of the services of a professional promoter when he wants to raise cash, then section 44 is ill-advised and I submit that the Government should change it and permit provincial companies to hold and develop oil locations in the North West Territories.

There is another paragraph in the regulations about which I wish to say a few words, and I shall endeavour to conclude as soon as possible. I have reference to the division of the property which the locator is at liberty to stake. Under the present regulations, a locator may go into the Mackenzie basin and locate 2,560 acres of land and drill, and when he has found oil the Government will issue a lease to him of one quarter of this area, three-quarters reverting back to the Crown. Now, I take the position that nothing is indicated in the regulations as to what disposition is to be made of these three-quarter sections, and if the Government wishes at any time it may allot them to any financial company or individuals on whatever terms it may see fit. Whoever acquires these three-quarter sections, which have been practically proven up by the locator in his drilling, has three times as much power as the one who has actually located the ground and developed it up to the point where he is entitled to get the lease. The holder of the three-quarter sections has three times the quantity of land, three times the wealth, and three times the financial backing of others, and it would be easy for the person acquiring these three-quarter sections, under whatever terms the Government may choose to sacrifice one of them to put out of business the man who has actually drilled and found oil, obliging him to surrender to powerful interests.

At the present time the regulations actually prevent men from going in and prospecting that country, and only large financial companies can get into that territory with any reasonable certainty that they will be able to acquire any of the Crown lands which are to be disposed of after the oil has been found. The regulation, I submit, has been based on the assumption that we have railways running

in that country and that you can dump off all sorts of tonnage in the Northwest Territories, that there are facilities for taking oil out, that everything is lovely, and that you can just take the oil to the refinery. These are not the conditions. An estimate made by the Imperial Oil Company, to ascertain whether enough oil could be got to warrant the building of a pipeline, shows that they will have to be guaranteed the production of 20,000 barrels per day. Ling, one of the officials of the company, says that the present well yields 800 barrels per day; and they take it that they will get twenty-five producing wells. They will not get a gusher with every hole drilled unless they break all records. An American geological report says that the Texas record is 27½ dug holes to one producer. Taking the average at Norman to be ten, they will have to drill 250 holes to get enough oil to warrant development.

The cost of these 25 wells will be:

Cost of freight on one well outfit, including lumber, 200 tons at $20 per ton	$ 40,000
The Albertas outfit weighed 113 tons without lumber or season's grub. The Hudson's bay rate of freight in 1921 is 13 1/20 c. per pound, or $27 per ton. Cost of drill and 1,000 feet of 6-inch casing	15,000
Cost of lumber, timber, tools, etc.	8,000
Fares of 7 men in and out at current rates	2,700
Wages of 7 men, averaging $400 a month, by 12 months	33,600
Total per drilling outfit	$ 99,300
Cost of 250 wells at 2 wells per rig per season: $99,300 by 125	$12,421,500

With four rigs they would drill 25 wells in about 3 years. As soon as oil is found on one location, it would be good business to locate a new claim. How many claims they would be holding to get 25 producing wells it is difficult to say, but not less than 25. They would be paying to the Government on these twenty-five locations the gross total of $32,000 annually. It would take five years to build the pipe line, but in the meantime the Government would take from the locators to the tune of $160,000 while the pipe line was being built. Here then is the outlay before any returns can be looked for. First the pipe line costing $55,000,000. (I will grant you, for instance, that it is not going to be every company that will build a pipe line; and I assume that no Government would permit a company to build a pipe line unless there were some guarantees that they would permit other operating companies to use the same pipe line; but for one company that they build that pipe line there is the initial cost of $55,000,000.) Secondly, the wells will cost $12,421,500; and in the third place the rentals will amount to approximately $160,000. Finally for a refinery we will allow the sum of $3,000,000, and you have the sum total of $70,572,500 before any returns can be secured.

Now we will assume that under these regulations a company has expended the necessary moneys to get the requisite number of wells dug to warrant them in constructing a pipe line. The first thing the company is confronted with is that somebody else comes along who has not spent one cent in proving that property and he can go to Ottawa and say to the Minister of the Interior who does not sit in this House, by the way, I want to buy your three-quarters, true, I want to secure them under whatever terms you will allow me. Then he goes in on those three-quarters which have been proven and paid for by some locator and developed by somebody else's own money, and enters the field in competition, I say, Mr. Speaker, that these regulations are nothing short of a monstrosity and should be altered without any delay. If the Government wants to go into the matter of public ownership then let them define that policy; it is not my own by any means. But between allowing the man to go in and get 2,560 acres of land and turn three-quarters of that back to the Government, after it has been proven by private enterprise, by the money of individuals and the money of companies—I say between that and public ownership there is only one thing to do. It is to let the field lie dormant and prevent the development which ought normally to take place. It is quite clear to my mind that the Government in taking rentals as they do are penalizing capital and preventing it from working. The system of withholding three-quarters of the ground after the oil has been found is a means of scattering holdings and is discouraged by authorities, that can be looked up in Hager's Practical Oil Geology, pp. 159-164. What the Government ought to do, I submit, is to encourage development and make it possible for private enterprise to develop that territory, then reap their benefits from imposition of royalties. The Government need revenue and can get it if there is production; but until there is production the Government should not impede development of that country by their regulations and they

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

should not penalize capital for trying to work.

If the Government were anxious about the Empire let them read Allan's First Annual Report, Alberta Resources, in which it is stated there is enough oil in McMurray's sands for the Crown's security or 500 times the world's normal consumption. In 1912 somebody came from London, saw the Minister of Interior and told him to cancel the tar-sand regulations, and they stand cancelled up to the present time except that an Order in Council has been passed in favour of one General Lindsay of Ontario who has located the best parts that are known to him in the town site of Mcmurray. If the interests of the Empire are at stake in the matter of oil read the report of Mr. Allan for the Province of Alberta and he will indicate that there is enough oil hidden there to satisfy the Empire's requirements. I do not know why the regulations should have been suspended so far as tar-sand is concerned. If there is that much oil to be extracted from tar-sands we need not bother ourselves about the Mackenzie field and prevent everybody from getting into it. I am sure the Minister of the Interior has never been off the train from Edmonton towards those fields and does not know the first thing about them. There is a method of getting down to that country and it is an expensive one. Why should we endeavour to hold up the development of a field which can only be reached by navigation of rivers on a course of over 1,400 miles following the sinuosities of those rivers. When the closest well in the North West Territories would be something like 600 miles from Edmonton. Why should you prevent development by these regulations I cannot understand unless there is some ulterior motive which I dare not suggest?

Now the answer may be made to me: So far as rentals are concerned you need not bother about that; all you have to do is to get down there with your drill and you do not pay rentals any more. That is true if I get a drill down the first year. But first of all I must locate and the session is short. I cannot locate and get out and arrange my financial affairs and get in again in the one season; and it is incumbent upon me to pay 50 cents an acre. I pay rental the first year on everything that goes back to the Crown, and I must necessarily pay to the Crown one dollar for the second year's rental. The third year I must prove to the Government that I am performing certain work in order to be released from paying the rental; and the fourth year I must have a well, or I must take a report to the Government that I am about to make a well. Then when I have done all this, the Crown steps in and takes three-quarters of the ground I have actually proven to be useful to the Dominion of Canada. I say that the regulations are quite unreasonable, and every man in the province of Alberta who is interested in the development of that field has taken the same position. There is also this point: If a man has proven enough in that territory to make it worth while to construct a pipe line, he must pay the Government rentals whilst he constructs a pipe line.

My object therefore this evening is to bring this matter to the attention of the Government and to show that the regulations were extremely unfair in the beginning—so unfair and so inequitable that before this resolution was spoken to in this House two amendments had been made by the Government to their own regulations, which were absolutely unworkable. I would have preferred that the other amendment had been made so that whoever gets into that country and drills and finds oil shall be at liberty to purchase or acquire the other three-fourths of his claim on some terms giving him preference. That is the amendment I seek this evening in speaking to this resolution; or else that this House places itself on record in favour of fair oil regulations such as I describe.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I do not know whether my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) had in mind starting a second attack on the Government from his own side of the House, but if he desires to continue the discussion further, I would draw his attention to the fact that it is now Tuesday morning, and as we have been in session a long time, he should now allow the House to adjourn.

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I must say frankly that I was not inviting any attack from any side of the House or thinking that a government so undeserving of such would ever receive it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now that it has come I would prefer to have it over, if that is at all possible, although I do feel that we have sat a long time. While I am on my feet I will set an example in brevity, without discourtesy, I hope, and endeavour to see if it will be possible for the Government to survive the last attack.

The oil regulations are under fire to-night from the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) on the ground that they are too exacting as against the oil prospector or developer, and that as a consequence there will be reluctance on the part of those who otherwise might perhaps journey into the far northern Territories and stake claims there. If I caught the substance of his charge, it is this: that too high rentals are taken, that insufficient inducements are given, and that consequently there can only be development by men of large means. Now, I am quite free to admit that under the regulations that we passed only a few weeks ago there can be actual development in that district only by the investment of large sums of money. And no regulations that would protect the public interest at all could be operative that would permit development except by the expenditure of large sums of money, for the simple reason that otherwise development cannot be undertaken. The regulations were designed to apply to an oil field, not wholly in prospect but actually, to some extent at least, proven. The regulations that were in force before were in considerable measure attractive to the prospector because they were applicable to a field only in prospect and in no degree at all proven. They were changed because by the discovery of oil at Fort Norman, some fourteen hundred miles north of Edmonton, the Territories oil field became an established field—of what extent we do not know—and thereafter it was felt the regulations should be such as would do ample justice to the general interest of the whole country in that field.

Now, what are those regulations? They provide that any person of eighteen years of age or upwards can stake a claim not exceeding in all 2,560 acres or four sections of land, and he may stake it in four different areas, each being rectangular and of any size he chooses. Upon staking the claim and complying with the regulations—which must be done within a certain time after the staking, I think thirty or sixty days—he pays 50 cents an acre the first year, and thereafter $1 an acre for the land that he retains. The regulations also provide that he must within two years have a drilling outfit on the ground capable of drilling for oil within the area staked, and if he has that drilling outfit on the ground, showing that he is a real oil borer, and not merely a company promoter, then the rental for the second year is not charged; and if in the third year he proceeds to drill, then for that year as well the rental of $1 per acre is not charged, but he must pay in any event on the oil that he produces a royalty for the first five years of not less than 2½ or more than 5 per cent; and for the next five years a minimum of 5 per cent and a maximum of 10 per cent. Those royalties virtually amount to the entire rental that he pays to the crown. He is permitted to retain a quarter of the land he stakes, and the other three-quarters revert to the Crown; but he can choose the land he retains anywhere within the area that he stakes so long as he makes it a square piece of land.

Now, it is argued by the hon. member that land may afterwards be taken up by somebody in the city of Ottawa, and that the man who went up there and took the risk and discovered the oil will derive no advantage from the other three-quarters, although he paid rent on that land at 50 cents an acre. It is true he paid that rent, but it is not true that anybody in Ottawa could get that land; it reverts to the Crown solely. It is quite possible that later on it might be found equitable in the regulations providing for the disposition of the other three sections, or three-quarters of the land staked, that the man who staked the first 640 acres should have a prior claim upon it.

These regulations have been framed mainly after the regulations applicable to the Alaska oil field, although there is not a proven field as in the Territories. But it may be afterwards held equitable to do as is done in Alaska: to give a prior claim to the entrant for the 640 acres, and to provide, say, that tenders shall be called on a royalty basis for the oil in the other three sections of land, and that after the highest bona fide tender is received the entrant for the 640 acres shall have the right to that oil at the price tendered by the highest bona fide bidder. That is not the law to-day, it is true; but it is the law to-day that nobody else can get that oil. That portion of the land originally staked is simply held until it is found what is going to be equitable having regard to actual development. And it is quite within the power of the department to issue further regulations providing that a fair and just preference shall be given to the man who has taken the risk and made the discovery.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): That is all I am asking.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to what shall be the general policy with regard to this oil, speak-

ing on the subject a few weeks ago I referred to the regulations that had been in force for many years excepting oil from royalty. It will be observed that as regards this field that exemption does not apply. Not only is that so, but regulations are now in force specifically requiring royalties—a minimum of 2½ per cent and a maximum of 5 per cent for the first five years, and thereafter a minimum of 5 per cent and a maximum of 10 per cent. In the United States, I believe, provision is made whereby a preference is given as to the rest of the land to the entrant for whatever share he is entitled to there on a royalty basis of 12½ per cent. Something like that might possibly be later on found suitable in Canada. But it does seem to me that the regulations as they stand now, having in view the fact that no provision is yet made for the disposition of the other three sections, are not prohibitive by any means and should not deter anyone who really wants to develop oil in that territory, because anyone who really wants to do so must certainly have money at his back; otherwise he has no real intention of developing oil. The cost of getting in is great; the cost of boring is high; the cost of maintenance is very high; and after the oil is bored it must be got out, and that cost is very great indeed. It is estimated that a pipe line from that district would cost twenty or thirty millions of dollars. Now, there is one object to be served above all others, and it is this: to take care that the regulations are such, so far as we can frame them, as to discourage the practice of promoting companies and selling stock where there is no real exploitation under way; the regulations are designed to forbid, as far as they can, that being done. It does seem to me that the first requisite is that the innocent public shall be protected against those who look upon that district as merely a chance to fly kites and to do an oil business upon paper. The field should be reserved for those whose intention is to get oil and to serve the needs of the public by getting oil. There is no preference given to anybody in this regard; any who have the money and who intend to get oil will go up under these regulations; there is no reason in the world why they should not. It may be found by experience that preference should be shown in advance to those who take the one section. That is the only thing that seems to me to be worth consideration now, and that is under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my right hon friend pardon me if I interrupt him? At the beginning of the war, in the session of 1914 or 1915, we enacted a law giving the preference to the Home Government in respect to oil produced in Canada. Has that statute been made use of?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. That is not quite the fact, though I know what the hon. member refers to. A regulation was passed at the suggestion of the Home Government reserving from entry oil in the forest reserves and parks owned by the Crown, and that regulation was fully complied with until a few months ago—if my memory is correct, about nine months ago—when certain lands in the Rocky Mountain Reserve—I am not sure whether it applied to others or not—were opened under the oil regulations. The idea was in that reservation that oil was going to be a war necessity of the future and that unless the necessary steps were taken the oil of Canada might get into the hands of citizens of other countries and the purposes of our own country be forestalled. I think that was the idea underlying the reservation. Against that, though, it can be said—and said very emphatically after the experience of the war—that even though leases for oil lands be held by outsiders, even though others come in with their capital and get these leases and own them to the exclusion, say, of Canadian or British capitalists, the Government of Canada in time of war has absolute control of the whole situation; can prevent the export of oil or the export of anything else—indeed, in time of peace can do the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there not a clause in the leases to that effect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. But aside from that, the power of expropriation exists, and the course of the war showed that there really was not the peril in that regard that was anticipated. Consequently I as Minister of the Interior did not see that we were serving the interests of Canada by continually tying up these territories. I thought it was better that we should find out just what they contained and reserve to the whole country a just and fair interest therein. Special regulations, therefore, were made applicable to the oil in the Rocky Mountain Reserve, holding a very considerable proportion for the state in case oil should be discovered, much along the line of the regulations that are not under discussion. These regulations, let me explain to the House, are different for the Northwest Territories from those that

apply to the provinces. The reason is this: in the provinces there is no proven field as yet on any considerable scale; it is largely a matter of prospect and hope. In Alberta three refineries, I think, or three oil wells, are now being developed, but the amount of production is not relatively very high. In this Fort Norman well the flow is large. The best reports would indicate that the flow is very considerable indeed—that there is a very large field of oil; how much it will prove to be, only time will tell. The flow is on such a scale that undoubtedly it is a field of very considerable dimensions. The regulations, therefore, applicable to the Territories, fix definitely the royalty that can be charged, and they are such as not so much to encourage people to come in to look for oil, but to encourage people to go in who are going to bring oil out. That, in one word, distinguishes the regulations that should apply and do apply in the case of a proven field from those that are more applicable to a field that is still in prospect.

Now, I have no word at all to say in derogation of the rights of the hon. member (Mr. Mackie) to put this resolution on the Order Paper and to address the House upon it. I know that he as a member for his district is vitally interested in the prospect of oil development in the Territories as well as in his own province. But I submit to him that inasmuch as the regulations stand to-day in such shape that the department is quite in a position to give, if experience shows it to be necessary, a fair preference, as respects the other three sections, to the entrant for the one section; and inasmuch as up to now others cannot enter for these other three sections—the state only is interested in them; they are reserved to the state and to the state alone—it is scarcely right to ask the House to find that there is not sufficient inducement offered to the prospector, or that the oil regulations are such as to throw undue restraint around the development of the industry in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I submit to my right hon. friend that it is unreasonable to ask the House to proceed any further with the discussion this evening.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we should close, too. I am sure the debate is over; I think that with all I have said, perhaps the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. MACKIE: Mr. Speaker—

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I would direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that if the hon. member addresses the House at this stage, the debate will be closed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it not possible that other members may wish to speak to this resolution? This is an important subject; it amounts to a charge against the Government, and I do not know whether my hon. friend is prepared to withdraw that charge at the present stage. It is unreasonable to expect hon. members, after midnight, to take up an entirely new subject, and I do not think my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) was fair to the House when he caused us to proceed with this new subject at a late hour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an old subject.

Mr. MACKIE: Other gentlemen informed me they wished to speak on this matter; but I had one purpose to serve, and that was to bring to the attention of the Government what I think I have presented clearly, and if I had an opportunity to reply, I think I could make it yet more clear that the regulations are not as they ought to stand. I do not, however, wish to press this resolution to a vote, and unless hon. gentlemen really want to speak on it, I will withdraw the resolution after making one or two comments on the remarks made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw his resolution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the resolution being withdrawn, but the hon. gentleman said that he would like to make one or two comments by way of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is rather an unusual situation. The hon. gentleman rises to close the debate. He must either close the debate or withdraw the resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to do the hon. member an injustice. He said he wished to withdraw the resolution after making some comments by way of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch that remark of the hon. gentleman. It would be a most unusual procedure for an hon. member who is about to exercise his right to close the debate, to move the adjournment thereof.

Mr. MACKIE: I will let the matter stand as it is, as I shall not crave the in-

dulgence of the House. There will be days when Supply comes on, and some one will speak on this matter again.

Resolution withdrawn.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, March 15, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

RETURNED SOLDIERS—SPECIAL COMMITTEE

FIRST REPORT

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London) presented the first report of the Special Committee appointed to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance, and the re-establishment of returned soldiers, as follows:

> Your committee recommend that their Quorum be reduced from thirteen to seven members. All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. CRONYN: By leave of the House I would move that the report of the Special Committee apointed to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance, and the re-establishment of returned soldiers presented this day, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED

Fourth Annual Report of the Editorial Committee on Governmental Publications dated 1st March, 1921—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister on behalf of a large number of people who are interested in the matter, if it is the intention of the Government to give the usual bonus to the Civil Service this year.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The matter is under consideration, and I expect that a decision will be reached by the end of this week or the beginning of next.

CAPTAIN HENRY C. H. ADAMS, H.M.C.S. AURORA

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): For the purpose of asking a question, I desire to bring to the notice of the right hon. the Prime Minister a report which appears in this morning's paper of a speech delivered yesterday before the Canadian Club at Vancouver by Captain Adams of the H.M.C.S. Aurora, in which, when referring to the ships of the Canadian squadron, he is alleged to have said:

> Although these small ships were very good in their way, what the Dominion required was a striking force in time of war.

And later, that

> England to-day is paying $17 a head of population for the maintenance of the great navy which protects us. It is time that Canada stepped in the breach and assumed her fair share of this burden.

I would now ask the right hon. gentleman if Captain Adams, when speaking as he is alleged to have spoken, did so with the knowledge or authority of the Government and if not, will the Government bring to the attention of Captain Adams the fact that the question of Canada's naval requirements is one to be determined by the representatives of the Canadian people, and not by one of their employees even though he be the captain of a ship.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is perhaps in order in submitting his question, because it is one of public import, but he is not in order in making an argument under the guise of a question, which he did in the latter portion of his remarks.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I must admit that I have never had the alleged speech drawn to my attention until this moment, nor did I know until the hon. gentleman arose that we had a captain in our service by the name of Captain Adams. I do not know whether I should assume that Captain Adams is aware that the laws of Canada are made by the representatives of the Canadian people, but if I have any reason to believe that he does not know that, we will take occasion to inform him.

ARMOURIES FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): I should like to draw the attention of the Government, and particularly of the Minister of Militia and Defence, to a despatch in the Montreal Gazette of yesterday, upon which I shall put a question to the hon. gentleman. The despatch is concerning an incident at Windsor, Ontario, where an official of the Canadian Government is reported to have made

a statement which may be regarded as an interference with freedom of speech and a just cause of offence to a neighbouring people. I shall not read the whole speech, but very briefly it is to the effect that the Ontario Referendum Committee had arranged to hold a meeting in a Government building, the armouries, that it was contemplated that among the speakers at that meeting would be an American gentleman sometimes known as "Pussyfoot" Johnson, and that the Commanding Officer of the Militia who was in charge of the building refused to issue a permit on the ground that this gentleman was coming. The Commanding Officer is reported to have said:

> The Referendum Committee is welcome to use the armouries for meetings, as it has in the past, but I will not countenance bringing foreign agitators from the United States to Canada. We have trouble enough without that. England did not want Johnson, and Canada does not want him. Canadian or English speakers will be welcome.

Without comment, I desire to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence whether he is aware of the facts of the case, and whether it is the intention of the Government to uphold this official in his refusal to allow a public meeting to be held in the armouries.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia and Defence): In answer to my hon. friend's question I may say that yesterday morning a gentleman named the Rev. Mr. Oaten called at the Department of Militia and Defence and requested the privilege of using the Armoury building at Windsor for the purpose of a meeting under the auspices of the Dominion Alliance, and I at once gave instructions by wire to the headquarters of the Military District at London, in which district the city of Windsor is, to grant permission for the use of the Armoury upon the usual terms—the usual terms being that the buildings are not required at that particular time for military purposes, that a fee of $10 is charged, and that a patrol from the local fire brigade will be maintained during the meeting to protect the property.

Mr. MURPHY: During a temperance meeting?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The policy decided upon by the Government in regard to the use of these Armoury bulidings for the purposes of public meetings is briefly this: Any reputable body of citizens may have the privilege of using the buildings providing they comply with the terms I have just stated. That for the last ten months, at all events, has been the policy of the department. I know nothing about the meeting of the man who is known as "Pussyfoot" Johnson, whose name was not drawn to my attention. I knew nothing of the alleged refusal at Windsor, but I gave orders yesterday morning and the telegram went to military headquarters at London. The news will go to Windsor, so I assume the meeting will take place in due course.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I should like to ask the Minister of Railways whether it is his intention to lay on the Table of the House this year a report of the Canadian National Railways, and, if so, when?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): I have not yet received a report from the management. I expect it shortly and will lay it on the Table immediately on receipt of it.

CANADIAN MERCANTILE MARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): With reference to the question asked by my hon. friend, I might say to the Minister of Railways that there is a general desire, not only on the part of members on this side of the House, but in the country as well, to have some information regarding the expenditures and the financial operations of the Canadian Mercantile Marine. Does the minister intend to give to the House a detailed statement of the financial operations of the Mercantile Marine showing the business for the year ended December 31 last?

Hon. Mr. REID: I intend within a very few days to give to the House my annual statement with reference to the railways. So far as the Canadian Mercantile Marine is concerned, I may inform my hon. friend that it is the intention of the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) to make a statement regarding the operations of that branch of the public service. I understand that he will have that statement ready within a few days.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask the Minister of Railways to state precisely on what date he and the Minister of Marine purpose presenting the statements to which reference has been made. If he cannot do that, will he tell the House

whether those statements will be made before or after the Easter holidays?

Hon. Mr. REID: I am sorry I am not in a position to answer my hon. friend, for the reason that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) is ill just now and I do not know how long he may be confined to his house.

BY-ELECTIONS—DATE OF WRITS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I notice in the press the statement that the Government intends to issue the writ for the by-election in York-Sunbury, but that the issuance of the writ for the by-election in Yamaska will be deferred to a later date. Is that report correct? If not, will the Government inform the House when we may expect the writs for the several vacancies now existing?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I did not authorize the report in question and know not how it reached the press. The matter stands in exactly the same position as when inquiry was last made, and my answer must be the same.

TARIFF REVISION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): One of the Government organs this morning states that there will probably be no general tariff revision this session. Will the Minister of Finance affirm or deny that statement?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I am afraid I must deny it. I can very truthfully say that I had nothing to do with the publication of that report. However, I may say that the work is going on not only day by day, but by day and night.

Mr. JACOBS: May I ask the Minister of Finance, notwithstanding the statement he now makes, whether there will be a general tariff revision this session?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The work is in progress—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Tedious.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not so tedious, perhaps, as the hon. gentleman may think; there are several very interesting facts in connection with it. For example, there are very strong demands from Quebec for a very heavy protection on tobacco, and I am sure that is something that must interest my hon. friend. It gives room for a great deal of anxious thought. The time at which the tariff will be completed depends very largely, not only on the amount of detail work there is, but on the frequency of demands made for consideration of different items.

DATE OF BUDGET SPEECH

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Will the Minister of Finance say whether there is any truth in the statement published in the Ottawa correspondence of the Montreal Star on Saturday last to the effect that his Budget Speech will be delivered about a week or so after Easter?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There, again, I fear the answer must be the same as I have already given.

Mr. PARENT: No answer at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That may be, but, unfortunately, I can do no better.

Mr. FIELDING: "Wait and see".

FOREIGN AGITATORS AND ELECTIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec S.): With reference to the previous question put to the Minister of Militia and answered by him, I should like to ask him, in his capacity as Acting Solicitor General, whether or not he can tell the House that the presence in Canada of foreign agitators during an election is not distinctly contrary to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act passed last year?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: Speaking from recollection, I think there is some clause in the Franchise Act passed last session in regard to this point. However, my memory is not very clear on the subject. I will therefore refer the hon. member to the provisions of the Act.

Mr. POWER: That being the case, will the Acting Solicitor General be pleased to confer with the Minister of Militia in order that the Minister of Militia may not go wrong on the law of the land?

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen (Prime Minister), that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before this motion carries I should like to point out to the Government the impossibility of this House proceeding intelligently with a consideration of the Estimates until it has before it the full report of the Auditor General. There is no single right, or duty, or function of the Commons of greater importance than that of exercising careful scrutiny and control over public expenditures. Of so great importance has that function been recognized, that Parliament has framed special machinery by law with a view of insuring the control which the House of Commons should have. A part of that machinery is the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act which has a special provision respecting the presentation to Parliament of the Auditor General's Report. That provision has been drafted by Parliament with the object of ensuring the presentation of the Auditor General's report in complete form to the House of Commons at an early date. May I quote to the House the chapter and section to which I refer? It is chapter 24, section 48 of the Revised Statutes and reads as follows:

> The Minister of Finance shall cause an account to be prepared and transmitted to the Auditor General on or before the thirtieth day of June in every year, showing the issues made from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in the fiscal year ended on thirty-first day of March preceding, for services directly under his control.
>
> Such accounts and reports of the Auditor General thereon shall be laid before the House of Commons by the Minister of Finance on or before the thirty-first day of October next following, if Parliament is then sitting, or if not sitting, then within one week after Parliament is next assembled.

Hon. members will see that the provisions of the law in regard to the presentation to Parliament of the Auditor General's Report are in brief—that the report should be presented to Parliament, if it is in session, not later than the 31st of October, but if assembled at a later date, then within one week after it has assembled. This Parliament assembled on February 14th. We are now at the 15th of March, more than one month after the date of reassembling, and we have not as yet before us the full report of the Auditor General, nor are we able to obtain from the hon. the Minister of Finance, a statement as to when the full report will be presented. Mr. Speaker, I desire to point out that the Government is acting in direct violation of the law of the land in not presenting this report to Parliament in accordance with the provisions of the Act to which I have just referred.

[Mr. Power.]

When this matter was brought to the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance a day or two ago my hon. friend made rather light of it. He stated that in delaying the presentation of the report he was but following an immemorial custom, or something to that effect. I have taken the trouble to compare the dates of presentation of the Reports of the Auditors General to Parliament in the last Parliament under the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier with a corresponding number of years of this Parliament, and I should like to give to the House the facts respecting the differences under the two Administrations.

The Parliament of 1907 assembled on November 28th, of that year, for the session of 1907-08. Volume 3 of the Report was presented on November 28th, 1907, the very day on which Parliament assembled; volume 1 on December 2nd, and volume 2 on December 17th. In other words all of the reports of the Auditor General were before Parliament before the end of the calendar year of 1907. Parliament in the session of 1909 assembled on January 21st. On January 21st of that year the Auditor General's Report was brought down—there was not the loss of a day. Parliament for the session of 1909-10 assembled on November 11th, and volumes 1 and 3 of the Auditor General's Report were presented on the following day. Volume 2 was presented on January 12th, 1910. Parliament for the session of 1910-11 assembled on November 17th. On November 21st, four days later, the full report of the Auditor General was presented to Parliament. In other words in the last Parliament of the Administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the Auditor General's Report twice within that time was presented in full before the end of the calendar year in which the fiscal year ended, and in no instance was the report later than February 23. Now, the fiscal year ends, as hon. members know, on the 31st of March, so that during the years of the Liberal Administration which I have just mentioned there was in each one a period of from over one to three full months when the House had before it the Auditor General's Report, thereby permitting a full discussion on the Estimates before the end of the fiscal year had been reached.

Now let me contrast with that statement, the facts in regard to matters as they have developed under the present Government. Parliament for the session of 1917 assembled on January 18th, 1917. Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4 were not brought

down until April 19, three months after Parliament reassembled and nineteen days after we had entered on a new fiscal year. Parliament for the session of 1918 assembled on March 18th of that year. Volume 4 of the Auditor General's Report was not brought down until April 22nd, over a month after Parliament had assembled and twenty-two days after we had entered upon the new fiscal year. Parliament for the session of 1919 assembled on February 20th, 1919. Volume 4 of the Auditor General's Report was not brought down until April 22nd, over two months after Parliament had reassembled and twenty-two days after the beginning of the new fiscal year. Parliament for the session of 1920 assembled on February 26th of that year. Volume 4 of the report was not brought down until May 17th, nearly three months after Parliament had reassembled and a month and a half after the beginning of the new fiscal year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there has been a violation by the Government of the statute governing this matter for every year during the past five years. We seem to be getting into the practice of ignoring completely the statute which has been framed, as I have already mentioned, for the express purpose of enabling the Commons to exercise control over public expenditure which it is its first and most important duty to perform. There are possibly a number of explanations for this delay. I should hesitate to say that it is a deliberate device on the part of the Government to prevent Parliament from having information to which it is rightly entitled in considering matters of public expenditure. I do not hesitate to say, however, that one cause is that members of the Government have not been attending to the business of administration as they should have been attending to it. We witnessed the spectacle last year in Ottawa that for the greater part of the fall months it was impossible to bring together a quorum of ministers. Some ministers were in Switzerland, others were in Spain, others were in Belgium, others were in France, others were in England, some were on the Atlantic coast, others were on the Pacific—they were everywhere excepting in Ottawa attending to their several departments. The result is that instead of public business being in a form which permits of Parliament proceeding in an expeditious and intelligent way we are obliged day after day to call for reports which instead of being presented promptly are not only still incomplete but so incomplete that the Government can give no definite information as to when they will be available. May I also mention this fact? Hon. members opposite have been saying throughout the country in a somewhat boastful manner that the Opposition have done very little in the way of criticism of Government expenditures before the Public Accounts Committee. I ask my right hon. friend how it is possible to criticize expenditures when the volumes which contain the particulars in regard to these expenditures are not presented to Parliament in accordance with the requirements of the law. Let me point this out: The hon. the Minister of Finance mentioned a day or two ago that he had brought down certain volumes of the Auditor General's Report and that only one remained to be tabled. The one remaining is the really important one inasmuch as most of the matters that are controversial or contentious appear to be included in or referred to in volume 4. Parliament has placed before it statements which may be passed upon more or less without considerable discussion, the really important controversial subjects are necessarily held over until volume 4 is down. They arrive then for discussion at a time in the session when business has already been continued for a considerable period, the Government starts its late sittings at nights and on into the mornings, and an intelligent and careful discussion of public matters becomes next to impossible. Let me cite just one example. I have here volume II of the Auditor General's report for the present year, part K to SS. Under the summary of expenditure and revenue of the Department of Militia and Defence the following figures are given:

Salaries under statute	$ 18,849 43
Civil Government salaries and contingencies	208,797 00
Militia and Defence, general	4,616,781 00
Miscellaneous	1,394,825 00

The details for these particular summaries are given in this report. But here is the next item:

War appropriation, $247,997,725.

And the reference to the particulars under that heading is Part ZZ; in other words, volume four, which as yet we do not know when we are likely to receive. This expenditure of $247,000,000 odd on account

of War Appropriation at this particular time cannot be scrutinized too carefully either in this House or before the Public Accounts committee, and I submit that Parliament is helpless in discussing that expenditure without having before it the reports, which it is entitled to have.

This delay on the part of the Government is the less excusable inasmuch as the matter was expressly brought to its attention on two or three occasions during our last session. When we were discussing Supplementary Estimates on June 7 last I took occasion to address the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) as follows:

> I want to say, not by way of threat but simply that hon. gentlemen opposite will understand the position of the Opposition, that if the Government of the day should by any possibility be in office next year we shall not be willing to make these advances.

I was referring then— and I think the Government would do well to consider this particular feature at the moment—to the practice which my hon. friend asked us to adopt of voting a portion of the Supply en bloc at the end of the fiscal year before there had been any opportunity of considering the Estimates. I was pointing out to my hon. friend that there were very strong reasons for taking exception to that practice, and I drew his attention to the circumstance that while we were ready to concur last session to oblige the Government, we would not do so at a subsequent session if the Government was negligent in calling Parliament together at an early date and in providing the reports which we were entitled to have before us. I said to my hon. friend:

> We shall expect the Government to call Parliament earlier than was done this year and to have public business sufficiently under way to enable the due control to be exercised over public expenditures which Parliament ought to have.

My hon. friend made this reference to my remarks:

> I hope that next year the session will commence in the month of January.

Then the the very last day of the session the matter was again brought up, because we on this side of the House realized the significance of the Government's attitude in appearing indifferent to the demands of the law in the particular mentioned, and on the first day of July, the day Parliament prorogued, I again took occasion to draw the Government's attention in the following words to the wisdom of presenting the Estimates at an earlier date:

> Might I take advantage of this moment again to suggest to the Government that if by any possibility they should be in office this fall they consider the advisability of calling the session at an early date, so that we will not again be confronted with a situation such as we have had on this occasion, of reaching the month of July with a very large proportion of Estimates to be hurriedly passed in the last remaining twenty-four hours. I trust the Government will make a point not only of bringing down its Estimates as early as possible, but of affording early opportunity for a consideration of them. We of the Opposition—if we are still in opposition—will not agree to give the Government any votes on account if that can be avoided. The public interest in these matters must be protected as far as possible.

My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who was acting Prime Minister at the time, gave the House this quasi assurance:

> But the Government, as it always has done, will try and get the session on as early as conveniently possible; and, as it always has done, it will have a body of Estimates ready for the Opposition almost from the time that the House gets into working order.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that assembling Parliament in February when it is contemplated that Parliament shall assemble in November, is not bringing Parliament together "as early as conveniently possible".

Let me conclude with a reference to what was said by my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). It was, I think, practically the last word spoken in the last session. At page 4589 the hon. gentleman is reported as follows:

> It is one thing to have a body of Estimates laid before us; it is another thing to have a proper opportunity presented to discuss them. It is the opportunity to discuss the Estimates that has been delayed in many cases.

That is the point of which we are complaining at the moment. There is not an opportunity intelligently to discuss these Estimates until we have in its completed form the Auditor General's report of the preceding fiscal year, and until we have several other reports which have already been asked for, and concerning which we can get no definite information from the Government. I think, Sir, that until we get a definite assurance from the Government that we are going to have a proper opportunity of discussing the Estimates with reports in their complete and full form we would not be justified in proceeding at the present moment with the consideration of any portion of those Estimates.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will not again be misinterpreted if

I say that I see nothing in the remarks of the hon. gentleman that would warrant the high tone of voice and apparent indignation with which they were delivered. It is quite true that the law calls for the presentation of the Auditor General's report within a week of the opening of each session; and it is quite true that that is most desirable if it can be procured; and, further, it is quite true that the presence of the Auditor General's report for the preceding year is of much value in the discussion of the Estimates for the succeeding year. But alongside those considerations must be set the fact that the Auditor General's report is not prepared by the members of the Government or by officers directly under them. That report is prepared by the Auditor General and his officers, and they bear a relation to the Government of any day under the constitution of this country that I think hon. members fully understand. Nothing has been done on the part of the Government, and nothing has been withheld so far as I am aware—and I am sure I am right, for I think I know all the facts connected with the case—designed to deter the presentation of the Auditor General's report. What would be the object of the Government in so acting? And if we had none, does the hon. gentleman want to insinuate that the Auditor General would withhold his report at the instigation of the Government? It is merely a matter of getting through the physical labour that must be accomplished before the Auditor General's report comes down.

Now, while it is better and, indeed, essential, that before we proceed far with the materials which we are presenting to the House by way of Estimates we should have the Auditor General's report relating thereto before Parliament at the time, that is the case now. Three volumes of that report are down, two of them have been down for some time, and we are quite content that those departments —and those alone—as respects which the Auditor General's report is down shall be now considered by the House in the way of Estimates.

My hon. friend says there are certain estimates—if I understood his remarks correctly in connection with a quotation he made from some reports that have been brought down—there are some items in the report which bear reference to volume 4. If that is the case, certainly the Government would not ask, if anybody objected, that anything relating to that item be gone on with in the Estimates. Indeed, it is not necessary that we should go on with them; we have three volumes here and we have ample reason to proceed. Surely the time has come when we should start upon the Estimates. I am not able to understand the logic of my hon. friend's argument when he says: "In previous sessions we have not had time to discuss the Estimates, therefore this session I am going to hold up the House and not let it get to the Estimates."

Mr. PARENT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad to have the approval of my hon. friend from Quebec; I know that would appeal to his good judgment.

Now, one would really think that some innovation had been risked by the Government in launching upon a career of violation of law, and the hon. gentleman selected two or three years during which the late Liberal Government were in power to show that they had complied with the law, as opposed to this Government, which did not comply with it. In order to be fair in the presentation of the facts I am going to adduce, let me say that the Auditor General's Department held exactly the same relation to the government under preceding governments in Canada as it holds to-day. But the delay of which my hon. friend now complains so bitterly and in language of rather amusing indignation was exceeded three times over under the government of which he himself was a member; and while it was exceeded the Estimates were gone on with in the House at the request of the government of which he was a member. I have not been able to find a single year —my search has necessarily been hasty, because I had no notice from my hon. friend that he intended to launch this attack— I have not been able to find a single year in which the Government of which he was a member did comply with the law. It may be that a year can be found, but I could not find any in going hastily through these figures furnished by the Finance Department. I will read them exactly as they are, and the House can judge for itself.

The House met on the 8th of March, 1906. The second volume was brought down on the 28th of March, 1906, or three weeks afterwards, whereas the law requires that it be brought down within one week. That was a violation of the law in respect of very volume except volume 1. The House met again on the 22nd of November,

1906; volume 1 was brought down on the 4th of February, 1907.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend will pardon me, he must be misinformed, because the figures which I quoted show that volume 1 was brought down on December 2, 1907.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am talking about 1906-07. The hon. gentleman made a careful selection of his years, but there are other years besides those he gave.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt my right hon. friend, but he was referring to the time when I was a member of the Government, and I was confining my remarks to that period.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said, the Government of which he was a member. He became a member in 1908. We will see how they lived up to the law in 1908, 1909 and 1910.

Mr. JACOBS: We are now having some ancient history.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not so very ancient. At all events, 1906 is not so very much more ancient than 1908.

For the year 1906-07 the House met on November 22; the first volume was brought down on February 4, 1907. This year the first volume was brought down not long after the opening of the session. I have not the exact date; perhaps the Minister of Finance will give it later. I might add also that that volume brought down on February 4, 1907, was only a portion of the first volume; the other portion was brought down on February 8, 1907—that is the way my notes read. The second volume was brought down on the first day of March, three months and eight days after the opening of the session. The third volume was brought down before the first—on the 9th day of January, 1907, nearly two months after the opening of the session, and the last volume, relating to the Post Office Department and the Mounted Police, was brought down on the 22nd of February, 1907, or exactly three months after the session opened. We are now at the end of the first month of this session, and my hon. friend comes into the House in this great state of indignation—

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My Hon. friend from Three Rivers appears to follow in every particular and to share the indignation of my hon. friend. If I am not wrong, the hon. member for Three Rivers was a member of this Government that delayed three months in bringing down the report of 1906-07. Moreover, he was Solicitor-General, I believe—legal adviser—so that he would know they had to bring it down in a week or be branded as violators of law.

In the following year, 1907-08, the House met on the 28th of November, 1907. The first volume was brought down on the 29th of November; the second on the 17th of December, almost a month after; the third on the 28th of November. The first and the third were apparently brought down together.

Mr. PARENT: The same year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same year, of course; did the hon. member think they would bring them down a year after?

For the year 1909-10 the House met on the 20th of January, 1909. The first and third volumes were brought down on the 22nd of January, 1909; I think that is the date given by my hon. friend. The next volume—it is marked here "P.O."; I assume that figures relating to the Post Office Department were contained in it—was brought down on the 22nd of February, 1909, a delay of a month and two days longer than in the present instance. That was the first year in which my hon. friend was himself a member of the Government. It would have been peculiarly appropriate if he had waited on this occasion for two days more and then he could at least have said that the delay was one day longer than was the case when he himself was a member of the Government. But the next volume was brought down on the 23rd of February, so that, in the case of two volumes out of three, the same period exactly had elapsed of which he complains to-day. In the first year in which he was a member of the Government, only one was brought down and two remained after the expiration of the same time of which he complains to-day. Now three are down and only one remains, and my hon. friend is filled with indignation. Moreover, the expenditures, operations and activities of the Government are not only far greater to-day than they were in 1908 and 1909, but they spread over a far wider area and necessitate much greater delay in the preparation of these publications than was the case at that time.

For the year 1909-10 the House met on November 11. Two volumes, the first and third, were brought down on November 12. Volume 2 was not brought down until the 12th of January, or over two months after the House met. That was the next year in

which my hon. friend was a member of the Government; still he upbraids this Government for delay and violation of the law, and says that in the interests of the taxpayers of Canada he cannot allow one dollar of supply to be voted until the Auditor General's report comes down. It is very unfortunate for my hon. friend that he was for these three years a member of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: And for the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may have been unfortunate for the country, but on that subject I am not speaking now.

Now, in respect of the years to which my hon. friend refers, those since 1917, it must be remembered that during that period this country was at war; that there was an overseas ministry of militia; that the returns from that department particularly could not be in at the same time as the returns from other departments, and, furthermore, that every department of this Government was being conducted under difficulties of which the Government preceding it knew nothing at all. There would, therefore, be abundant reason, abundant necessity, for delay in these years that did not exist in his time by any means. Even yet there are returns from overseas—I cannot speak authoritatively on this, but I am very much disposed to think that this fourth volume is not down at the present time because of delayed returns that even yet must come from overseas. I understand that the fourth volume refers chiefly to war appropriations; but the fourth volume will be down; we have reason to believe that it will be down in very good time. In the meantime it is suggested only that the House shall go on with such Estimates as are fully covered in the volumes already on the Table. I do not think one single year can be pointed to during which my hon. friend or the hon. gentleman beside him were members of the Government when Estimates were not gone on with before the complete set of volumes of the Auditor General's Report were on the Table. If this be the case, by what show of reasoning does my hon. friend ask this House to block the Estimates and even to refuse to go into Supply before the last volume of the Auditor General's Report is on the Table? The only reason is that there is no better one to present, that there is nothing better to fight with—

Mr. PARENT: Good enough.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and consequently it is "good enough," because something must be found. It is surely important that we arrive at Supply at an early date. It is complained that Parliament did not meet in time. Again references could be made to previous meetings of Parliament, but it has been the practice for some time to call Parliament after the New Year, instead of before, and many hon. members—and they are not all on this side of the House either —have urged that that practice be followed, because of the delay and loss of time entailed in going and coming for the very short period prior to the Christmas holidays. It was hoped that this year we could meet earlier that last. We have met earlier than last year; indeed, we met almost two weeks earlier than last year. We met on a Monday, and no time whatever of the representatives of the people was lost by adjourning until the next week. We immediately got down to business; the debate on the Address was proceeded with; it was not rushed through by the Government; all the time asked for by the Opposition was given, and the debate continued at considerable length after members of the Government had desisted,—it continued at the length it did because hon. gentlemen opposite determined that it should so continue and they themselves conducted the debate. After the debate on the Address was closed, there was abundant material before Parliament for the consideration of Parliament. Already only a week or so afterwards, the Estimates are laid on the Table, and we ask the House to proceed to a consideration of those Estimates, in order that the very thing of which my hon. friends complain shall not take place; in order that Parliament may early in the session get to those Estimates, consider them fully and without haste, and conserve the public interest thereby. If that be desirable, surely then it is not desirable that, for reasons such as my hon. friend has adduced, the consideration of Estimates should be deferred.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, we are told by Shakespeare's Dogberry that "comparisons are odorous." They are sometimes interesting though they may not be helpful. I have been gathering some information from the speeches of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen). They have been giving me some dates, and from those dates I learn—I am assuming that the figures given by my right hon. friend are correct—that in times past, some years ago, the Auditor General's Report was rather

slow in coming down; but whether it was due to the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite or the pious resolve on the part of the Minister of Finance at that date, I cannot say, but, according to the Prime Minister a great change came about, and in the last Parliament which was in the time of a Liberal government, according to the dates given by the leader of the Opposition and not disputed by the leader of the Government, it appears the Auditor General's Report came down very promptly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, nearly two months after the opening of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: In one case only.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In two, if not three

Mr. FIELDING: I understood from my right hon. friend that the dates given by the leader of the Opposition were very favourable; but he said that there were other dates, and so he went back to ancient history. There is, however, a more serious point than that. It appears to me that my right hon. friend has failed to appreciate adequately the importance which, not only these public documents, but others as well, have in regard to the business of the House, and I should be glad if I could assist him to get a better appreciation of the importance, the necessity, of having public documents brought down at an early date, without the need of commenting upon times past and without undertaking to make any comparison of one government with another.

The leader of the Opposition has truly said that the first and chief function of Parliament is to control public expenditures, and the documents relating to public expenditures are of paramount importance. We must first have the Estimates; we must have the Public Accounts; then we must have the report of the Auditor General for the year that is past. Before Parliament is asked to vote additional Supply to the Government, it is reasonable that Parliament shall have an account of how the money previously voted was spent, so that those three series of volumes, the Estimates, Public Accounts, and the Auditor General's report, are of vital importance. Irrespective of what anybody is doing now or has done in the past, I should like the Government to appreciate the great importance of so adjusting public affairs that those reports will come down at the earliest possible moment. I do not emphasize the fact that the law requires that the Auditor General's Report shall be brought down within so many days of the opening of Parliament. That is always found to be difficult and, perhaps, impossible. I do not insist on the Auditor General or the Government being tied up to the days mentioned; but an effort should be made to bring down those reports, and other reports as well, at an early date of the session. The whole basis of the business of the Government and of Parliament is that we shall have before us the reports of the various departments of the Government and when days, weeks and months roll on and we do not get those reports, the purpose of Parliament is defeated.

4 p.m.

[Mr. Fielding.]

My right hon. friend says that the Auditor General is not responsible to the Government. That is true only in a measure; it is true that the Auditor General is an independent officer; that he can be dismissed only by a vote of the House. But it is not true that the Auditor General's department is so absolutely disconnected as my right hon. friend suggests. The Auditor General is my right hon. friend's own appointee, and he has a reasonable right to ask that that official shall attend to his duties. I am not suggesting that the present Auditor General, who was a clerk in that department in my own days and who is, I believe, a very capable man, is in any way in the wrong. But when my right hon. friend says that he is not responsible for the Auditor General, he is getting away from parliamentary responsibility which should extend to the Auditor General. I understand the Auditor General's complaint is that he has not a sufficient staff. Whose fault is that? It is the business of the Government to see that he has the staff that he needs, and that he is facilitated in bringing down his report at the earliest possible moment, and no arguments that the Government can make can absolutely absolve them from responsibility in that regard.

It has been said that there has been difficulty in regard to the printing, but there should not be any difficulty now. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) told us the other day of the immense improvement that had been made in the Printing Bureau by the dismissal of four hundred and fifty men after many years' service. Well now, if they have improved it so much, if, as he says, the business is done more efficiently, might we not reasonably ask that these various public reports

should be ready at an early date? Behind that, is the question of the date when Parliament shall meet. I know that is a question on which there is some difference of opinion, but I want again to put forth my views in favour of carrying out what was the design of Parliament when the fiscal year was changed. Formerly the fiscal year ended on the 1st of July, and Parliament usually met in the month of January or February. That gave a period of seven months in which to get the public reports ready, a reasonable time, and when Parliament met in January or February, as a rule most of the reports were ready, or were shortly afterwards. But then there was this great difficulty: when Parliament met in January or February business men complained that they were kept here all through the summer until the hot weather, and many a business man who would be willing to give his time through the winter to the affairs of the nation was not prepared to sacrifice his time and neglect his business affairs away on until midsummer. So in the interests of efficient government, and to encourage men of the right stamp to give their time to the public service, it was decided to change the fiscal year, and by common consent on both sides of the House it was changed so as to end on the last day of March instead of on June 30. There was a gain of three months there in which to get the public documents ready. You could have seven months under the old system. You now have your fiscal year ending on 31st March, and you could meet in November or December and have just as much time in which to get the public documents ready as they had in former times when they met in January or February. Why cannot we do it? I am not making this a matter of party controversy, for I know we had some difficulty ourselves in doing it. But I think this Parliament could very well meet in November and dispose of the debate on the Address and a great deal of formal business, and make a good start on the business of the House before Christmas, when a reasonable adjournment could be had. Then after the Christmas vacation we could come back and end our business in May. This year—I do not know what plans are in the minds of the Government or hon. gentlemen opposite—all the indications are that if business drags along as it is doing now we shall be here in May, June, and July, and Heaven knows how much later. My hon. friend says that members on both sides of the House prefer to meet after the New Year. Notwithstanding that, the merit of the system itself should commend itself to the House. It is desirable that these public documents should be got ready earlier, and I think we should agree that it is desirable Parliament should meet earlier and not be kept sitting here until July, August or later, as sometimes is the case now. Unless we can agree to meet at an earlier date and get the business well advanced at an earlier date, I do not see how we are going to carry on the business of the country efficiently, and make the conditions of Parliament satisfactory to a large class of the best type of men in the country whom we should desire to have co-operate with us in Parliament. Therefore, the thought I would give to my right hon. friend, without finding any fault or entering into comparisons between now and the old days, is that he should appreciate in larger measure the great importance of having these documents ready in time, and, if necessary, get a large staff for the Auditor General and for the Printing Bureau. Let him get back these 450 men if it is going to give us the documents in time, so that Parliament may be able to meet earlier and have the documents ready at a reasonably early period in the session.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I confess that I have a good deal of difficulty in reconciling the present debate with the hon. gentleman's great anxiety that business should be proceeded with and the House adjourned at an early date. There are one or two faults which are laid at the door of this Government. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) gives two concrete suggestions. He makes a concrete suggestion as to the staff of the Auditor General, and another concrete suggestion as to the staff of the Printing Bureau. Now, if we have any ground for complaint in the matter of these criticisms it is rather to be found in the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition that the Government are responsible for what the Auditor General does; because the Government responsibility so far as the Auditor General is concerned is to supply him with the means wherewith to carry on his work, and, having done that, to refrain from interfering with him in his work in any way, to turn him either this way or that. And we are not interfering with him.

Let us deal first of all with the questions of staffs. I would like to make it perfectly clear to the House that there is

no trouble about the printing of this report. The delay is not in the printing. So far as the staff of the Auditor General is concerned, I do not know how much larger a staff the hon. gentleman thinks the Auditor General should have.

Mr. FIELDING: Enough to get the work out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It might get to that point where there would be so many that they would be tumbling over each other and the work not be got out. It might be like conditions at the Printing Bureau at one time. We had employed in the Auditor General's department for the year 1920-1921, 114 employees; we have for this year 158 employees, or an increase of 44 permanent employees in that comparatively small department.

Mr. ROBB: Is the minister satisfied that the new employees are just as competent as the old ones?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not going to say anything as to any personal knowledge I have as to the competency of the staff of the Auditor General. We are relying upon the Auditor General. In the main there have been but very few changes, but so far as the new appointments are concerned, the Government have received no complaint from the Auditor General as to their efficiency. But the publishing of the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report does not depend so much on the size of the staff, as upon whether the necessary information has come to hand. The Auditor General says he has not got all the information yet, and that he cannot get it before the end of the month.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is in default? That is the point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that I can say that he is in default or not. If he has not the information, he cannot very well get on with that work. It must be remembered that the Auditor General is an entirely independent official. There has been no interference with him. On the other hand, he has been urged to get the report out. He reports that some information has not yet been received. He has to-day a task of infinitely greater difficulty than in pre-war days. The volumes are greater, and the weight of the burden is infinitely greater. But even in pre-war days, when there was not quite as much reason for delay as there now is, hon. gentlemen then in charge of affairs thought it would be a good thing that progress should be made with the Estimates as and when progress could be made. It was thought it would be a good thing that the reports of the Auditor General should be brought down from time to time when they were ready. I note for example, that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's is thus reported in Hansard of 1906, at page 6,126. There had been a discussion as to the advisability of bringing down the Auditor General's report in instalments, and this is what my hon. friend said:

> In regard to the next session, the circumstances are so exceptional that we can hardly hope to have the ordinary blue books ready for the early part of the session. But, as to our practice generally, I think that the most that can be said is that, where there is a probability of delay in the presentation of the Auditor General's Report, it would be better to have it brought down in instalments.
>
> But if in ordinary sessions there is likely to be delay in presenting the completed volume, and if the business of Parliament is likely to be retarded on that account, I think it would be better to present the report in instalments.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the greatest charge against us is that we have followed not only the action but the advice of the hon. member; and, frankly, I do not think that we have committed any grave offence in doing so. The hon. member went on to say:

> I think that an examination of the records will show that there has been little delay in any case—the Auditor General's Report has been brought down within a few days of the time specified by law * * * If, in future, there is danger of delay which will impede the business of the House, I agree that the report should be brought down in instalments, because it is the basis of much of the business of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Had there been any complaint that the reports were delayed, to which this was a reply? It might be curious to know who was complaining at that time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I much regret that owing to the fact that we have had somewhat hurriedly to prepare for this discussion I have had no opportunity of reading Hansard myself. I merely give to the House the extract from my hon. friend's remarks with which I have been furnished. Now, Mr. Speaker, what real difficulty is there? The public accounts have been tabled for some time—since the 8th March. We have already got the first three volumes of the Auditor General's Report and they are very largely complete in themselves. They are not complete in so far as demobilization items are con-

cerned. The demobilization items are contained in volume 4, and it is because of those items that there is a delay in connection with that volume. The demobilization votes refer only to certain items in the Estimates. Militia and Defence, Labour, Justice, Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture and Privy Council, the report of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department, are contained in the fourth volume; and as the right hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) has pointed out, we are not now seeking to go into Supply in connection with any of those matters which are dealt with in volume 4. Almost the whole of the Estimates can be dealt with without the slightest reference to, or the slightest help from volume 4. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the objection is one calculated to delay the proceedings of the House, and it can serve no useful purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is a discrepancy between the Prime Minister and myself in regard to some of the statistics given. In quoting for the year 1907, I wish my right hon. friend would mention the dates he has in connection with the presentation of reports that year. I find a difference between his dates and mine:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Do you mean 1906-7?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, 1907-8.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House met on November 28, 1907, Volume 1 was presented on November 29; Volume 2, on December 17; Volume 3 on November 28.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When my right hon. friend spoke before, I did not think he gave November 28.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That was the date given; I took down the items as he read them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then his figures are correct.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statements of the Minister of Finance and of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, but no good reason has yet been given to the House why the Auditor General's report should not be on the Table. There is one fact that we must not lose sight of, and that is that owing to the change in the fiscal year all the items to be found in the Auditor General's report, when presented, will be at least one year old. The Auditor General's report will give us information only up to the thirty-first day of March, 1920, and as it is now bordering on the thirty-first of March, 1921, all the items that will be contained in the Auditor General's report, when we receive it, were expended one year go. Consequently, there can be no fair argument, if the department is awake at all, why the report should not be placed on the table of the House, as required by law, within one week after the opening of the session. In the old days, when Parliament was supposed to meet in the autumn, the case was different. The Auditor General had only six or seven months to prepare his report. Under the present system, when we meet in February, he has practically a year in which to get his report ready. The Auditor General was a witness last year in an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee. He was asked why he delayed so long in preparing his report, and he gave very unsatisfactory answers. One of the questions asked him was this:

When was the first manuscript sent by you for that current year to the King's Printer to be printed?

What do you suppose was his answer? Now, it was his duty to begin the report immediately after the 31st of March of the previous year, and his answer was that it was on the 17th of November, 1919, that he sent in his first copy to the King's Printer. He appears to have slept for eight months after the close of the previous fiscal year before sending a line to the printer. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is unpardonable; it shows, for one thing, that the department is not doing its duty. I appreciate what the Minister of Finance says, that the Auditor General is a responsible officer and that no interference must be made with his duties. That is all right. But for that very reason, my hon. friend will not go so far as to say that he is not accountable to this Parliament. If the Auditor General decided not to send us his report at all, would Parliament stop sitting? Would it discontinue the consideration of expenditures altogether? Surely that is not the intention of the law. While the Auditor General is a responsible officer and is supposed to look after the details of his own department free from interference, still the head of the department has a duty to perform; and if it is true that the Auditor General delays for six or seven months, or eight months, in sending his copy to the King's Printer to

be printed, until Parliament is to meet, then it is the duty of the Minister of Finance to draw this matter to his attention and to see to it that the department of the Auditor General does its work.

Now, my right hon. friend, if I heard him correctly, stated in his speech—which consisted largely of post mortems—that the details of the Estimates which the Government are now asking the House to deal with had already been presented to Parliament, and that he was not asking the House to deal with any Estimates that are not already detailed in the Auditor General's report. I think that was the substance of what he said. Now I have the Auditor General's report on my desk and I took occasion to look the matter up. From the Hansard report of last night's sitting I find that it was proposed to deal to-day with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice. Taking first the Department of Agriculture and referring to volume 1, of the Auditor General's report of this year, page A2, I find the item: Canada Food Board, $48,656.71. Now the Canada Food Board has always been a contentious matter; members of this House will want to know all the details of the expenditure in connection with it. And yet we are told that those details are set forth in part ZZ of volume 4 of the Auditor General's report. So much for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be no need of that item going on, or any expenditure connected with the Food Board, if hon. gentlemen opposite want it deferred.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I am speaking of the announcement as to the business to be taken up to-day which is contained in Hansard. According to Hansard my right hon. friend said that the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice were to be dealt with first.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My point is this: If there is any item in the Auditor General's report which refers to something in the Estimates, and volume 4 of the report is necessary in connection with its discussion, that item can be deferred; there is lots of other work to do until the remainder of the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I think it will be difficult for my right hon. friend to find any item with which we can deal in that case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why defer consideration?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I turn up the Auditor General's report containing items of expenditure in connection with the Department of Justice, which is volume 2, page L2, and at the foot of the page I find the sum of $1,644,168.28 as to which we are told the details are set out in volume 4. These are the two Departments whose estimates we are supposed to deal with to-day. Now I think my right hon. friend could not have been looking up the details of the expenditures when he made the announcement that the Estimates of these two Departments are set forth in the Auditor General's report, because the Estimates for both Departments contain items, and large items, which are detailed in volume 4 of the Auditor General's report. It has already been stated in the discussion which has so far taken place that the practice—

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Will my hon. friend allow me just one word? I merely wish to remark that the consideration of certain items could, of course, be postponed, but last night when the House adjourned the Prime Minister, answering a question as to what business would be taken up to-day, spoke as follows:

> Supply: Estimates of the Departments of Agriculture and Justice. If we get beyond that, we shall take up the other Government Orders.

The Prime Minister last night expected that we would pass all the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We might get beyond them without passing them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the House is not in committee, and that it is absolutely irregular for one hon. member to interject remarks while another hon. member has the floor.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I consented to my hon. friend from Beauce making a remark. As a matter of fact I have nearly concluded my speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough had no right to give such consent.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, your admonition

will apply to the future. It is not applicable in the present case because it was given too late. The fact has already been remarked that the contentious items in the Estimates are apparently relegated to volume 4 of the Auditor General's report. I have been endeavouring to keep track of the Auditor General's report for some years past, and in other years we have had the same experience, namely that the items which the Opposition desire to investigate are generally placed in volume 4 of the report, and that volume comes down very late in the session when there is not sufficient time to make any investigation into the expenditures. That was the case last year, and the same experience occurred the year before. If we could induce the Minister of Finance to place volume 4 on the Table first we would have very little discussion of this kind. I would therefore make the proposal to my hon. friend that he should print volume 4 before he prints volumes 1, 2 and 3. If he does that, we would get along much better and not have so much discussion about the date on which the Auditor General's report is presented. In practically every department of the Government there are items which are referred to in volume 4. The gross amount will be found in the summary of expenditure in volume 1, and it amounts to more than one-half of the total expenditure of the Government for the year. It reaches the enormous total of $346,612,954.56. Now that is a very large sum as to which we have no details at the present time, and we shall not have those details until volume 4 is presented to Parliament. As I have said, that sum represents about one-half of the total expenditure for the year and it is composed of items related to almost every department of the Government.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Just one moment in order to make a remark or two in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair). He says that if the House really wants to get into Committee on Supply as soon as possible, the Government should make it easy to do so. The Government asks for Supply. The leader of the Opposition says, "You shan't go into Committee of Supply". The Government's position is: Let us get to work as quickly as possible and give a chance to every member in the House to dig in in the matter of Supply. The leader of the Opposition says "No, I am going to stop you from going into Committee of Supply". We say, "Very well, what is the reason?"

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my right hon. friend permit me to make a correction?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not going to state the case unfairly at all. The leader of the Opposition says: "I am going to stop you from going into Committee of Supply". We ask "Why?" My hon. friend replies, "Because there are some portions of the field that we cannot dig over properly owing to the fact that volume 4 of the Auditor General's report has not yet been brought down." Now, if a man is a farmer, and the spring time comes, and the Deity and the weather conditions are favourable to commencing farming operations, and the call is to the farmer to get to work, an obstinate farmer like the leader of the Opposition would say: "No, good Lord, no. Because there is a little bit of land here on my farm that from which you have not yet taken the ice, I am not going to do a stroke of digging until you do take that ice off."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend stated that he wished to present my argument correctly and I am sure he will permit me to repeat exactly what I did say. I have never said that the House should not proceed to go into Committee of Supply, but I have said that it was impossible to proceed intelligently with Supply until we had information that is lacking. I have also said that we ought to be assured that we are going to have a full opportunity of discussing the Estimates in a comprehensive and intelligent way before we go on. That is what I have said; but I have not tried to delay the House from going into Committee of Supply in any way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the delay of the proceedings is apparent if my hon. friend intervenes and a long discussion takes place when the Government is anxious to go into Supply. Then we come to look at the pertinence of his observations as to why the House should be precluded from going into Supply. His first objection is: You have broken the law, and because you have broken the law I am putting in this protest and my party is going to stand behind it. Well, there are only two grounds upon which the hon. gentleman can take that stand—the ground of conscience; and the ground of expediency. As to the former, when we go back to the record of the hon. gentleman himself, we find that he does not stand upon that consistently, because when he was a member of the Liberal Government the

Auditor General's reports were late in coming down. That means that he was a breaker of the law. Then on the ground of expediency and intelligent work in committee on items of the Estimates, I do not think my hon. friend would strain the point to say that if one-half of his field was absolutely fit for cultivation, with all the utensils at hand necessary to carry it on, he could not intelligently farm that part of his property, but would wait a day or two, or a week or two, until the sunlight had made the other part sufficiently dry for cultivation. He works just as intelligently on the portion that he is tilling as if all the rest of the field was prepared for tillage. So it is with regard to this field. The Government brings down Estimates which cover a certain number of items and a certain total of expenditure. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has just admitted that only one-half of the total expenditures of the Government has reference yet to volume 4, and so could not be intelligently undertaken. Granted that that is so, his own admission goes to show that there is one-half of all the expenditures of the Government upon which the Auditor General's reports are already down and which we can intelligently carry through. With reference to the Department of Agriculture spoken of by my hon friend from Guysborough, he found one item of about $40,000 which had relation to a Food Board, and opposite that were tacked the letters "ZZ." That is, out of 123 pages in the Estimates referring to expenditure on agriculture there was one item of about $40,000 for which he could not account until he had volume 4. For most of the other expenditures of the Government we have the Auditor General's report already down. If there be any one item, as the Prime Minister has said, on which explanations as to last year's expenditures will only be available when the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report comes down, that can stand until the volume is ready. But there is not any rhyme or reason at all, is there in our refusing to go on with those portions of the expenditures of next year in their relation to the volumes that are already down when we take them into consideration with the proposed expenditures for next year? Every Government since I have had experience of governments has always been fortunate in having its ideals a little ahead of its practice. It was so with my hon. friend's Government, and it has been so with all other governments; there is always a little space left in which we may excel over former usages; and I will venture to say that if my hon. friend goes back to the beginning of Confederation he will find examples in every Government.

There are three stages in connection with the issue of the Auditor General's report. There is the preparation of the accounts in the different departments. Then those are sent to the Auditor General, and his department is responsible for the auditing of those accounts, and reporting thereon. His report is then sent to the printing department which is responsible for its prompt printing. Now, I am quite certain that all through the administration of all governments there will have been lapses, greater or less, in all these three stages. it is impossible to have perfection. But at the present time the difficulty is not in the printing department—of that I am certain. The Auditor General is, as has been stated, an officer of the House. While you can recommend to him and urge upon him, he is still master of his own department. I am not aware that he has called for a single clerk to be added to his staff and has been refused, and the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has shown that there were forty-four more members of the Auditor Generals' staff last year than there were the year before. Consequently it is not because of an insufficient staff that the Auditor General's report has been delayed. I think the real reason for the delay, such as it is, in the completion of volume 4 is that that volume has to do very largely with expenditures in relation to the war, for instance, demobilization, chiefly—there were two ministers of war, one overseas and one on this side—and then those other military operations in which several of the other departments were concerned as to expenditures.

But, after all, when we come to think of it, we will reach the conclusion on both sides of the House that after having had this conference the thing to do is to go on with the Estimates—and they will not be pressed where explanations are not forthcoming because of the fact that volume 4 of the Auditor General's report is not yet before the House. We will make progress in that way, we will do our work intelligently, and we will not be subject to any criticism from the country that we are unnecessarily delaying the business of the House.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, the sweet reasonableness of the right hon. gentleman's contribution to what he calls this "conference" impels me to say a word or two. If this discussion is to serve any purpose at all, it ought to be in the way of securing an improvement in the future in the bringing down of the Auditor General's report. Now, much of what we have heard from our hon. friends on the other side of the House is designed to shift the real basis of this discussion. The point really at issue, I submit, Sir, is not so much a comparison between the practices of the two Governments as to the dates at which they brought down the Auditor General's reports with reference to the date of the opening of the session, but as to the dates upon which these reports were brought down with reference to the end of the fiscal year; and from that point of view the odds are altogether in favour of the late Liberal administration. If the House will refer to the dates that have been given they will find that under the Liberal administration all reports were down long before the end of the fiscal year, while in the case of our hon. friends opposite several numbers of the Auditor General's reports were brought down only after the end of the fiscal year—some of them several months afterwards. I submit, Sir, that an improvement in that direction ought to be the outcome of this discussion.

Now, having had some experience in connection with these matters a few years ago, I am not any more enamoured about increasing the staff in this or that department than some of my hon. friends opposite. My experience was not that better work or more speedy results were obtained by increasing the number of employees. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has indicated exactly what the trouble is in the present instance: that delay has been caused the Auditor General by reason of his not getting the material for this report which has not yet been brought down. I may suggest to the Minister of Finance how that difficulty can be overcome, and I can do it by referring him to the method that was adopted in years past. I understand that at present, my hon. friend, in addition to a few other duties, is Acting Secretary of States. If he is, I would refer him to the records of that department for the years 1909, 1910, and the beginning of 1911. He will find that in those years, immediately upon the prorogation of Parliament, notices were sent out to each of the departments reminding them of the date upon which their annual reports had to be presented to Parliament, requesting them to send in the manuscript of these reports upon a certain day, and notifying them that if the manuscript was not sent in a follow-up system would be instituted and they would be given no peace or comfort until the manuscript was fully in the hands of the Auditor General in the first place, and afterwards in the hands of the King's Printer. It was because that follow-up system was pursued literally that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was able this afternoon to cite the dates upon which the reports were brought down, showing that, if not strictly within the period required by law, those dates were at least very close to it, during the years of the late Liberal Administration. I would suggest in all kindness to my hon. friend that he see that the same system be adopted and pursued in the future.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would say this: I shall certainly have pleasure in looking into the matter, but I think it will be found that the same procedure has been followed. I find Mr. Mulvey a very attentive and efficient deputy; the matter is in his hands.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

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

Civil Government — Agriculture — Salaries, $541,955; contingencies, $135,000.

Mr. McCOIG: Will the minister explain the increase?

Mr. TOLMIE: It is due to statutory increases.

Mr. MURPHY: I observe that there is an increase in the number of employees; while there were 318 last year, 359 are to be provided for this year. Will the hon. gentleman explain what this increase is for?

Mr. TOLMIE: It is due to an extension of the work generally throughout the country.

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend will refer to his printed Estimates he will see that the explanation which he has just given cannot be of general application. I understand that the expenditures under Civil Government relate to employees here in Ottawa. Now, under the head of clerks

there is an increase of 5; under the head of junior clerks, an increase of 3; clerk stenographers, an increase of 7; junior clerk stenographers, an increase of 10; office appliance operators, an increase of 2; messenger clerks, an increase of 2. These increases surely must be here in Ottawa, not throughout the country.

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, the increases are as the hon. member has stated. But there has been a great extension of agriculture throughout the country. Our experimental farms are extending their scope; our live stock is extending its scope; and it has been necessary to put more men in the field, and, therefore, to increase the staff at headquarters to carry on the general business of the department. I think it will be found also that the revenue from agriculture has increased very materially in the last few years.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it not a fact that some experimental farms have been closed?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Has not the experimental farm at L'Assomption been closed?

Mr. TOLMIE: That was rented only for one year to carry on some tobacco experiments.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption-Montcalm): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister argues that no experimental farms have been discontinued these last years, and, in answer to the hon. member from Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault) who told him that the tobacco experimental farm at L'Assomption had been closed last year, he stated that it was only a venture which had been abandoned. I must say to the hon. minister that he is mistaken, as the experimental farm of L'Assomption had replaced the one which existed for a number of years at Saint-Jacques de l'Achigan, where it did so much towards furthering the tobacco industry of that district. Without consulting me, the department thought fit to close that farm at St. Jacques, and it is then that L'Assomption was selected as the most suitable place for that experimental farm. But, last year, it was wiped out. And yet the location seemed to be so good that it had been thought proper to send the principal officers of the department to the college authorities to induce them to sell the property which had been rented for the establishment of this experimental station. The chief of the Experimental Farms branch and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture had come to L'Assomption to see whether the location would be suitable. It was found to be so suitable that they immediately went to the college authorities to find out whether it could be bought at a reasonable figure. The prices of neighbouring farms were even inquired into, and it was realized that even in the matter of price this property was the most desirable. The officers of the department above named together with the head of the tobacco growing industry, thereupon went to the college authorities and told them: "The price you ask the department is altogether proper, and you can depend upon the Government keeping this farm." This was done with so little hesitancy that the college authorities, counting upon a sure sale, said to the Government representatives: "There is a part of this farm which we could sell at a much higher price than what we have asked from the Government; would you allow us to sell that part? You would still have enough left." This was peremptorily refused. Permission was denied to sell that part of the land. Then the college corporation, feeling that the Government would not fail to buy after such formal understanding, refused to sell the remainder of the farm at an advenced price, and took steps to stop work on the premises. They sold their herds of cows—which were considerable—their agricultural implements, and disposed of everything they used in the working of the farm, and expected to deliver the latter to the Department of Agriculture without delay, as had been understood with the deputy minister and the chief of Experimental Farm branch. Months passed, the college heard nothing further, the project came to naught, the department causing thereby to the corporation damages to the extent of several thousand dollars. As an excuse the department now says: "We would buy willingly enough, but the Minister of Finance will not let us have the requisite amount; there are, in the Cabinet, ministers who will not hear of the purchase of this experimental station." And the experimental station at L'Assomption is closed.

I have come to the conclusion, although this was not said in plain language, that the location was wrong, that if this experimental farm had been situated in another province, it would have suited the Government better. I do not want to insist too much upon this, but when we see the experimental farm grants increased, when we

are asked for more money for them, I ask myself why this curtailment in the province of Quebec, in the region which I have the honour to represent, certainly an important district, especially in the matter of tobacco growing; I ask myself why this experimental farm is done away with, which contributed to develop this industry among us to the point which it has reached to-day. Even a rented experimental station is dispensed with which was so useful to the tobacco planters, after the department having so obviously humbugged the L'Assomption College Corporation with the prospect of the purchase of their farm.

The CHAIRMAN: Before this matter goes further, I beg to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that this discussion would be absolutely in order under item No. 40, but it is not in order under item No. 14. If the committee will allow item No. 14 to carry, we can continue the discussion. Is there any objection to the passage of item No. 14?

Mr. BELAND: What is this item?

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 40 is the item on experimental farms, about which the hon. member for L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Séguin) has been speaking.

Mr. COPP: What item have we been considering?

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 14.

Mr. FIELDING: Do you not think, Sir, under the item of salaries, the whole question of experimental farms comes up?

The CHAIRMAN: Not the question of the establishment or the failure to establish at any particular point a particular experimental farm. The general question of experimental farms would, because the general question of experimental farms is related to the number of employees required in the head office. But the establishment or closing of any one experimental farm would come very much more properly under the item by which money is provided for experimental farms.

5 p.m.

Mr. SEGUIN: (Translation.) I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but if I deemed it advisable to touch upon the question of the tobacco illustration station situated at L'Assomption, it was because the hon. minister had just explained he was asking for much larger appropriations for salaries on account of the increase in the number of experimental farm officials all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN: (Translation.) That may be germane to the question, but barely so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The minister stated in answer to my question that no experimental farms had been closed. I pointed out that the experimental farm at L'Assomption had been closed. I was sure there were some employees there receiving salaries from the Government. We are now considering the question of salaries of employees on experimental farms as well as other employees of the Government, and it is perfectly in order to discuss the salaries of these men.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not considering the salaries of employees on experimental farms throughout the country.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does the item not refer to salaries of all employees of the Department of Agriculture?

The CHAIRMAN: The item which we are now considering refers to salaries paid to all employees of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Civil Government is what we are discussing now.

Mr. FIELDING: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but may I suggest this for your reflection? I think in the English House of Commons it is not an uncommon thing to move a reduction of salaries and on that basis to discuss the whole department. I grant, however, it would be much more convenient if your ruling could be carried out.

Mr. MURPHY: Perhaps the discussion was brought about through a reference of the minister to an increase in the work of experimental farms. I am not questioning the ruling at all.

The CHAIRMAN: It was precisely on that feature that the discussion came up, and it was also for that reason that the Chairman did not interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Séguin). He merely drew the attention of the committee to the matter after the hon. member had concluded his remarks.

Mr. MURPHY: May I suggest to the minister that he go over the increases item by item and explain to the committee the increases in the work or other necessities justifying the increase in the number of employees.

Mr. TOLMIE: What item?

Mr. MURPHY: I would suggest beginning with the first item of that class, head clerks, increase three to four, principal clerks, increase four to six, and so on, each one in sequence.

Mr. TOLMIE: That was due to a change in the classification. This man is a very efficient officer, one of the best we have in the department, one who is thoroughly versed in his work and one whom I have found, in my brief time in the office as minister, a very valuable man.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I see by last year's Estimate that there were only three head clerks, now there are four. I admit this clerk may be very intelligent, but he cannot double himself.

Mr. TOLMIE: This man has been promoted, and a position beneath him filled, making four instead of three.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The work which was done last year by three man cannot be done now by three?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, if we wish to obtain the efficiency we desire.

Mr. BELAND: Has the minister before him the names of these four head clerks with rather good-sized salaries?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, but I shall be glad to furnish them later.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: In what branch is this new head clerk?

Mr. TOLMIE: In the deputy minister's office.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice the salary of the deputy minister is fixed at $5,500. I understood that the salaries of other deputy ministers had been fixed at $6,000. Why is this deputy minister receiving $500 less than other deputies?

Mr. TOLMIE: He has a house allowance, which accounts for the difference.

Mr. JACOBS: Does that house belong to the Government?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, it is situated on the Experimental Farm. The present deputy minister was Director of Experimental Farms, and resides there in the house he had before, and is always available for giving his valuable advice in the work of the farm.

Mr. JACOBS: Would it not be better to fix the salary at $6,000 and charge him $500 rent?

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Mr. TOLMIE: The deputy minister seems to be quite satisfied with the present arrangement, and we have found no objection so far.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I would be disposed to be very generous to the Department of Agriculture, because I do not think we have been spending enough money on that department as compared with other departments of the Government. I find by the Auditor General's Report that there has been an apparent extravagance in travelling expenses. The travelling expenses shown at page A-14 of the Auditor General's Report, referring to the headquarters' staff I presume, amount to the large sum of $55,276.70. I think the minister ought to give some explanation of that. In looking over the names, I find that in one case, at all events, the amount spent in travelling expenses exceeded the amount of the man's salary, and in other cases the travelling expenses are quite large. Why is it necessary to spend such a large sum as $55,276.70 in travelling expenses?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have recognized that travelling expenses have become a very important item, particularly on account of the increased railway fares, the great increase in hotel bills these men have to pay, the increased rates on dining cars, and for hiring cars to take them from place to place about the country, and so forth. Several of our divisional officers have necessarily to do a lot of travelling in order to carry on their work. In the Health of Animals branch, for instance, the men have to travel from place to place. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, in connection with clearing up the mange, we had a large number of men travelling over an area of 2,600 miles. We have fruit inspectors moving from one part of the country to the other, and livestock promoters out in the field working up the live stock business, encouraging breeders to co-operate in their methods of marketing their stock to the very best advantage, and so forth. Then there are the Experimental Farm superintendents and the inspectors of Illustration Stations. All these men require a large amount for travelling expenses. It has become a very large item, and we have given a great deal of consideration to it, but until there is a general fall in prices, I do not see how we can reduce travelling expenses very soon.

Mr. MORPHY: Instead of having men travelling from Ottawa to different parts

of the country, would it not be possible to have men located at different points throughout the country, who at the same time would be in constant touch with the authorities at Ottawa? Why could not that be done to save travelling expenses? I would think that men on the spot would understand the conditions better.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have men on the spot now, but the "spots" are very big. For instance, a fruit inspector in British Columbia has to move about among the other inspectors who are permanently located at different points. The chief inspector goes about exercising general supervision over their work. The same is true of the Health of Animals Branch. A man might be located at Ottawa, and there might be an outbreak of hog cholera 200 miles away. There is nobody closer to that point than himself, and so he has to travel that 200 miles and back again, and pay his hotel bill while he is engaged there. We are attempting to curtail travelling expenses as much as possible, so far as is consistent with rendering efficient service to the live-stock and other agricultural interests.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I do not think this item of $55,276.70 covers the travelling expenses of the inspectors who are out in the field, because provision is made in different parts of the Estimates for that. I think this large item refers to the head office staff here in Ottawa.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have a number of heads of different branches located in the city of Ottawa, such as the Director of the Experimental Farms, the Veterinary Director General, the Assistant Veterinary General, the Livestock Commissioner, the Chief of the Fruit Markets Branch, and many others. We find that to keep these men up to date and thoroughly abreast of the work being carried on throughout the country, and so that the field inspectors may benefit by their better knowledge of the whole situation, it is necessary for the branch heads to visit the different parts of the country at least once during the year. We find that has a very stimulating effect on the work being carried on. The chief inspectors in the different provinces are very glad to see the man from headquarters. I speak with a good deal of feeling on that point, because I was Chief Inspector of the Health of Animals Branch and representative of the Livestock Commissioner in British Columbia for many years. One or two years might elapse without my ever seeing anybody from headquarters, and I know how a person is inclined to drift from the ordinary lines under those circumstances. We find it very beneficial to have a headquarters man going around throughout the country to keep everything working uniformly.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice that on page 89 provision is made for a Chief, Poultry Division; Chief, Sheep and Goats Division; Chief, Cattle Division; Chief, Horse Division; but no provision is made for Chief, Swine Division. Not because I am personally interested, but for the good of the country, I would like to know what has become of the swine.

Mr. TOLMIE: The swine are included with the sheep and goats.

Mr. JACOBS: When the minister comes to separate the sheep from the goats, where will he find the swine?

Mr. MAHARG: The minister has told us that the deputy minister is occupying the house he occupied as Assistant Director of the Experimental Farm. Might I ask what housing provision has been made for the present Assistant Director?

Mr. TOLMIE: The deputy minister occupies the house he occupied as Director of the Experimental Farms, not Assistant Director. The present Director occupies the house he occupied as Assistant Director.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There is no assistant director?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is an assistant director, Dr. Shutt, of the Experimental Farm system. He resides at the Central Farm in Ottawa.

Mr. MAHARG: Does the gentleman who took the place of the present deputy minister reside on the farm at present?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. McCOIG: Would the officials of the department be entitled to lower transportation rates over Government roads?

Mr. TOLMIE: We used to get a rate over different lines, at one time as low as a cent a mile. Later on it was increased somewhat. That concession has been discontinued entirely now.

Mr. McCOIG: I want to direct the attention of the minister to the present expensive cost of food on dining cars. I think this matter should be brought forcibly to the attention of the Minister of Railways. Members of the House, and

citizens generally who travel to any extent, will quite appreciate what the minister says in regard to the cost of meals on dining cars throughout the country. It might be possible for the Minister of Agriculture to take this matter up with the Minister of Railways. Something should be done, at any rate, because the dining car rates to-day are more exorbitant than they should be in view of the amount of food supplied the patrons of the different railways for the prices charged. The people feel strongly on this question, and I am glad that the minister has referred to it. It is one that could be dealt with very satisfactorily between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Railways, and if something could be done to reduce the rates on dining cars, it would be highly appreciated.

Mr. EULER: What disposition is made of the products of the Experimental Farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are sold, and the money is turned in to the Receiver General.

Mr. ROBB: Before we leave the question raised by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig), with regard to travelling expenses of officials, now that Canada owns such an immense mileage, are instructions given to Government officials as to what roads they should travel over when going from one part of the country to another where both roads run?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, in our department they are instructed to use, as far as possible, Government roads, Government express, and Government telegraph service.

Mr. ROBB: Are those instructions carried out?

Mr. TOLMIE: Wherever practicable, but in some parts of the country it is impossible to avoid the use of the other roads.

Mr. JACOBS: When they want to get from one place to another in time, what are they instructed to do?

Mr. DEVLIN: I certainly do not rise to encourage any extravagance at this time; I know that the country cannot afford to spend too much. But I see that a great deal is being expended in agricultural salaries one way and another, and I desire again to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that year in and year out, on the floor of the House, I have been asking his careful attention to the study of the agricultural condition in the northern part of the county of Wright,—I do not mean its extreme north, because it extends almost to the North Pole. The county is very large, and it afforded me much pleasure to be present last fall at an exhibition held in Maniwaki, which is about 98 miles from Ottawa. The exhibition was a great credit to the place. It brought numerous exhibitors together and demonstrated just what could be produced in the way of agricultural products as far north as anything could grow. They have put up a building there, in the construction of which I understand the Government has aided. I marvelled at the building they were able to erect for the sum of money which it actually cost. In another portion of the county, in the town of Aylwin, there is always a splendid exhibition, but, of course, it is the most populous part of the county. At that exhibition they show stock, poultry, and field products, and it has been of immense benefit it the people living in the lower end of the county. I have found that agricultural lectures serve a great purpose, and I have particularly requested an experimental station, or rather two. There could be a station at one end of the county, and another up north. It seems a lot to ask for, but it would result in incalculable good. I do not want to increase expenditures unnecessarily, for I believe in economy; but owing to the varied conditions in that county, to its altitude in certain parts, at least two experimental stations are necessary, one in the northern, and the other in the lower part of the county. I speak now for the county of Wright; not for that part of the county which, up to 1917, was included in Wright, and which is known to-day as the county of Hull.

Mr. TOLMIE: I shall be glad to look into the matter carefully. Perhaps illustration stations would be more suitable than an experimental farm, because they could be located at a small expense, and would be useful in demonstrating to the farmers of the immediate vicinity under what conditions the best results in agriculture could be obtained.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do not want to repeat a question asked on a previous item, but will the minister please indicate in what branches there has been an increase in the number of employees? At page 90, for instance, we have head clerks, of whom there are four now as compared with three last year. The minister has

given a reason for that increase. In the next item there are six instead of four, then eight instead of seven, twenty-one instead of sixteen, and so forth. Will the minister indicate in what branches there have been increases in the number of employees, and for what reasons?

Mr. TOLMIE: In the first one there is one increase, a senior clerkship. That was in the Health of Animals Branch. The Health of Animals Branch has extended a good deal during the last year on account of the development of the Accredited Herd System, and the outbreaks of hog cholera this year have also been much more numerous, making it necessary to carry on a great deal more record work than in the past. The next increase of clerks has been in the Experimental Farm system, as well as in the Health of Animals Branch system. With reference to the latter branch the same answer that I gave before to the hon. member applies.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do I understand that it is at the Experimental Farm that the increase has occurred?

Mr. TOLMIE: In the Health of Animals Branch, and also in connection with the Experimental Farm. The two together would account for the increase. Does the hon. member require any further information?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I want the whole list.

Mr. TOLMIE: The next item with respect to junior clerks is relative to the Health of Animals Branch. In the item dealing with senior accountant clerks the changes have been in the accountants branch of the Department of Agriculture. The item relating to senior clerk stenographer applies to the Health of Animals and Livestock Branches.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I notice there is an increase of seventeen stenographers.

Mr. TOLMIE: In the case of the clerk stenographers this applies to the Health of Animals Branch, the Livestock Branch, and the Seed Branch. The junior clerk stenographers that are referred to are in the Seed Branch, the Livestock Branch, and the Experimental Farm. The clerk typists referred to are in the Seed Branch, the Livestock Branch, and the Health of Animals Branch. The item referring to office appliance operators has to do with the Publications Branch.

Mr. CANNON: Would the minister be kind enough to inform me who is in charge of the cattle which are distributed throughout the country by the Department of Agriculture. I would like the minister to state the name of the official, his salary, and where his headquarters are located?

Mr. TOLMIE: The Live Stock Branch is under the supervision of Mr. H. S. Arkell, Livestock Commissioner, whose salary is $4,200 a year.

Mr. CANNON: Were any cattle distributed by the department last year? If so, in what localities did the distribution occur?

Mr. TOLMIE: I will give the hon. gentleman all the details. A large number of cattle have been distributed throughout the whole of Canada, because the system is a very popular one. I shall be very glad to state the places to which they have been sent but at present we are discussing an altogether different item.

Mr. CANNON: Upon whose recommendation is the distribution made?

Mr. TOLMIE: The applications are sent into the Livestock Branch by various clubs under certain conditions, and the applications are carefully looked into by the representatives of our branch. Mr. Hamer represents Mr. Arkell in this matter, and if the application made is in strict conformity with the regulation and the conditions are found to be satisfactory, a distribution is made. If such is not the case, the application is refused.

Mr. CANNON: When the animals are thus distributed are they given away by the department, or must they be returned after the expiration of a certain length of time?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are simply loaned.

Mr. CANNON: Can the minister tell me if the cattle which were distributed in my constituency in 1917 have been returned to the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: To what part of the country does the hon. member allude?

Mr. CANNON: I am very much surprised that the minister should have to inquire the name of my constituency. Since the minister has taken charge of his department he has shown great efficiency, and has also displayed great devotion to the interests of the farming class in Canada. I would advise my hon. friend to be kind enough, after the recess, to come into my

constituency and then he will learn that it is one of the best farming constituencies in the province of Quebec. In that connection, and referring to the question which I just put to the minister. if my hon. friend does come to the county of Dorchester he will find there lots of cattle that belongs to his department. Those cattle were placed in my constituency by a very generous government during the election a few years ago.

Mr. BUTTS: A bad recommendation for your county.

Mr. CANNON: It is a very bad recommendation for the Government, not for my county. The minister has inquired as to the name of my constituency. Now that I have told him, and also informed him where the constituency is situated, I hope he will show towards that county the same interest he has displayed towards the rest of Canada, and especially towards his own province of British Columbia.

Mr. TOLMIE: If time permits I will be very pleased indeed to accept the kind invitation of the hon. member for Dorchester to visit his constituency next year and look into its agricultural prospects. When I make that visit I sincerely hope I shall find the hon. member at home.

Mr. CANNON: I am always there.

Mr. TOLMIE: Since last session I have made every effort to visit as many parts of the Dominion as I possibly could. I have been in Quebec on several occasions, but I have not seen half enough of that province. I hope at the first opportunity to extend my visits to those parts of the country that I failed to reach on previous occasions. As regards the distribution of these bulls and other livestock, the distributions are made absolutely free of any political considerations. I have worked in this particular line myself in British Columbia, and in every instance we considered whether the group of men or club had fully complied with the regulations, and if we found they had not they got no animals, if they had met all the regulations, we gave them the best animals we could get for the money. We have 266 bulls at the present time in the province of Quebec, distributed there by the Livestock Branch. I could not give details of their distribution at the moment, but I will be very pleased to furnish this information if my hon. friend wishes it.

Mr. CANNON: Have horses been distributed by the department?

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. TOLMIE: Under the old system we used to distribute horses under the same conditions as we distribute cattle, sheep, and swine, but that system has been changed.

Mr. CANNON: When was it changed?

Mr. TOLMIE: I think about three years ago.

Mr. CANNON: Were any complaints received by the department from the district of lake St. John as to the distribution of horses there by the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not that I know of. It was before my time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Might I inquire what item is before the committee? I am sorry I was not in the House when these Estimates were taken up.

The CHAIRMAN: The item before the committee is No. 14 on pag 8 of the Estimates, but the explanation of that item is to be found on pages 89, 90 and 91.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Then I assume that the matter that has been under discussion is not pertinent to the item before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion on the distribution of livestock would be more in order under item 49, where a special amount is provided for livestock.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I presume that this item applies to the inspectors of livestock throughout the country who are on the permanent staff. Are these inspectors, who I believe are graduates of the veterinary school, appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. TOLMIE: The inspectors in the Livestock branch and the Health of Animals branch are appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This item of $541,955 is very large, and in connection with it I want to say a word or two about some of the inspectors of livestock. It is quite evident that a considerable change comes over some people when they get permanently in the service—they become very autocratic and domineering. I have in my constituency a man who considers that he has been very badly used not only by the inspectors but also by the Department of Agriculture itself. This man raises hogs. An inspector from the department examined the hogs and said they were diseased and that he would come around in a day or

two and destroy the whole herd. My constituent denied that there was any disease in his herd, that on the contrary he had not lost a hog for two years, and that if any cholera existed among them surely there would be some evidence of it through the hogs dying, because the disease works very rapidly as a rule. A number of the animals were fit for market and the owner asked to have the privilege of dressing the carcases and disposing of them if the animals were going to be destroyed, The inspector gave him the privilege of dressing all he could in one day. Thirty-three of the best finished hogs were dressed and hung up for the inspector's examination. He examined the intestines and did not find any disease, and the carcases were disposed of for food. But the inspector destroyed every other animal—there were 245 in the herd—and refused to give the owner any compensation. Now, we have been passing legislation in regard to compensation, but I do not think there is anything in the statutes covering such a case as I have represented. It is true that certain authority is given to the department to make regulations, and I am informed that it is under those regulations that this action was taken. I am merely calling the attention of the minister to the very peculiar manner in which some of the inspectors in his department acted in this particular instance. All the aggrieved party asks is that a commission be appointed to investigate the matter, and he will abide by their decision. But the department will not consider the suggestion. I even had the temerity to write a letter to the Veterinary Director General, and I am told that one of these understrappers in the department made the remark, that Mr. Sutherland had better attend to his own business and they would attend to theirs. Now, if that is correct, and they are the class of men that we are voting salaries to to-day, I think we should know something more about them before we pass this item of over half a million dollars, particularly in view of the statement made by the head of the Civil Service Commission yesterday, and published in the press this morning, in which he practically dictates to the members of this House what they shall do, and imputes motives to them that no employee should be permitted to impute and remain in the service of the Government.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I think the minister should have an opportunity of replying to the question.

Mr. TOLMIE: In reply to what the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has said, it must be borne in mind that hog cholera is not a disease which shows itself very clearly in all cases. Where the disease is very acute the animal dies within a few hours and the symptoms are clearly defined; but should the animal be suffering from chronic cholera there would be no external symtoms and to the eye of the layman the hog would be apparently healthy. So far as our Health of Animals branch is concerned, I want to say that it is the most efficient, not merely on this continent, but in the whole world. Our men are all graduates of recognized veterinary colleges and in addition have passed a stiff Civil Service examination as well as an examination under the Health of Animals branch, with a view to ensuring their qualification for the important work they have to undertake. Having myself been one of these men, I know the ups and downs of the business very well. In many cases where a man's animals have been destroyed he sees that there is a loss of money and he is very much hurt. He cannot, perhaps, trace the source of infection; he cannot understand why the animals should be sick, and in some cases it is very difficult to please him. But I am quite sure that the reports of these inspectors could be depended upon if they made a diagnosis and found hog cholera, because my deputy minister has mentioned some of their names and I find that among them are one or two of the best we have in the Health of Animals service. I shall be very glad, as long as I have the honour to preside over this department, to receive complaints from anybody regarding any of our officials who are not courteous or who do not carry out their duties in the proper way. If any such cases are brought to my attention, I promise to make very careful investigation of the circumstances. The member for South Oxford has already mentioned this particular case to me. I have sent for a report, but it has not yet come to hand; I expect it at an early day.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would like to say just a word in regard to this matter of appointment of officials. If I could not make any better appointments than some that are made by the Civil Service Commission I would consider myself absolutely incompetent to give an expression of opinion upon

anything. In regard to these inspectors, I do not know how many there are in connection with the Health of Animals branch, but it would appear to me that the staff cannot be a very large one, or else they take things very leisurely. There was an outbreak of glanders in the northern part of my county last year, and on the 14th of October inspectors came out to that district, quarantined three or four farms, shot half a dozen animals or more, and gave strict instructions as to the carrying out of certain regulations, telling the farmers that they might not under any circumstances allow a horse to come on their farms until the Government lifted the quarantine. They also informed the farmers that they would be back in thirty days to make a further inspection and that they would then inform the farmers whether or not they could be freed from the quarantine regulations. The 14th of November came around, but no inspector appeared; the 14th of December passed, and still no inspector. These farmers wrote me in regard to the matter. I called up the department by telephone, and apparently it was only then that they remembered that there was a place out in the north of Frontenac which had been visited by their inspectors and in which some animals had been shot and a quarantine established. Indeed, it was only after they had been reminded of the matter several times over the telephone that they got busy and did anything; it was not until well on in January that the quarantine was lifted. What I complain of, and what these farmers complain of, is this: if there are not enough of these inspectors to attend to the business at the proper time, then more should be appointed. When these inspectors said they would return in thirty days, they should have returned in thirty days. As it was, the farmers could not prepare their ground for the next year's crop; they could not even get out their potatoes or anything of that kind, and on the whole they were left in a very bad position as regards their crop for this year. I think that was absolutely unnecessary; it would not have occurred had these inspectors cared, as I submit they should have cared, about the way in which they performed their duties. The trouble with a lot of people in the Civil Service to-day—and we have repeated instances of it—there is no use shutting our eyes to the fact—is that they feel that they are absolutely independent of this Parliament and they do not give a hang what we say or what we think. They hold their meetings; they say through the head of their commission and others the most impertinent things. They impute to members of this House motives that they have no right to impute to them, as did, according to the papers, the chairman of the commission the other day. What right has Hon. Dr. Roche, even though he was a member of this House and a member of the Government at one time—what right has he to say that because I choose to take a view in regard to this matter which differs from his view, I am actuated by a motive to hold the whip hand over people in my county? I resent any such attitude or any such words on the part of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. If the gentleman had not occupied a seat in this House and a seat in the Government at one time I do not think he would have felt that he could go quite as far as he has gone in expressing opinions derogatory to members of this House. With any person not so high up in the scale as the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission we would have no hesitation at all in characterizing such words as absolute impertinence, and even though he does occupy the position of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission I want to say here and now that I so regard the words which he made use of in speaking in the city of Ottawa, if he is correctly reported in the papers of yesterday and to-day.

Something is wrong in regard to this Health of Animals Branch. These men should have returned when they said they would. It seems to me that they were indifferent; that is the only way that I can look at it—they were indifferent as to what the effect would be upon these farmers in my county. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister of Agriculture, as I will to the minister of any other department of this or any government while I hold a seat in this House, that no department or government in Canada will show indifference to any of the people of the county I represent and get away with it.

Mr. TOLMIE: Perhaps a word of explanation, Mr. Chairman, will throw a little light on the subject. I am very sorry indeed if the farmers of any part of Frontenac have been inconvenienced in any way owing to the fact that inspectors could not reach their premises and release them from quarantine just when they promised to. But there are extenuating circum-

stances, I think. For instance, in undertaking the accredited herd work throughout the whole of Canada we were astounded how popular the work was with the farmers; a great many more went into it than we had anticipated. In addition, the big work was on in Alberta in connection with the elimination of mange, and we had an extra number of hog cholera outbreaks last year, so that there was an extreme shortage of qualified veterinary inspectors. To give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, as to what changes have taken place in the veterinary profession as a result of the fall in the price of horses, let me say that there graduated from the Ontario Veterinary College last year, the largest college of the kind in Canada, only twenty-five men or thereabouts, whereas in 1891 I remember quite distinctly that 225 men graduated from that institution. The field of operations for the veterinary is not so large as it used to be. Consequently, many of our young men, with the high prices prevailing and the good opportunities offering in other lines, have not taken up veterinary work, and we have a good deal of difficulty in securing qualified veterinary surgeons to carry on the work of the health of animals branch. In this connection we are not entirely alone because, while we are, I think, one or two hundred herds behind in the way of applications, in the United States, with their accredited herd system, they are many thousands of herds behind in their applications. Their work thus shows that there is a shortage there also. I am sorry to hear that these men were inconvenienced, and I will use my best efforts to see that that sort of thing does not occur again.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Last year I succeeded in obtaining for certain farmers in my constituency certain books called "Farmers' Account Books." Some were in English, and I had to apply to the Commission of Conservation to have them translated into French. I succeeded in having that done, but I am told that now the Commission of Conservation is going to be abolished. Will the minister tell us to whom we shall now have to apply to obtain these books, which are very valuable to farmers especially in view of the fact that they have to make income tax returns like anybody else.

Mr. TOLMIE: I cannot give the hon. member exact information now, but that is a matter that will be taken up in the event of the Commission of Conservation being eliminated.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Will those books be in French?

Mr. TOLMIE: We will do what is right.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READING

Bill No. 24 (from the Senate) for the relief of Frank Alexander Staunton.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 29, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Essex).

Bill No. 30, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Devlin.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committtee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the House rose at six o'clock we were considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. We had reached and quite fully discussed item No. 14 on page 8 of the Estimates, the details of which are to be found on pages 89, 90, and 91 of the Estimates for the current year. Shall item No. 14 carry?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: With reference to the footnote on page 9, would the minister inform the committee what part of the salaries are carried under the War Appropriation and Demobilization votes?

Mr. TOLMIE: These contingencies are for clerical and other assistance, printing and stationery, sundries and travelling expenses. The details will be found on page 91.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend wants to know what part of these salaries comes under War Appropriations and Demobilization.

Mr. TOLMIE: None of it.

Mr. COPP: Then what do the asterisk and footnote mean?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is still some correspondence in connection with the Food Board that is being carried on by Mr. Stephens, the principal clerk to the deputy minister. He received no extra salary for that work.

Mr. COPP: I do not think the minister yet understands my hon. friend's question. Opposite the item of salaries for the Department of Agriculture there is an asterisk, which is explained by the footnote on page 9, "These votes include salaries and contingencies carried under the War Appropriations and Demobilization votes." If that is correct a certain part of the item for salaries comes under the War Appropriations and Demobilization votes, and we want to know just how much.

Mr. TOLMIE: The only work that would come under that is the answering of correspondence in connection with the Food Board, for which no extra salary is given to the principal clerk who does that work.

Mr. COPP: Then why is this reference made to the footnote?

Mr. TOLMIE: I presume a portion of his salary is attributed to that. He spends from one to three hours a week in connection with the work of the Food Board.

Mr. COPP: How much would it be in dollars and cents?

Mr. TOLMIE: Probably from $30 to $50 a year, roughly speaking.

Mr. COPP: That comes out of this vote?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is that extra salary?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much of the whole appropriation for civil government is to be expended in connection with the Dominion experimental farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: I could not give that as a total, but I could give it item by item, which would take some time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Can the minister say what proportion will be expended in connection with experimental farms in the province of Ontario? My reason for trying to get this information is that I made quite an effort last session to get it, and I was told that the per capita expenditure for the province of Ontario was greater than that of any other province in Canada. My observations would lead me to the conclusion that the province of Ontario was doing this work itself and paying for it, as well as contributing to the expenses of the other provinces. In answer to a question I placed on the Order Paper last year as to what was the amount paid in salaries at the Central Experimental Farm under the head of Civil Government for the year 1918-19, the total given was $93,295.95. There is a very large expenditure on this farm that has evidently been charged against the province of Ontario, although it is well known that the work of the farm is not confined to Ontario, but is carried on for the benefit of the whole Dominion. The farm is the centre of the whole system in operation throughout the Dominion, and I for one must refuse to have the total expenditure for this central farm charged up against the province of Ontario, and to be told that the per capita expenditure is greater for Ontario than for any other province. I have for years strenuously objected to the manner in which Ontario was being discriminated against in the matter of experimental farms.

Mr. MICHAUD: How many experimental farms have you in Ontario?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is a small tobacco farm at Harrow, about 487 miles from the central farm at Ottawa. There is another farm at Kapuskasing, 542 miles to the northwest of Ottawa, in the bush in northern Ontario. So far as I know, those are all that are being carried on in the province, with the exception of the central farm, the work of which is, in my opinion, more beneficial to some of the other provinces than it is to Ontario. We were told this afternoon that even a part of the salary of the deputy minister is charged up against the expenses of this farm. The salary of the deputy minister, I understand, is more than that of others in view of certain perquisites which he has in connection with the farm. Before this item passes, I think we ought to know exactly whether the expenditure for the experimental farms, particularly under the head of Civil Government, is anything like equal throughout the Dominion. My own view is that it is not. Ontario has been continually discriminated against in this matter, although it is doing the work and payng for it besides contributing to the expenses of the other provinces.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Does the hon. member think that the experiments conducted by the farm here would benefit the other provinces, particularly in the West, where climatic conditions are different, to the same extent as they would the province of Ontario? I think that these expenditures should be charged against this province. The experiments conducted at this farm would be of no particular benefit to us, because our climatic conditions are different.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The headquarters of the whole system of farms are situated here; the officers are here all the time, and the work is beneficial to Western as well as Eastern Canada. The work on the farm here serves the adjoining province of Quebec much more than it does the province of Ontario.

Mr. WHITE: I was not speaking of Quebec but of the western provinces.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was speaking of both Western Canada and Quebec. I was informing the hon. gentleman that this was the headquarters for the whole system, operating in Western Canada as well as in other parts of the Dominion, and he says that this ought to be charged up against Ontario because the work is of no benefit to Western Canada.

Mr. WHITE: The experiments conducted here are of no use to Western Canada. At all events, it is obvious that they are more beneficial to Ontario than to a province where conditions are different.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The item under discussion is Civil Government expenditures; it is not a matter of experimental farms at all.

Mr. TOLMIE: About three-quarters of it would come under the head of Civil Government. The whole staff of the experimental farms comes under the head of Civil Government. I regret that we cannot give the total. I could give it item by item, but that would take a good deal of time. In connection with the Central Farm, we have appropriated $396,858.50; in connection with Kapuskasing, in northern Ontario, $35,405; and in connection with the Harrow tobacco farm, $6,231. The experiments conducted at the Central Farm are beneficial to many other provinces. A good deal of general work is done, such as experiments in connection with new plants—as, for instance, varieties of wheat, such as Marquis and Ruby wheat, different kinds of oats, and one or two varieties of barley—and while this is beneficial to Ontario, it is also useful to the whole of Canada. Take, for instance, the sunflower experiments this year. We have produced from twenty-seven to thirty-two tons of sunflower to the acre, and put it into the silo at $2.70 per ton. That is something of the greatest benefit to the people of the whole country; it is useful to farmers all over the country who are interested in these special lines of experiment. It must be remembered, however, that the mere fact that the farm is located here is of immense benefit to the province of Ontario, because it is easily accessible to the farmers of that province who can take the train, or in summer, come down in their motor cars and see the work being done, thus benefiting directly.

Mr. MAHARG: What are the qualifications and responsibilities of those designated head clerks?

Mr. TOLMIE: These are men who assume a certain amount of responsible work in their various departments. They carry on important correspondence and also investigation, to some extent, and they usually have three or four clerks under them. In a limited way they are supervisors.

Mr. MAHARG: I asked what their qualifications were.

Mr. TOLMIE: They have to pass a Civil Service examination, and a good many of them are university men.

Mr. MAHARG: I asked this question because I see that the salaries paid run up to $3,200. On page 89 the salary of the superintendent of the farm is, however, only $2,340. Does the minister think that these salaries bear any proper relation to the qualifications and the responsibilities of the respective officers?

Mr. TOLMIE: What particular officer does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. MAHARG: I was saying that the salary of the superintendent of the farm is only $2,340, whereas the salaries of the head clerks go as high as $3,200. What relation is there between those salaries and the responsibilities of the men engaged in the different classes mentioned?

Mr. TOLMIE: The superintendent of the farm is, of course, immediately under the director. The clerk the hon. member speaks of is a man who, as I say, assumes a certain amount of the responsibilities of the office. It is very difficult to state exactly whether one is more valuable than the other. If that farm superintendent were left to his own resources I should imagine his responsibilities would be very much greater; but I think we all now realize pretty well that these matters are fixed by the Civil Service Commission. There are, perhaps, a good many things done of which we do not approve but we cannot help it.

Mr. MAHARG: We have had considerable discussion about the Civil Service Commission, and the only way in which we can determine the value of the work that it is doing is by making inquiries of this kind. Personally I cannot see any relation between the qualifications required from, and the responsibilities incurred by, a man who has charge of an experimental farm and a clerk in an office. It seems to me that the salaries paid in this case are not relatively proportionate to the responsibilities incurred.

Mr. TOLMIE: I may say that the salary of the superintendent of the farm will finally go up to $3,000. He also has a free house, which is heated for him, and that is an added advantage.

Mr. DUFF: I notice there is a gentleman who separates the sheep from the goats. He is paid $3,000, whilst the superintendent of the farm only receives $2,300. Why is there that much difference?

Mr. TOLMIE: These salaries are all fixed by the Civil Service Commission. The man who "separates the sheep from the goats," to quote my hon. friend's words, does work throughout the Dominion. He has to be familiar with local conditions in various parts of the country, and a great deal more general knowledge is demanded of him than of another man who may be an expert in a particular department.

Mr. DUFF: Has he been successful in separating the sheep from the goats?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have not heard of any quarrels among them yet.

Mr. GOULD: I would like to know the reason for the increase of $8,000 in the Entomological branch? My reason for asking the question is that for years in the West grain growers have been suffering from certain insect pests. One is the sawfly which attacks our wheat; in fact the ravages of this pest have reached such a stage that some growers have about decided to forego the growing of Marquis wheat in my area. The ravages of the sawfly are largely responsible for this determination among the farmers. Then the grasshopper pest has worked havoc for the past three years in a large area out there. I was wondering whether this $8,000 additional was to be applied to the solution of the problem of combatting evils such as those I have alluded to. I believe that in certain parts of my constituency no less a sum than $10,000,000 has been lost in the last three years owing to the depredations of these insects; and we have been very much interested in learning whether the Dominion and provincial governments would not endeavour to provide some remedy that would successfully combat the attacks of insect pests. I would like to have an expression of opinion on the subject from the minister.

Mr. TOLMIE: The crusade against grasshoppers in Western Canada is carried on under the provisions of the Destructive Insect Pests Act, and the vote for that purpose will be found in the Estimates. I may say that we have been in the past few years co-operating with the provincial departments of agriculture in the carrying out of measures for the eradication of these pests, and I think that last year very satisfactory work was done. We have a number of experts who devote their whole time to that work out in the West. We have one in particular who accompanies a moving demonstration train throughout the western country giving lectures, and affording other information, in connection with the measures for dealing with these pests. Last summer, with the co-operation of our men the provincial governments were able to substitute sawdust, and other things, for bran in connection with the poisoning of grasshoppers. They also conducted experiments with poison gas and found that putting poison in bran and other materials was far more satisfactory than the use of gas promised to be. We are still continuing that work. I would like to extend the scope of the work of the department a good deal because I think there are a good many opportunities to do so, but of course we cannot carry out all our wishes having in view the financial situation in Canada. We therefore have to work with the brakes on, so to speak, in connection with this matter.

Mr. CRERAR: I notice, Mr. Chairman, a considerable increase in the number of the employees under the item we are considering. Under the vote for Civil Government in connection with the Department of Agriculture, 318 employees were last year provided for. This year the Minister is seeking to make provision for 359, an increase of 41. Now I quite recognize the very great importance of the Department of Agriculture to the welfare of the Dominion; but at the same time consideration should be given to the financial position of the country and the fact recognized that it is time to exercise economy. We should therefore keep our expenditures, if possible, within the limits of what they were last year. I

was just wondering if it would not be possible for my good friend who presides over the Department of Agriculture to get along with the same number of employees that he had a year ago, and thus reduce the expenditure under this particular heading by anywhere from fifty to sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. TOLMIE: I fully realize the financial condition of the country, and on any occasion when I find myself inclined to be a little neglectful of the fact in my enthusiasm for further expansion, I am promptly reminded of it by my colleague the Minister of Finance. With respect to the particular items to which the hon. member has referred, I may say that I explained them all in detail shortly before six o'clock. If my hon. friend reads to-morrow's Hansard he will there find all the details of our work as it is carried on throughout the country. We have been as economical as possible, but we feel that these increases are absolutely necessary if we are going to maintain the progress of agriculture in Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to say a word or two before we get away from the subject of the experimental farms. Some hon. gentleman opposite drew the minister's attention away from this particular matter, but I would like to institute a comparison between the two old Provinces of Ontario and Quebec where the conditions are very similar. At one time the Central Experimental farm served both these provinces, and there was no other Government experimental farm in existence, At the present time, however, I notice that in the province of Quebec there are five central farms and fourteen sub-stations. Four of these farms are very much closer to the Central Farm than are the two farms located in the province of Ontario. I have noticed the expenditure for labour on these farms and I presume that the votes for a good many of these men come under the head of civil government, for the men are permanent and are employed from year to year. I also notice that for the two farms in Ontario the expenditure was $17,521, whereas the expenditure for the same purpose in the province of Quebec was $65,869. This does not include the $93,000 paid out in connection with the administration of the Central Farm at Ottawa some of which I presume will be charged up against the province of Ontario. There is a large item in the Estimates for travelling expenses incurred by officers employed on this farm. I am not finding fault with the number of the men, or the work they are doing but I have contended in the past—and I still contend—that Ontario is being very unfairly dealt with in this regard. We contribute about one-half of the revenue of this country, and we are either paying for or doing ourselves the work that the other provinces are having done for them by the Dominion. If the Government is going to continue in that course we should, I think, consider whether it would not be better to hand this work over to the different provinces and let them conduct their own affairs. Then we should have an equitable distribution in connection with this matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: I may explain that none of these farms were located in the province of Quebec during my term of office, and the moneys to which the hon. gentleman refers as moneys paid out for the carrying on of the various farms do not come under the civil government vote and consequently not under the item which we are discussing at the present time.

Mr. GLASS: I would like to ask the minister if the department is taking steps to rebuild the experimental flax mill which was destroyed by fire some time ago. So far as I can see there is no item in the Estimates providing for a continuance of that experimental work. I would like to know what the attitude of the department is towards this industry.

Mr. TOLMIE: We are having plans prepared for a new flax mill to replace the mill that was destroyed. We have a certain amount of money in these Estimates which might be used towards re-building, and if it is decided to go ahead with the new mill we may have to get more money in the Supplementary Estimates to complete the work. I fully realize the importance of the flax industry and its possibilities, and I can assure the hon. member that I shall be very glad to render every asistance possible to its development.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do I understand that the item under discussion does not cover the branch experimental farms at Kapuskasing, Harrow, Cap Rouge, Lennoxville, Ste. Anne, and Farnham?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. MAHARG: While on the question of salaries, I think it has been recognized for years that officials in the Department of Agriculture are very much underpaid in comparison with officials in other departments. I am not going into the ques-

tion to-night, but I want to make one comparison. I notice that in some of the other departments a filing clerk receives a higher salary than professors in the different branches of the Department of Agriculture, such as assistant chemists, field husbandry men, and other technical men who have to spend years to qualify for their positions. I think there must be something radically wrong when a filing clerk is paid $100 more a year than the men I have described, and I would draw the minister's attention to the situation. I shall be willing to give him my support in any efforts he may make to place the salaries of these technical men on as attractive a basis as that obtaining in the other departments of the Government service. Perhaps the minister would like to voice his opinion on that point?

Mr. TOLMIE: I think good men are always worthy of their hire, and undoubtedly we have in the Department of Agriculture many men who are rendering very valuable service to this country—service which could never be put in dollars and cents. Dr. Saunders, who created Marquis wheat, made a very valuable contribution to the country at a time when an improvement in our wheat was very badly needed, and I am sorry that there is no way of recognizing his ability. I think that, generally speaking, the hon. gentleman is correct and that the merit of our technical men in the Department of Agriculture has not been recognized as fully as it has been in other departments of the Government. So far as I am concerned, I shall always be glad to do all I can to the end that these men may be paid as liberally as possible. We must make their positions attractive if we expect to retain good men. By underpaying them we are simply making the department a training school for the benefit of other governments; we find our best men are taken by the provincial governments and by the government of the United States after we have trained them for three or four years.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is every man employed at the experimental farms classified under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are all classified except the labourers.

Mr. MYERS: Is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture to expend any money during 1921 in experimenting on the treatment of flax fibre in the West.

[Mr. Maharg.]

Mr. TOLMIE: It is the intention of the department to expend money on the experimental farms in the Prairie Provinces in connection with the development of the flax industry.

Mr. PARENT: What are the average hours that men employed on the experimental farms are expected to work?

Mr. TOLMIE: The average is about nine hours in winter and ten in summer.

Mr. PARENT: I am informed that men employed on the experimental farms are sometimes obliged to work from twelve to fourteen hours per day without extra remuneration. I would like to know the policy of the Government in respect to these men.

Mr. TOLMIE: Men like herdsmen and teamsters and others engaged in various lines of work where it is necessary for them to give attention to animals after their regular working hours are paid salaries, and they work on an average about eleven hours a day, but those are exceptions.

Mr. PARENT: I think the minister ought to be in a position to give this committee his definite views so far as the employees of the experimental farms are concerned in regard to how much they are paid for a ten-hour day, and how much they are entitled to if they work extra hours.

Mr. TOLMIE: Day labourers work by the day and in Eastern Canada are paid about thirty to thirty-five cents an hour. If they work overtime they are paid at the same rate. In Western Canada they are paid from forty to forty-one cents an hour.

Mr. PARENT: What is the policy of the Government in regard to these men, and how much are they paid when they work extra hours? I do not refer particularly to those engaged on the experimental farms in the province of Quebec, I am referring to those engaged on all the Government farms.

Mr. TOLMIE: The rates as I have stated them; they are not the same all over the country. If the men work an extra hour they are paid at the same rate.

Mr. CANNON: I notice that in this item a special sum is allotted to the library. Where is that library, what books are in it, and to whom are the books distributed?

Mr. TOLMIE: The library is located in the West Block. It contains a large number of books dealing with agriculture. Books and publications are also kept there which are received in connection with the International Bureau of Agriculture, with headquarters in Rome, to the meetings of which we send a delegate every year. We secure from that source very valuable information concerning crop production all over the world, the production of animals, and so on, and we are able to keep in close touch with market conditions and, in general, prospects for the future in agriculture. Improved methods in agriculture are also noted and those that we think suitable to our needs and conditions are tried out on our experimental farms.

Mr. CANNON: I am well satisfied with the answer given by the minister. Are these books published in both languages?

Mr. TOLMIE: Some of them are. Some, too, are published in more than two languages.

Mr. CANNON: Are the books distributed throughout the country, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are for the use of the Agriculture Department. Of course, any reliable person can communicate with the department and take out one of these books for a time and subsequently return it.

Mr. McMASTER: I notice a strange anomaly on page 90: "1 translator, $1,500; 1 junior translator, $1,550." Apparently it is best to be a junior if you are in the translating business.

Mr. TOLMIE: That is fixed by the Civil Service Commission. It can be explained by length of service in the department.

Mr. McMASTER: To try to palm this off on the Civil Service Commission does not seem to be satisfactory. "Junior translator" connotes, to my mind, the idea that he is junior in the service to the translator, yet he gets $50 more. There must be some explanation of this, or some mistake has been made which should be corrected.

Mr. TOLMIE: There are a great many anomalies in the Civil Service re-classification. Under the old classification this junior translator was entitled to run up to $1,560. According to the ruling of the commission, employees could not be paid less than they were receiving before. This translator has come in under the new classification.

Mr. VIEN: What is the name of the translator and what is the name of the junior translator?

Mr. TOLMIE: I regret I cannot give the names just now, but I shall be glad to get them for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. VIEN: How long have they been in the service and what are the reasons given by the Civil Service Commission for the salaries assigned to each?

Mr. TOLMIE: The junior translator has been in the service about six years, and the translator about two years. I cannot personally account for any action of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VIEN: Is the minister positive that the Civil Service Commission is accountable for the fixing of this salary?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, as far as my information goes.

Mr. VIEN: But we want to know whether or not the minister is prepared to state definitely that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for fixing the salary of this translator at $1,500 and of the junior translator at $1,550.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Act is responsible for the $1,550, and the Civil Service Commission is responsible for the other one.

Mr. CANNON: I note that there is provision for two junior zoologists at $1,295. I do not see any senior zoologist in the list. Why should there be two juniors and no senior?

Mr. TOLMIE: There are no senior zoologists, and these two employees do not work in the same office. Both are women.

Mr. PARENT: Will the minister inform me whether the men employed at the experimental farms are entitled to a holiday of fifteen days or so each year without reduction of salary, even if they are absent one or more working days throughout the year?

Mr. TOLMIE: Those who work by the hour lose their time if they remain off. Those who work on salary are entitled to the usual holiday period. If a man misses a day through sickness or something of that kind, it is not deducted from his holiday.

Mr. PARENT: Do I understand then, that if a man employed at the experimental farms is absent, say, ten days, and later, at different times, absent another five days, he will still get his fifteen days' holiday without suffering any reduction of salary?

Mr. TOLMIE: In all those cases he must get permission from the Civil Service Commission before he is permitted to take those days.

Mr. PARENT: Not at all. The minister is not serious there.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not know whether we should blame the minister for the further anomalies I purpose setting forth before the committee, or whether the Civil Service Commission is to blame but I would draw this to the attention of the minister, as it seems to constitute a grave injustice. A senior file clerk gets $1,525; one file clerk gets $1,600, or more than the senior; a junior file clerk gets $1,250, and junior file clerks are paid more than a great number of stenographers. I should imagine that the work of a filing clerk was purely mechanical, requiring only carefulness and industry, while to be a good typist one has to have a very substantial degree of education. Perhaps the minister is not to blame for this, but certainly it does not reflect great credit on whoever is responsible for drawing up these grades in the service.

Mr. TOLMIE The same explanation that I gave a short time ago under the same conditions apply to that.

Mr. McMASTER: That is that the Civil Service Commission is responsible, but that is really no explanation to the committee for these very startling anomalies. The higher grades of service are being paid on a lower scale of remuneration than the lower grades. That is not fair.

Mr. PARENT: I should not like the minister to go on record as saying that employees on experimental farms are entitled to a holiday whenever the Civil Service Commission declares them to be entitled to one. I do not think the minister meant what he said a minute ago, and I should like him to give an answer again so that the committee will know exactly his position in the matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: What I said is that they should get the authority of the Civil Service Commission before they could get a holiday. Those working by the hour are not entitled to holidays with pay; they lose their pay if they take a holiday. Those on salary are entitled to the regulation holidays given to any other members of the Civil Service.

Mr. PARENT: That is not the point I am aiming at. I should like the minister to state whether, if a man happens to take only five days at one time and then takes one day after another, he is entitled to fifteen days altogether without having his salary reduced.

Mr. TOLMIE: As I understand the matter from the Civil Service Commission, it is not necessary for him to ask for the whole fifteen days if he wants five days, he can get them. If he is sick, he can get sick leave. The hon. member will find the provision in the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. COPP: The minister, in giving or attempting to give explanations regarding the items of the Estimate we have before us, has exposed the weakness of the Civil Service Commission. He blames, and, I think, rightly so, all these anomalies that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) speaks of, on the Civil Service Commission but in spite of the time spent by Arthur Young and Company, Griffenhagen and Company and the Civil Service Commission, there is still in the department of the minister, one poor unfortunate who has failed to be classified at all. Surely the minister will be able to tell us something about this person, what he does and what his salary is.

Mr. TOLMIE: What item is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. COPP: The last item on page 91 a civil servant not classified at all, with a salary of $1,600. What does he do?

Mr. TOLMIE: I can get that information for the hon. gentleman in a few minutes.

Mr. PARENT: With a view to pointing out to the minister that I am not talking simply for the purpose of embarrassing him, because I do not believe I could, I will give him a concrete case which is reported to me and which is a justification for my interfering at this particular point of the discussion on the Estimates. I am told that at some experimental farms, employees are working ten hours and sometimes twelve or more hours a day, and they deserve a good deal of credit for the

time they spend on these farms in the interest of the people at large. When the time comes to take a holiday and they ask permission from the superintendent of their farm, he will say to them: "You may have this day, but it will be deducted from your salary." Therefore, these people complain that they have no opportunity to have a holiday outside of the ordinary holidays of fifteen days in the year. While some of them may take their fifteen days at one time; others would rather take ten days and then keep five or six days during the year for other purposes, taking a holiday whenever they want it. If it happens that they do not take their fifteen days at one time, but keep a few days for their own pleasure or purpose afterwards, when they take such a day, a day's pay is deducted from their salary. Whatever there is in the complaint, all I can say is that I have received it, and these people say that a strong injustice is being done to them by their salaries being reduced for a day's holiday although they spend so many hours working for the country. That is why I am asking the minister to state whether, if a man is entitled to fifteen days' holiday in the year, if he takes these fifteen days at one time or a day now and then, he is entitled to full pay and not to have his salary reduced because he takes a day or two now and then.

9 p.m.

Mr. TOLMIE: As I pointed out before, there is no objection to these men obtaining their holidays from time to time as may suit their convenience, but on every occasion, they must receive authority for doing so. If they use up their fifteen days in that way, their pay is not reduced.

Mr. PARENT: That is just the point I wanted the minister to come to. There is, for instance, employed on an experimental farm at Charlottetown, a man who has a brother dying, for instance, in Quebec, and he has to leave at once. According to the view that the department is taking now, this man has to write to Ottawa in order to receive authority for one or two days' holiday. That is what happens, that has happened, and the minister should see that a situation like that is not tolerated any longer.

Mr. TOLMIE: That is not exactly the case. In an emergency of that kind, he has no trouble. He does not even have as much trouble as other people have under similar circumstances. He gets permission from the superintendent and is allowed to go at once.

Mr. EULER: In the various classifications of stenographers, clerks and so on, are men and women doing the same class of work?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. EULER: Is any distinction made as regards salaries?

Mr. TOLMIE: No distinction for similar positions.

Mr. CANNON: Referring to translators, I notice that the senior translator of the department secured this year an increase of $120. The translator is not classified as either senior or junior, but is simply put down as translator. He gets an increase of $60, while the junior translator gets an increase of $100. I should like to ask the minister, who fixes the amounts of these various increases, and what is the reason for making these distinctions between people who are apparently doing the same class of work. Why should the junior translator get a bigger increase than the translator?

Mr. TOLMIE: The junior translator is under the old classification and his salary is practically fixed by the Act. It could not be reduced to a lesser amount than he was receiving, and it goes on increasing at the old rate. The increases under the new classification, under which the others come, are fixed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CANNON: Am I to understand the minister to mean that the Civil Service Commission has the right to fix the wages that shall be received by the civil servants in the employ of the Government, without the head of the department having anything to say about the matter?

Mr. TOLMIE: The salaries and the increases are fixed by the classification.

Mr. CANNON: Does the minister refer to the classification that was made by those American experts imported into Canada, or to some other classification?

Mr. TOLMIE: The classification brought into force about a year ago.

Mr. CANNON: By whom?

Mr. TOLMIE: By the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CANNON: Last week the Minister of Trade and Commerce explained during a debate in this House that experts brought

into the country by the Government, and who were absolute strangers to the Civil Service had made certain changes in the classification of the civil servants. Am I to understand that the changes which appear in the item I refer to were made by the experts or by the Civil Service Commission itself?

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand that these salaries were fixed at the time the classification was made, but what part the American experts played in the classification I could not say off-hand.

Mr. CANNON: What I want to know is who made the classification? The Civil Service Commission, the minister, or the outside experts?

Mr. TOLMIE: It was certainly not the minister, but the Civil Service Commission. Whether they had the assistance of these imported experts or not, I could not say.

Mr. CANNON: The minister states he is not responsible for the classification of these employees?

Mr. TOLMIE: The minister had nothing to do with the fixing of these salaries.

Mr. CANNON: But before the classification was made was not the minister consulted by the Civil Service Commission or by the experts, because, after all, the people who can give proper information in regard to the employees of a department are the head, the deputy head, and the branch heads? Were they consulted, and if so, did they make reports written or verbal?

Mr. TOLMIE: The classifiers had a staff of experts of their own, and also consulted the deputy head before the classification was approved.

Mr. CANNON: Am I to understand that the deputy head of the Department of Agriculture is responsible for the classification of these particular employees. If so, I would like the minister, who is the head of the deputy head, to tell us the reasons for these varying increases.

Mr. TOLMIE: The evidence of the deputy minister was taken by the commission, who came to their own decision.

Mr. CANNON: I should like to know from the minister, now that his deputy is here and can give him the required information, why the junior translator is getting a bigger increase than the translator himself?

Mr. TOLMIE: Although the evidence of the deputy minister was taken, the final decision was in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. Therefore, I do not hold the deputy minister responsible for these increases that appear here. As I have explained before, there is the old classification and the new. This particular class of junior translator begins at a salary of $1,200 under the old system, with annual increases of about $50 a year up to about $1,600. Under the new classification the minimum salary of translator is fixed at $1,440 with annual increases of $60 up to the maximum.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask if the superintendents of the various experimental farms in this country are competent men?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are, so far as I know.

Mr. PARENT: Then if they are, I should like to know why, when a man on one of these farms wants a holiday, he has to apply to Ottawa instead of to the superintendent of his particular farm?

Mr. TOLMIE: In case of an emergency, a holiday is given by the superintendent of the farm, and authority afterwards obtained from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PARENT: That just brings me back again to the same question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I notice that these farm labourers receive a bonus of $420 in addition to their regular salary. About a year ago we obtained the information that the expenditure under the head of civil government for the experimental farm at Ottawa was $93,295.95, and that the wages paid to the farm labourers amounted to $163,831.87. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Parent) need worry himself so much about the holidays of these men on this little farm out here. They are having a pretty fair time considering the number employed and the wages paid them. Over a quarter of a million dollars is being paid in salaries out here on this farm on the outskirts of the city, and I think the amount is altogether too great considering the results from the farm. I believe that the sooner a radical reform is instituted in connection with the experimental farm system in this country, the better it will be for Canada. I think that an example should be set those who are engaged in agriculture in this country, instead of having a great show place for the whole country when they come to Ottawa. The work carried on at the farm is largely lost to the average farmer. and a quarter of

a million dollars, under present conditions, is altogether too much to spend in connection with a farm of this kind. I do not think, furthermore, that these expenditures should be charged up against the province of Ontario, which, we are told, is being benefited thereby. I do not see what ground there is for telling us that we ought to be satisfied, when we have to do the experimental work ourselves on our own farms and pay for it.

Mr. DAVIS (Neepawa): I see there is an increase in the number of messengers from eleven to thirteen. What are the duties of these messengers?

Mr. PARENT: They carry fresh eggs.

Mr. TOLMIE: I shall answer first the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). It is true that a great deal of money is expended on the Central Experimental Farm, but it carries on work of great benefit to the whole country. I think that in that Central Farm we have one of the best establishments that can be found anywhere. Only last summer, a prominent and well known agriculturist of Great Britain visited Ottawa, and, with a letter of introduction from me to the Director of Farms, he went to the Experimental Farm and looked over our livestock and the work that was being done. On his return he stated that, so far as he was aware, there was no establishment of this kind anywhere in the world, and certainly not in Great Britain. The farmers here, he said, had a tremendous advantage in having experimental work carried on for them, in having new lines produced, new cereals, new fruits, new vegetables and roots, such as he saw out on the farm, and so forth. All this information, after it is gathered together, the farmers have absolutely free of charge, and we have in Canada a tremendous opportunity for the development of agriculture. There are very many new areas in certain provinces where land and climatic conditions vary to a great extent. A settler may come from England or, say, the state of Alabama, and if he landed in those parts of the country and had no information, it would take him four or five years at least of valuable time getting established and studying the conditions prevaling there. All this time would be lost before he finally could get to work. With our experimental farm system he is able, at the outset, to obtain all the information necessary to take up the line of agriculture most suited to that particular section of the country. In addition to that, he can obtain information as to the best varieties of seed to sow, how and when to sow it, etc. He can find out the best varieties of livestock to keep and the best method of marketing his products. I consider this a very great advantage. Only last summer we had a horticulturist from Oregon who came to Okanagan Valley in British Columbia and visited the station at Summerland. After examining the methods carried on there in connection with dry farming and irrigation, he stated that he was well acquainted with all the various farms in the United States, and that in future he would come to Summerland for his information because the work carried on there was better and more reliable than that of any other farm he knew of on the continent of America. Now, take this particular farm which the hon. member for South Oxford referred to. I may say that we have no fewer than thirteen branches there of various lines of work, from experiments in connection with horse breeding down to the breeding of bees and the production of honey. To give one example of the splendid work done on our farms; I may say that the average Canadian hen is responsible for only 65 eggs a year. Out on the farm at Sidney in British Columbia last year, the hens produced, by careful breeding and selection, no fewer than 300 eggs a piece. If we had failed to take advantage of the opportunities that presented themselves in this matter we should never have got anywhere, and our agriculture in this, as in other lines, would drag along in a listless sort of way. You may take a horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink, and if the farmers of this country have not life enough to take advantage of the opportunities that offer, and to secure all the information they can from our farms, then it is their own fault. I am sure there is no intelligent farmer who can go to the Central Farm, look over the livestock and see the methods of agriculture that are practised there without gaining considerable important information, whether he farms on Vancouver Island or on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. VIEN: How many experimental farms are there in Canada?

Mr. TOLMIE: There are twenty-one regular farms, two tobacco stations, seventy-five illustration stations, and six or seven sub-stations.

Mr. PARENT: What kind of hens—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. TOLMIE: I might mention the methods practised in connection with grain and vegetable plots. These plots are only about one-fortieth of an acre in extent, so small that you cannot use machinery to advantage on them. A new variety of grain may be secured from some other place and an experiment is made to find out whether it would be useful in this country. In addition to that particular plot there would be a number of other check plots planted at the same time, and this goes on from year to year. It is obvious, therefore, that a great deal of work is involved in keeping the place in proper condition, and information is not released until such time as the director of the farm is absolutely certain that what he has to impart is perfectly reliable and that anyone may make use of the information he gives, no matter whether he is in British Columbia or in Nova Scotia. This makes necessary considerable very fine work; it entails a great deal of hand labour, and naturally it means a lot of expense. After the experiments have been carried out the results are applied under field conditions, and the information obtained in consequence is published so that anyone may secure it for the asking, either through the mails, or directly from the farm. I feel sure that these farms are rendering a very valuable service, and a great many men derive considerable benefit from them. Of course, one cannot expect any profits from experimental work of this kind, requiring such minute care and attention, although many of the sections, such as our livestock and dairying sections, and the hog, sheep, and poultry sections, frequently yield a profit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not want the minister to misunderstand me. I am not condemning the experimental farm system. I have always upheld that system, and have been a strong advocate of its extension, but when I refer to the Central Farm in Ottawa I have in mind the fact that you can go westward in Ontario and not find another Dominion experimental farm except a small tobacco farm in Western Ontario for the growing of tobacco. Even the operations of that are confined to a part of two counties and consequently its influence does not extend very far. Just a word or two with regard to those people in western Ontario who are so dense that they cannot follow the example that has been set them here in Ottawa and elsewhere by the experimental farm system because they have not had the advantage of visiting the farm, unless they happened to come to this city, although there is a big stretch of the province of Ontario between its western limits and the city of Ottawa that separates the two and consequently conditions are not very similar. I might, for example, refer to the factory output of dairy products in a certain little spot of western Ontario—the county of Oxford—and to the fact that it equaled for the year 1917, which is the last that I have, the factory output of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and almost that of Prince Edward Island. So that as far as the farmers of that part of Canada are concerned, they have evidently been keeping pretty well abreast of the times bearing in mind the result of their labours. What I have objected to is that the experimental farm system is not brought home to the people, and that they do not have an opportunity of reaping the advantage they should derive from the money that has been expended here. I do not say that Ontario has been neglected. As I pointed out, and have repeatedly pointed out, we are doing the things that the Dominion ought to do for us, seeing they are doing those very things for the rest of the provinces. That is the exception I take to this enormous expenditure of over a quarter million of dollars on the farm at Ottawa which plays but a very small part in farming operations so far as the province of Ontario is concerned.

Mr. GLASS: I cannot altogether agree with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) in his criticism that there has been extravagant expenditure on the farm adjacent to this city. I think the time has passed when it is necessary for any member of this House to defend the expenditures of the Federal Government on agriculture. If I had any criticism to offer, it would be that in my humble opinion the Government have not yet risen to the height which the country should demand of them—and that applies not only to the present Administration, but to Governments that have preceded them. There has always been an insistance upon the curtailment of expenditures when it came to agriculture. I was glad to hear the minister's remarks and his defence of the experimental farm. In his speech he touched on the question of poultry, and

having some knowledge of that industry, as well as some interest in it, I recently made a little study of its development in this country. I was influenced to do so more particularly by reason of the fact that last week I was booked to address a gathering of four or five hundred poultry men in the city of London. In connection with the inquiries I made I was informed that the production of eggs in this country last year amounted to 2,244,000,000. Dividing this number into dozens we have 187,000,00 dozens of eggs; and then dividing that number into cases of 30 dozen each it yields a total of 6,233,333 cases, or 15,555 carloads. But, Sir, I find that statistics show that the production of poultry in this country for the year 1920 amounted in value to the enormous sum of $120,000,000. The development of the poultry industry in Canada, and its expansion during the past few years, has been largely due to the splendid work of the experimental farm, and here I give credit to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) for the legislation that was introduced a year or two ago, whereby the standardization of eggs was brought about, as being a matter of immense value to the poultry industry. I was speaking to the official in charge of the farm here upon the egg production in Canada, and the effect that the standardization of eggs had on our foreign markets. He told me that in the British market the Canadian egg standardized commanded a price of from eight pence to one shilling a dozen more than American eggs from the South. I asked him how the production of eggs in the United States and in the warmer climates compared with production in the colder climate of Canada. He replied that our production was not only better but that the quality of the egg was very much superior. The earliest census of poultry taken in this country goes away back to the year 1695 when in old Acadia there was a total of only 362, but in 1891 we had 12,696,701 in this country. According to the census returns in 1901 the number had increased to 16,651,337; in 1911 it was 29,773,457; and in 1920 the estimated figures of the poultry of the country were 45,000,000 head.

Now we find that this country last year imported a large number of eggs, the total importation amounting to 6,515,928 dozen, having a value of $3,051,833. It would seem to be a most regrettable thing that a country of such enormous resources as ours should have to import eggs for its own consumption. But it must be borne is mind that in 1920 we exported 6,324,838 dozen, having a value of $4,198,430. Our import of eggs showed an average cost of 46.8 cents per dozen, while the export of eggs from this country, by reason of the standardization of our eggs and by reason of their superior quality, obtained for our exporters an average price of 66.3 cents. So that we export our eggs on the basis of 66.3 cents and import them on the vasis of 46.8 cents.

The work done on this experimental farm in Ottawa is not measured by what is produced there, we all know that, and I just simply illustrate the poultry division as only one item amongst many in which the advice given by the management of the experimental farm has been of enormous potential value to this country—a value that it is almost impossible to conceive. I say, success to the experimental farm at Ottawa! I agree with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that it is desirable to establish demonstration farms in practically every township if possible, but that work comes largely under the purview of the Provincial Governments, and their work, assisted by the Federal Department of Agriculture, has resulted in very great benefits to our farmers. I trust that this department will not in any way relax their efforts. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), I notice, is somewhat critical of the expenditure and would economize by reducing the staff; but our expenditure here is nothing at all in proportion to the expenditure on agriculture in the United States, and if we are to develop this great country to its fullest possibilities in agriculture it is obvious that there should be no curtailment so long as the money is wisely used in the development of our experimental farm system.

Mr. VIEN: I cannot agree with the previous speaker when he says that model farms in various sections of the country—

Mr. GLASS: I said demonstration farms.

Mr. VIEN: —that demonstration farms should be left entirely to the Provincial Governments. I sympathize with what the hon. member for South Oxford has urged, that we should spend less on these experimental farms and more on demonstration farms all over the country. Why? The minister has just given the reason. On these experimental farms experiments of a very expensive character are conducted, so expensive that the ordinary farmer could not undertake them on his own farm. If

I read correctly the Auditor General's Report, we spent last year $375,000 on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. In my opinion this item could have been reduced by over $100,000, and still experiments on the scale I have described could have been carried on to whatever degree necessary for the purpose of enlightening our farmers. If instead of spending that $375,000 on the Central Experimental Farm the Government had devoted $100,000 or $200,000 in demonstrating in various sections of the country better methods of agriculture and in encouraging farmers by instruction and premium to grow better crops and raise better stock to suit local conditions, greater benefit would have resulted to the country generally; and even had the expenditure been greater than the amount in question it would have been thoroughly justified, because no matter how well the experimental farm in Ottawa is conducted only a very small number of our farmers can afford to visit it and derive personal benefit from the experiments there being carried on. The minister has told us that a distinguished gentleman from England visited the farm last year and expressed regret that they did not have such a farm even in England. Well, I think this country should be satisfied with what they have in England so far as demonstration farms are concerned. We should not indulge in such luxuries as are exhibited at the Central Experimental Farm. We could easily dispense with a number of these items of expenditure and use the money all over the country for the great advantage of the many rather than as at the present, for the benefit of a few.

In the riding which I have the honour to represent we have an annual exhibition in the month of September which is assisted by the Provincial Government. The provincial department of agriculture send their specialists who give to the farmers very valuable information—information which can be utilized by our farmers to suit local conditions. Prizes are given for the best crops and also for school gardens, and every year the farmers can see the results of the best farming in every parish. But no matter what experiments are carried on at the Central Experimental Farm in Ottawa, very few farmers can afford to visit the farm even once in ten years. That is one reason why I sympathize very much indeed with the idea put forward by my hon. friend from South Oxford, that we should reduce the expenditure on our experimental farms and apply the money saved to increasing our demonstration farms so that their benefits may be brought home to every locality.

The Federal Department of Agriculture must have at heart the development of agriculture in all sections of the country, and that development is not being promoted to the fullest extent by conducting experiments here in Ottawa where climatic conditions are very much at variance with those prevailing in many other sections of the country. I would urge that the Government reduce their extraordinary expenditure on the experimental farms and devote the money to establishing more demonstration farms.

Mr. BEST: It is very evident that the speaker who has just taken his seat does not know anything about farming. He speaks as though the experimental farm at Ottawa was just for the benefit of a few local people.

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the hon. gentleman. I never said any such thing.

Mr. BEST: The experimental farm at Ottawa has sent samples of grain and shrubs and seeds all over the Dominion. When the hon. gentleman speaks about school fairs in his riding, I may tell him that we have them in my county, and most of the children who plant their seeds in the school plots get those seeds from Ottawa. While I am opposed to extravagant expenditure in any line, I make the statement that when hon. gentlemen get up and talk respecting farming, it is evident that they never did any farming in their lives, or they would not complain about this expenditure of $350,000.

Mr. VIEN: I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. My father was a farmer; I was brought up on a farm; my ancestors were farmers for three hundred years.

Mr. BEST: It seems strange that most professional men in this House and out of the House claim that they were raised on the farm. I can certainly vouch for the fact that most of them were milked on the farm, anyway. I think hon. gentlemen are making a great mistake when they find fault with an expenditure of $300,000 or $350,000 on an industry which supplies as much as two-thirds of the wealth of this country. When the Government propose to spend three or four times as much on agriculture as was spent by past governments, we should commend, not criticize them. When I came to this House

ten or eleven years ago, less than one million dollars was spent on agriculture; now I believe we spend between five and six. If the money is wisely spent, no hon. member should find fault with a policy of that kind.

But there is one thing I do deplore—the fact that, as the minister says, the Civil Service Commission select the men for the different branches of this department and arrange their renumeration. I am sorry that the minister is not in a position to select better men to fill positions in his department than those who never farmed a day in their lives. Why are two or three men selected to sit in Ottawa and carry on the business of branches of which they know nothing whatever? We have a glaring example of that kind of thing in hon. gentlemen who get up in this committee and talk about the hours and the time and the holidays. Of course, a lawyer comes into his office at about ten o'clock in the morning, goes out at four or five and counts it a day, but the farmer has to work all day. These speeches that are being made about hours and time and holidays are doing more to hurt the farmers of Canada than anything else that could be done, because they are causing dissatisfaction among our men on the farms who are hired by the month or by the year. There are times when the people in the towns and cities would go hungry if the hired men on the farm did not work fourteen hours a day. I do not know whether these fifteen days' holidays are supposed to be the legal holidays or whether they are over and above the holidays, but when a man is hired by the month or by the year on the experimental farms he is suposed to work a month or a year and he is supposed to get the legal holidays and no more. Something has been said about a man not being able to get away if a friend had died. Well, I know that in the county which I represent, if a hired man on the farm lost a relative by death the farmer would leave the work in the field and let him go, and our government would do the same. This talk about six or eight hours a day is driving our boys and girls off the farms; making them believe there is pleasure and nothing to do in the cities, and slavery and misery on the farm. I resent that kind of thing. I have spent most of my life on the farm and I say that there is no place where a man can have a better time or enjoy life better than on the farm. I hope that hon. gentlemen who get up to talk about farming and about agricultural matters generally will be men who know something about farming.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend intimates that I do not know the first thing about farming.

Mr. ETHIER: Oh, no, he was referring to the member for South Oxford.

Mr. VIEN: Both of us, I think, can give him some pointers on farming. The lecture of the hon. gentleman was quite unnecessary. I did not criticize the expenditure of $375,000 for the farming industry, though my hon. friend sought to create the impression that I did. I would like this Government to cut out some foolish expenditure that is proposed in other departments and use the money for the development and improvement of the agricultural industry in this country. I am not criticizing expenditure in respect to experimental farms, but I would like these experiments to be carried out not merely at one central point, but in demonstration farms all over the country, because that would result in greater benefit to the farming community at large. Coming back to my hon. friend's suggestion that I do not know the first thing about farming, I do not like to blow my own horn as the hon. gentleman has blown his, but I may tell him that my ancestors came to this country in 1657 and were all farmers. My father was a farmer; I was brought up on a farm. I own a farm of my own, and am proud of it.

Mr. SMITH: What about your grandfather?

Mr. VIEN: I have said that all my ancestors were farmers; that should be sufficient for my hon. friend. I think it most improper, therefore, that an hon. gentleman should jump and say that we do not know the first thing about farming. Why, the hon. gentleman himself was ignorant of what he was talking about. He was throwing stones into the garden of his neighbour though he was himself inhabiting a glass house. Let him learn the lesson; let him go a little more slowly when he is impelled to make such remarks with regard to hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, if the committee is to understand that the minister accepts the statement of the hon. member for West Quebec that these messengers gather eggs, in approved committee style I shall have to add another question and ask how many eggs they collect. But that is

just in line with what I really wanted to ask. I notice in going over the list that there are about 125 stenographers in the department and about 100 clerks. Even the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) will admit that I know a little about this subject, even though I might not know so much about farming. I would like to ask the minister whether in his department there is any return of the number of letters or pages of typewriting which are turned out by this staff of 125 stenographers? Is any return made to the Civil Service Commission of the number of entries which these clerks are obliged to make? When the chief of staff in a large financial institution is asked whether a certain branch may have an additional junior officer, he can immediately go over the work of that office and determine whether or not the answer should be in the affirmative—and this without making any personal visit to the office. I think some such arrangement should prevail in the Civil Service I have made the suggestion before and I make it again now upon the coming before this committee of the first department's work. I should like and I am sure the committee would like to know whether any return of this sort is made or asked for from the departments, and I trust the minister will not forget my question about the messengers.

Mr. TOLMIE: We can furnish this information, but we cannot do it offhand. If the hon. gentleman wants it, I shall be glad to give it to him. As regards the duties of messengers, they are used in the usual way, in carrying messages from one office to another in the different departments which are scattered over the city. They are used in connection with the mail and so forth, along all the general lines for which a messenger is used. The messengers in our department are all steadily engaged and, so far as I know, they are rendering good service. In answer to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), as I have explained before, while we carry on these small experiments on the big experimental farm, they are afterwards tried out under field conditions and the information obtained is given out to the country. The hon. member speaks of what is being done now by the provinces in the way of demonstrating agriculture to the farmers. They use what are known as county representatives who travel about from one farm to another. We assist the provinces at the rate of one million dollars a year for improving agricultural education, some of this money being used in the way I have mentioned. As regards the work carried on at the experimental farms, not only can a man go there and look at the plots in which these experiments are being conducted, but he can also see the work that is being done under field conditions. For instance, the production this last year of an average of thirty tons to the acre, of sunflower at a cost of less than $3 per ton placed in the silo, is a demonstration that any practical farmer can benefit by. In addition to that, the crop of oats ran about eighty or ninety bushels to the acre grown under certain conditions. Clover was also grown under different conditions and calculations made as to the cost of production. Therefore, the experimental farm, in addition to demonstration work, is of great use to the practical farmer who wishes to visit it. The money expended at the Central Experimental Farm covers a wide scope in addition to what is done on the farm. For instance, it covers the tobacco farms at Farnham and Harrow. It covers the work at the illustration stations, of which there are seventy-five scattered throughout Canada. It covers the flax extension work, the potato inspection work, the rot investigation work, and it also covers a very important work we carry on for the education of the farmers. It covers the exhibits which are taken from our experimental farms to all the principal fairs in Canada, and we have with those exhibits demonstrators who describe the methods under which the plants are grown or the way in which wool is cared for after it is taken from the sheep and carded. We also demonstrate the candling of eggs and so forth. Any hon. member who has attended any of our large fairs in recent years will probably remember some excellent exhibits from those forms, and that is taking the demonstration to the doors of the farmers. On those seventy-five illustration forms scattered throughout Canada very excellent work is done, showing the farmer exactly how to use the best methods under actual farming conditions, and the experimental farms and illustration stations are cooperating very well together. In addition to that, we cooperate with the governments of the various provinces in many lines of work, and we oftan afford them great assistance which they use to good advantage.

Mr. McCOIG: I wish to say a word or two in connection with this expenditure of $375,000. I may differ from some hon.

members on both sides of the House in regard to this matter. My opinion is that the Central Experimental Farm should be the best, not only in the Dominion of Canada, but in any part of the world. When we are expending a few hundred thousand dollars on the Central Experimental Farm in the city of Ottawa, we are only carrying out a policy that has been laid down by the great ministers of agriculture that we have had, not only in the Liberal party, but in the great Conservative party, ever since Canada has been a nation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCOIG:—Or a young nation. As regards the argument that we should cut down this expenditure, I say to hon. gentlemen who are objecting to it, that we might as well be conducting the affairs of Canada in the Museum a few blocks away as conducting the affairs of Canada in this magnificent Parliament building which we have caused to be erected at a cost to the people of Canada of millions of dollars. When we stand up in this Parliament to-night and object to paltry expenditures of this kind, we are simply playing into the hands of the big interests of the country who are standing back and laughing; we are giving them a certain amount of amusement to think that we, as supporters of agriculture in Canada, are differing in regard to backing up the Minister of Agriculture as long as he carries on the affairs of his department honestly and well. When the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), whose views and ideas I have supported on many occasions, speaks about patronage, I say that the agricultural department should be conducted in the way in which it is being conducted, namely, by the Civil Service Commission; that patronage should be cut out, and that men who are qualified and who are deserving of promotion should be given the preference, instead of some partisans whose position or advancement may be advocated by hon. members opposite or by members on this side after members on this side come into power. I am in sympathy with giving the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) every assistance possible, because I am convinced that when he is fighting his Estimates through Council, he has his troubles, and while other ministers may smile, I believe they will agree with me that what I say is absolutely right. There is a great work for the Minister of Agriculture to do in this country, not merely for the general encouragement of greater production, but for bringing that production to such a point that there will be a reduction in the cost of living to the people of Canada, and without giving such assistance, we shall be unable to achieve that result. As regards extravagance in connection with our experimental farm, I am in favour of giving the minister every possible assistance, even if he does spend a few dollars more than we might see fit to endorse at this particular time. Experimental plots are absolutely necessary. This Parliament, not the Government, has already voted $1,000,000 to be distributed amongst the various provinces in order that they may carry on experimental farms so as to encourage the growing of crops that are particularly adapted for different sections throughout Canada. We have given that money; we are voting it to-night without discussion, and then we are hesitating to say that we stand behind the minister in carrying out the work he is going to do for the great purpose of agriculture which we all profess to be behind to the last. I am in sympathy with this expenditure, even if it may seem extravagant, because I believe the minister is doing the best he can under the circumstances.

10 p.m.

Mr. CASGRAIN: As a representative of a rural constituency I think I ought to say something on this subject. I agree with almost every word that has been said by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McCoig). I would ask the minister to consider a proposition which has been put before him on many occasions by myself and others on behalf of the people of the County of Charlevoix-Montmorency, and that is to reopen the demonstration farm which was established there some time ago, in 1913, or 1914, if I remember correctly, but which was discontinued. I have never yet been able to find out why it was discontinued, but since I have been a member of this House I have tried on many occasions to get the farm opened, without success.

Mr. MOLLOY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CASGRAIN: I should like an answer from the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out that questions concerning the establishment or re-establishment of demonstration farms have already been ruled out of order on this item. If any question concerning the expenditure of the Department of

Agriculture may be asked on item No. 14, the entire discussion can be started over and over again every time the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture are before the committee. Item No. 14 which we are now considering deals solely with Civil Government expenditure here in the city of Ottawa. I would not call an hon. member to order for discussing upon it any matter concerning agriculture that is not specially covered by another Estimate, but where there are specific items in the Estimates I would ask hon. members to wait until they are reached before discussing matters pertaining to them.

Mr. MOLLOY: On page 89 of the Estimates there are two items: "Veterinary Director General, $5,040" and "Chief Veterinary Inspector, $3,900." I understand that these are two separate positions occupied by two different men. I should like to know when the office of Chief Veterinary Inspector was established, where the official lives, and what his duties are?

Mr. TOLMIE: The name of that officer is Dr. George Hilton. He resides in Ottawa and has occupied the position for about 12 or 14 years, roughly speaking. This particular office was created before I became minister; I cannot say how long it has been in existence. The duties of the office are to assist the Veterinary Director General, and to act in his absence when he is out of town. Dr. Hilton assists in a great deal of the outside work at the various quarantine ports, and in connection with the field inspection work that is carried on throughout Canada.

Mr. SEXSMITH: The minister has told us that there are 70 odd illustration stations in Canada. How many are in Ontario, and how many in Quebec?

Mr. TOLMIE: The Department of Agriculture has no illustration stations in the province of Ontario. The Commission of Conservation has been carrying on some work along that line, and so long as they were doing that the department did not interfere. The proposed changes will perhaps result in a new policy in that direction. We have 30 illustration stations in the province of Quebec at the present time.

Mr. PARENT: Before this item passes I should like to satisfy my curiosity with respect to one statement made by the minister in his very eloquent and interesting remarks a few moments ago. He stated that years ago hens in this country were producing 65 eggs per year, and that now in some cases they are producing 300 per year. That is very important, I think, and I should like the minister to tell the committee, so that the country at large will know, what special strain it is that produces this large number of eggs per year.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. TOLMIE: The particular breed that made the big record was a special strain of Wyandottes at the Sidney Experimental station, 16 miles out of Victoria, B.C. The average hen in this country at the present time has been producing 60 and 65 eggs per year.

Mr. CANNON: Who looks after the apiculture work of the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Sladen.

Mr. CANNON: Has this branch taken part in any recent exhibits or fairs throughout Canada?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, we had a number of exhibits of bees, queen bees, bee products, and various bee supplies, hives, and so forth, at many of the fairs throughout the country during the past year.

Mr. CANNON: Is the minister in a position to state whether this Government has had any communication with the Provincial Governments, and particularly the government of my province, concerning this matter?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have been working together in connection with the eradication of bee diseases, but have had no correspondence of any particular note.

Mr. ETHIER: May I ask whether this item of $1,245,639 includes the minimum grant of $2,500 which the agricultural societies are entitled to receive in connection with the exhibitions in the different provinces. I understand the regulations of the department provides for these grants.

Mr. TOLMIE: Those grants are not included in that item. We pay something over $90,000 for that purpose, in addition to this item. It comes under the heading of livestock.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: On page 89 is an item, "Dominion Agrostologist, $3,120." Perhaps it is my lack of proficiency in the English language that makes it necessary

for me to ask the minister what this gentleman does?

Mr. TOLMIE: His name is Dr. Malte. He is an expert of very great ability in that line?

Mr. McMASTER: But what is the line?

Mr. TOLMIE: I was just coming to the line. His business is the study of grasses and different varieties of plants, and there are some very interesting examples of his splendid work on the farm. He crosses various kinds of grasses, plants, etc., the general business being the production of fodder plants. He has done most excellent work in improving timothy and clover.

Mr. CANNON: An hon. member on the other side said to-night that the frequency of our questions to the minister might be interpreted as an opposition to the agricultural estimates. I do not consider that I have to give any explanation of my attitude, because what I have done to-day is only what I do every day; I have performed what I consider to be my public duty by my constituents and by the people of the country at large. But should our attitude on this side, and the attitude of the committee, have had only the result of giving to the minister an opportunity to explain, as fully and as lucidly as he has done, every item in regard to which he has been questioned, I think that we have reason to be very well satisfied. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McCoig) has said that hon. members on both sides would gladly support the minister in the administration of his department, and with that statement I fully agree. Agriculture in this country, as the member for Kent has said, is not only important, but essential. We all understand that. I represent a farming constituency, and although I have not the honour to be a member of the farming community of Canada, I have great sympathy with the farmers. I understand their needs and try to help them to the best of my ability. Let us hope that so long as we have a government in Canada we shall always have as competent a minister as the hon. gentleman who now holds that office. The ministers at the head of the Department of Agriculture in past years were most remarkable men in many ways. We had the Hon. Sidney Fisher, who has left a name for himself. That hon. gentleman administered his department in such a way that he has shown the road that has been followed ever since by his successors. I have nothing to say in the way of compliment to the former Minister of Agriculture, who is now leader of the Agrarian party (Mr. Crerar). He stayed in the Government for a few years, and while he was there I think that all the farmers whom he represented were quite satisfied with his administration. On his departure from the department, my hon. friend from British Columbia was called to the Cabinet. To-night we have asked the minister many questions and he has very frankly and good-naturedly answered them, and I say that he has shown our country that the present Minister of Agriculture is just as efficient and competent as any minister we have had before.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend intended to give me some information. Will he give it to-night or at a later date?

Mr. TOLMIE: The unclassified man referred to, Mr. Cochrane, is an employee of the Dairy Commissioner's Branch, and it is just possible that we are considering his position at the present time.

Mr. COPP: How long has he been in the service?

Mr. TOLMIE: About twelve or thirteen years.

Experimental Farms, $1,245,639.50.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I put a question a few minutes ago to the minister regarding experimental farms, which, I understand, include illustration farms. I am told that there was an illustration farm in my constituency some years ago, and I should like to know to-night why it was discontinued. Is it possible to have one started again?

Mr. TOLMIE: That farm was closed up before I assumed my present position. I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend an answer off-hand, but I will try to get information on the subject.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would it be possible to have a station established in that district? What are the prospects?

Mr. TOLMIE: It is possible. We are contemplating the establishment of some illustration stations in many parts of Canada at the present time, and I assure the hon. gentleman that his district will receive attention.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In the very near future?

Mr. TOLMIE: Well, in the near future.

Mr. CANNON: I do not wish to burden my hon. friend with faults that may have

been committed in former years before he entered the Cabinet. But in my constituency a member of the former Government ran an election and, rightly or wrongly, with or without authority, but in his capacity as a member of the Government, he promised the electorate of that place that an experimental farm would be established in the County of Dorchester.

An hon. MEMBER: He had some pull.

Mr. CANNON: This promise was accomplished by a most generous shipment of bulls, which have not, however, been located, and I am sorry to say that the minister seems to have forsaken them. Evidently he considers that they are lost for good. But, talking about experimental farms, let me say that my constituency is most conveniently adopted for an experimental farm, and the people there were given the impression, by the gentleman to whom I have referred, who was a member of the Government at the time, that the Government intended establishing such an institution there. At the time of the election that gentleman was not very positive as to the exact parish in which the farm would be opened. Wherever we addressed the people the farm seemed to be most desirable, and as we went through the county the proposed experimental farm accompanied us. There are in my constituency some twenty-five parishes and when we were through with our tour we had practically twenty-five experimental farms in prospect.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did the bulls accompany you?

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, I do not expect the minister who is a serious business man, to establish twenty-five farms in my constituency, or one farm in each parish; but I should be most grateful to this Government if it would redeem the promise made to my constituents a few years ago by one of its former members. The county was expressly promised an experimental farm. I do not care where it is to be located; I want a farm and the constituency is entitled to one because it has received promise to that effect from a Cabinet minister and from the Government itself. This Government, Mr. Chairman, has forgotten lots of its promises and has broken lots of its pledges unfortunately; but for once let it give the example of an Administration which fulfils its promises and respects its pledges. Let the Government, as regards my county, keep for once the promise and the engagement entered into by a former member of the Cabinet. If this promise of an experimental farm for the county of Dorchester had been made by an ordinary candidate, a private individual free from responsibility who tried to carry his election by making lavish assurances, I would not hold the Government responsible; but the promise referred to was made to the county of Dorchester by a minister and the pledges given by him at the time were not only endorsed and ratified but publicly approved of by the then Prime Minister of Canada, the right hon. member for Kings (Sir Robert Borden). I think, Mr. Chairman, the Government has a duty and an obligation towards my constituency. I am quite sure it will only be necessary to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that such a promise has been made and such an engagement entered into to immediately cause that promise to be carried out. Then in my county we shall see the present Government build an experimental farm which will result in the realization throughout my constituency, and throughout the neighbouring constituencies, of the great benefits and advantages so eloquently set forth tonight by the minister himself.

Mr. SEGUIN: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, in answer to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Casgrain stated a moment ago that he could not explain how it was that the experimental farm at Baie St. Paul had been closed, in view of the fact that the thing occurred before he entered the Government. The tobacco experimental farm at L'Assomption was closed during last year, when the hon. minister was at the head of the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that the hon. minister knows perfectly well the reason why it was abolished. While rather anticipating on the time at which I should have spoken on that experimental farm, I stated this afternoon what occurred in connection with the purchase of that farm. Now, while I do not wish to repeat what occurred in connection with that purchase, I would like at least to point out to the minister that, had they dispensed purchasing that farm, they might have continued to rent it from the college for the purpose of illustrating in tobacco growing and thus continue to the farming community of that district of L'Assomption-Montcalm the encouragement which they need and all the facilities required to better themselves in the cultivation of tobacco. I think the hon. minister has not been wanting in good intentions. He did his

best to carry out the suggestions made to him for the establishment of an experimental farm at L'Assomption on a farm that would belong to the department. He could not get the necessary funds, but I do not see why they have not continued to lease that farm, as was done for some years, in order that the farming community could enjoy the advantage of having a tobacco illustration farm at L'Assomption, at a nominal rent. I believe that this would have been only fair to the people in the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm, who engage so eagerly in that agricultural specialty, and make great sacrifices so as to be able to develop that industry and who are entitled, I think, to every encouragement that the minister can give in that kind of farming.

Mr. PARENT: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SEGUIN: If my hon. friend will pardon me I would like to have an answer from the minister. Perhaps he has understood my remarks. In that case I will state in a few words that I wish to know the reason why the Department of Agriculture has closed the experimental station at L'Assomption which was of great value to the farmers and the tobacco growers of that part of the country.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am very sorry indeed that there was any misunderstanding in connection with the establishment at L'Assomption. I believe that representatives of the Department of Agriculture visited a farm for the purpose of examining the property and investigating as to its usefulness as an experimental station with a view to making a purchase. They were quite satisfied with the conditions there but, of course, that in no way placed upon the Government the responsibility of making the purchase, nor should in anyway have led the owners of the property to believe that a purchase of the land had been determined upon. Such at least is the report made to me by the officers of my department. In such cases it is customary to obtain the approval of the minister, and afterwards the approval of Council, before the land could be purchased. I am very sorry indeed if the owners of that property misunderstood what occurred, or took certain things for granted, in connection with that investigation, and, that in consequence they disposed of their livestock. That is a very regrettable thing indeed. However, as I pointed out earlier in the evening, motives of economy have been held in view as much as possible. There are many directions in which I would like to extend agricultural work throughout Canada, but under the existing financial conditions of the country we are merely spending what we think is absolutely necessary until such times as we shall be in a better position to expand our operations. The location at L'Assomption, I understand, is a very excellent one, and in the event of our opening up more experimental farms or illustration stations, in the near future I can assure my hon. friend that the location in question will receive our careful consideration. It has been recommended as a very excellent place for tobacco culture, suitable in every way, and consequently, being satisfactory, will receive consideration among the first of the places on the list.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would like to ask if the same thing will be done for my county?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have a note of the hon. member's county in connection with the applications for experimental farms.

Mr. SEGUIN: If the money for the purchase of the farm is not at present available, why not continue the station in operation, because the people of the county are suffering very much by reason of being deprived of it.

Mr. TOLMIE: Of course in carrying on the experimental farms there is a demand from time to time for new buildings and other improvements, and if we decided to establish the farm in question I would prefer to own the property in order that we might be free to carry on such development work as the situation would seem to call for.

Mr. PELLETIER: I would like to remind the minister of a promise that he made to me last year. If I am not mistaken, he assured me that demonstration farms would be located at Matane and Causapscal, two such farms being necessary by reason of the fact that the constituency is divided by a chain of mountains. I asked the minister at that time if he would kindly look into the matter and he promised that he would surely do so. Since then I have not heard anything further, and therefore I would like to know if the minister will give this matter his attention and see if he can possibly locate one, if not two, demonstration farms in the county of Matane where they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like the minister to detail the expenditure mentioned.

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not recollect having made any such promise. It is possible that I did lead the hon. member to believe that I would look into the matter, but I am very doubtful if I made a direct promise. However, I will be very glad to have the deputy minister give a report on that particular district.

Mr. PELLETIER: I thank the minister and I hope he will keep his word this year. All he has to do is to look up Hansard of last year and he will see that what I say is right.

Mr. STEIN: I think I have been more fortunate than my hon. friends who have just spoken, because in the county of Kamouraska we have enjoyed a very fine experimental farm since 1910. It was established there under the Laurier Administration through the efforts of my predecessor the present member for Quebec East (Mr. Lepointe). I hope the minister does not intend to close it as he has done the experimental farm in the county of Charlevoix. Instead of being closed our experimental farm should be enlarged. The deputy minister of Agriculture, who is very well received every time he visits my county, could give very full information to his minister as to that experimental farm, which is situated at St. Anne de la Pocatière, and is connected with the provincial college of agriculture for boys, where over one hundred and sixty students are studying to become practical farmers. In the village of St. Pascal in the same county we have a school of domestic science for girls. I would very much like to see the minister visit this country, which from the agricultural point of view is, I think, one of the most important in the Dominion, when I am sure he would agree with my description. If he would visit the experimental farm, the college of agriculture and the school of domestic science, undoubtedly he would realize the importance of these institutions.

Mr. TOLMIE: I shall be very glad to accept the kind invitation of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. It has been my object to visit as many parts of Canada as possible since assuming my present office, but unfortunately I have not yet be able to visit the fine district of which he speaks. I want to tell the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) that it affords me a great deal of pleasure not only to keep my promise of last year but also to make good my promise of this year, although it is only fifteen minutes old. I can assure him that a site has been selected for an illustration station in his district and it will be started on the farm of Michael Philibert this year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): I congratulate hon. members from the province of Quebec on receiving so many good things from the Minister of Agriculture. But might I call his attention to the fact that I have frequently asked for an experimental station up in the western part of the province of Ontario which is so badly in need of such assistance? I have had part of a promise, but I have not yet succeeded in having a station established there. The minister has been good enough to establish thirty experimental stations in the province of Quebec—

Mr. TOLMIE: Thirty illustration stations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):—thirty illustration stations, while in the province of Ontario we have only one. I have no objection to these illustration stations being established in the province of Quebec, but I think it is about time that the minister began to establish a few such stations in the province of Ontario. I am in full sympathy with their establishment. Years ago I said that I would like to see the day come when there would be an illustration station in almost every county, in these old provinces in particular. So I am not rising for the purpose of opposing hon. gentlemen receiving these illustration farms in their province, but I am merely asking that old Ontario shall receive at least one or two of these stations during the coming year.

Mr. PROULX: I concur with the hon. member from Lambton that the province of Quebec seems to be favoured more than any other province in regard to the establishment of illustration farms. My hon. friend from Dorchester said that a few years ago his county got quite a number of bulls from this Government. Are these bulls distributed under the patronage system or under the Civil Service Commission? And are there enough to go round each county? Is the department still lending bulls to the farmers in the different counties? I know that some farmers in my county would like to take advantage of the system if it is still being continued by the department.

Mr. TOLMIE: That is an item that comes properly under livestock. Under our sys-

tem pure bred sires are distributed in dis tricts where no such sires are available, usually in outlying new districts. Our system is for the farmers to form a club of ten members and on their showing that they have a proper number of cattle and that their farms are suitable for rearing stock, we loan them a bull and pay the freight on it to their nearest station. One of the farmers maintains the animal during the three or four years it is left in the district, and then it is moved to some ither section. That has been found to work to the very great advantage of our farmers, particularly those in outlying new districts. I have in mind such districts as that on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. A large number of settlers have gone into that country, and under ordinary conditions it would have been a matter of ten years before they would have enough money to purchase a pure bred sire—and they would at the end of that time still have scrub stock on their farms. But under this system of the distribution of pure bred sires we are furnishing sires to such districts as these in the first year of their settlement, so that in five or six years the cattle up there will be high grade cattle, not scrub stock, and the livestock wealth of Canada will be materially increased.

Mr. PARENT: Of this $1,245,000, what amount will go to each of the experimental farms in Canada?

Mr. TOLMIE: Charlottetown, $31,365; Kentville, $41,900; Nappan, $41,338; Fredericton, $40,482; Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, $40,650; Cap Rouge, $44,210; St. Joachim, $18,570; Lennoxville, $44,760; La Ferme, $35,956; Kapuskasing, $35,405; Morden, $30,970; Brandon, $42,880; Indian Head, $42,495; Rosthern, $28,600; Scott, $25,570; Swift Current, $19,450; Lethbridge, $42,-150; Lacombe, $42,150; Summerland, $39,-765; Invermere, $14,500; Agassiz, $36,500; Sidney, $27,090.

Mr. CANNON: In answer to my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Proulx) the minister said that sires were being distributed in outlying districts, and the hon. member for Prescott had mentioned my county. I wish to say that my county is not an outlying district.

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not want to cast any reflection on the hon. member's district. Perhaps after I have taken advantage of his kind invitation to visit him, I will know more about it.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Will the minister inform the committee what is done at these demonstration stations?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are more properly called illustration stations. The work is done on the farm of some good farmer in a selected district, under the direction of our Director of Experimental Farms. The seed is furnished and the farmer told what to do. The farm is usually seeded along a public road and the work is done in full view of the road so that it may be observed by anyone in the district. The farmer sees the experiments made right in his locality by a brother farmer, and very excellent service is being rendered with but a small outlay.

Mr. COPP: How long have these illustration stations been in existence?

Mr. TOLMIE: Since 1915.

Mr. EULER: How many are there in Ontario?

Mr. TOLMIE: The Conservation Commission has been carrying on certain work in Ontario, and the Department of Agriculture has not interfered or started any other farms of a similar character in that province. If the suggested action with regard to the Conservation Commission is carried out the Department of Agriculture will take up the matter of illustration stations in Ontario.

Mr. EULER: I understand, then, that in Ontario there is simply the experimental farm at Ottawa; there are no illustration farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have two other farms, one at Kapuskasing, in the clay belt, and a tobacco station at Harrow.

Mr. CAHILL: What has been the success of the Kapuskasing farm and the settlement in that territory? The minister promised last year to make an investigation of the Kapuskasing farm and of the farm known as La Ferme in the Abitibi district in the county of Pontiac.

Mr. TOLMIE: I regret that I did not have time to visit the Kapuskasing farm; I did pass through that district on a train. But the deputy minister went up and looked over matters at Kapuskasing. We have about 1,280 acres in that farm, about 500 of which are under cultivation and several hundred slashed, not yet cleared. Very excellent crops were produced last year but on account of frost they did not head out as well as might be expected. The production of fodder, however, was very good in-

deed, and from the experiments conducted up there we are of the opinion that that district has a very good future before it as a livestock district, having regard to the production of fodder plants. It will be what is known as a good hay and grass district, suitable for the raising of livestock. With regard to the settlement in the district, that is a matter with which the provincial government has to deal. I could not give very definite information in that regard.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister know whether the population there has increased or decreased since last year?

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not know that there have been many changes since last year, but I understand that the Provincial Government is opening up a very extensive pulp plant up there. They have laid out a town near the farm at Kapuskasing, and with the market right at their door there should be a considerable development of agriculture in the immediate neighbourhood.

Mr. MORPHY: How is it that there are thirty odd illustration stations in Quebec and none in Ontario? Is it a matter of Government policy, or do Ontario farmers not require them?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have pointed out that the Conservation Commission have been carrying on illustration farms in parts of Ontario, particularly in Dundas county. Ontario is one of the most advanced provinces in the whole of Canada; it has perhaps more pure bred stock than any other province. The Central Experimental Farm is in Ontario; some of our largest exhibitions are held in that province, and on these grounds we have not pushed the illustration stations as we have in Quebec. So far as western Ontario is concerned, I do think it is not well served with farms; there should be an experimental farm in that section. Under present financial conditions, however, we have been loath to open up new farms any faster than absolutely necessary. When we feel that we can proceed with safety, the matter will be given attention.

Mr. EULER: In view of what has been said in regard to the number of institutions of this kind in the province of Quebec, does the minister not feel that as a matter of practical justice to Ontario he should locate in that province some of these stations that are to be located? I am not one of those who want to weigh one province against the other, but from the intimation given by the minister to-night it would seem that Ontario is not being rightly treated. We have in the western part of the province the Ontario Agriculture College, a very good institution, but one which is under provincial jurisdiction. Perhaps it is on account of the service given by that college that the Dominion Government has paid so little attention to the province. I would like to associate myself with what the member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) said; I do not think that the expenditure which is being made in connection with the experimental farm at Ottawa is an improper one. After all, agriculture is one of the chief industries in Ontario and I believe the people of the province will be right behind the minister in the expenditures of moneys along these lines—except that I think he is not widening out sufficiently so far as Ontario is concerned. I am not inclined to make a criticism that might come to the minds of some of us from Ontario who are not supporters of the Government. But possibly these experimental farm and illustration stations are located in Quebec, because they are intended to be somewhat of a temptation to the people of that province to support the Government, and on the other hand, perhaps, we do not get them in Ontario because the Government feels sure of that province anyway. I know that is not the case with the present Minister of Agriculture, but possibly it has been the case in the past. I should like to suggest to the minister that he seriously consider whether he is giving Ontario that attention to which it is entitled as compared with other provinces.

Mr. TOLMIE: As I mentioned a moment ago, I think Ontario is deserving of more of these illustration stations than it has, and now that the Commission of Conservation will likely be giving up that particular work, we shall be glad to go into the matter very fully.

Mr. EULER: I presume, in view of that, the minister will seriously consider establishing one of those illustration stations in North Waterloo.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister must bear in mind that the people of old Ontario are probably the best farmers we have in Canada at the present time. In my section of country, we all have experimental farms at the expense, not of the Government, but of private individuals themselves. We have besides that at Guelph, a college of

agriculture which is probably the best agricultural college in America. We have also, in probably every county in Ontario, district representatives who are paid by the Dominion Government, and these men take great pains in trying to instruct anybody who requires instruction in any line of farming. While the province of Ontario, I have no doubt, would be very glad to get these experimental farms and illustration stations, at the same time, we are not suffering in the older parts of that province, in that regard. The minister is quite right in stating that in Ontario we nearly all have high-class stock, horses, sheep, pigs and cattle. We do not require any loans of sires; we have the sires; we have some scrub bulls which we can send down to the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) if he wants them. We are culling them out rapidly at the present time, and we can easily afford to give them to any sections of country requiring something a little better than they have themselves. I am speaking of conditions in southern Ontario in particular. Therefore, I do not think that while the country is so burdened with debt, we should press the Minister of Agriculture or any other minister in this Government to increase expenditures under any possible condition. While my hon. friends from Quebec and other provinces may be anxious to have illustration stations and experimental farms, I hope they will bear with the Minister of Agriculture for a few years yet until we pay off some of our enormous debt. There will not be much use in our raising crops or anything else if the profits are all eaten up in taxes.

Mr. COPP: The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is very magnanimous in regard to the amount of money that should go or not go to Ontario in experimental farms or illustration stations. I would remind him that from the Auditor General's Report of last year, the Central Experimental Farm in Ontario consumed something like $385,000 of public money. That is more than one-quarter of the total amount expended on experi-

11 p.m. mental farms and illustration stations in the whole Dominion. Therefore, I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) and also the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler) that the great province of Ontario is being pretty well treated at the present time at the hands of the Minister of Agriculture. The policy which the minister has adopted in regard to illustration stations and experimental farms is the policy which I have advocated in this House ever since I have come here, and I am very glad to see him taking it up. Has he gone down to the gardens by the sea and established any of these illustration stations there? If not, does he propose to do so? Are there any illustration stations in New Brunswick?

Mr. TOLMIE: There are six.

Mr. COPP: I am glad to know that illustration stations are being established in New Brunswick, and I suppose also in the other Maritime Provinces. Like the hon. member for North Oxford, I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that while we are anxious to have these illustration stations established throughout the Dominion, if that will aid in the development of agriculture, his are the first Estimates that have been brought before the House this session, and I regret very much to see that in item No. 14, which has already been passed, there is an increase of $55,672.50 over last year, and in the item under discussion, there is an increase of $30,639.50 over last year. I also find that in practically every one of the items that immediately follow on the same page, an increase over last year is being asked for. I would remind the minister, as he has been reminded many times throughout this country, in different ways, that a very serious financial situation is confronting the country. As regards the Estimates that have been brought down, there is, in nearly every case, an increase in the expenditures for the different departments of the public service. It does seem to me that the minister could have set a good example to his colleagues and to the people of the country as a whole if in this year of all years he had shown he was prepared to cut his garment according to his cloth, and had tried in some way to reduce the very large expenditures that he is asking of Parliament at the present time. We find increases in nearly every item of this list, and it does seem to me that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and the other ministers who are responsible for the Estimates that are brought down should have pared down the figures to such an extent as to show that for the next few years they were prepared to spend only what was absolutely necessary in the interests of the public service. Let us wait until the financial condition of the country straightens up to a certain extent, and until the people have a little more confidence in our financial position than they

have at present before launching on these large expenditures. But we find that large expenditures are being made, and that further large expenditures are being asked for, and that there are very substantial increases in almost every item. It does seem to me my hon. friend could very well have set an example to his colleagues by paring down the expenditures in the different branches over which he has control.

Mr. MORPHY: I understand from the minister that there are over thirty illustration stations in the province of Quebec, and only one in the province of Ontario. The minister frankly admits that Ontario has been poorly served in that respect. He says that he would take Ontario into consideration except for the burden of the national debt. Consequently, I feel that he has burned his bridges behind him, and that for the future western Ontarion may not look for any of the advantages that arise out of the system of illustration stations which the Government has built up in other provinces. To my mind the hon. member for East Lambton is entitled to a great deal of credit for bringing this question before the minister in this committee tonight. I am sorry to say that I quite disagree with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), in his idea that Ontario does not need these illustration stations. I think the reverse is true. The minister himself admits that such stations would be a great benefit to the province of Ontario, and I should therefore like to know whether it is part of the Government's policy that the province from which I come is to be relegated to the back benches so far as financial assistance from this Government for the betterment of our farming population is concerned. The policy seems to be designed for the purpose of passing Ontario by. I wish the hon. minister would be more definite. He has said that Ontario is entitled to these stations, that she needs them, but that owing to the national debt it is impossible to grant them. Ontario has been quiet about this and many other things, while the largess of this Government has been showered without stint upon the province of Quebec. Ontario has sat by and seen it done, perfectly willing to submit until that time comes which is indicated in the old adage, "It is the last straw which breaks the camel's back." I wish the minister would be more definite. If we are to be deprived of these stations because of the burden of debt, I would ask whether the minister is going to stop all improvements because of the debt? It seems to me that the benefit to the agricultural population of this whole country from a policy which I would indicate by the words "full steam ahead" would be inestimable, and I think the minister should say whether or not the present policy is one intended to ignore the province of Ontario and its just rights. The province has not been forward in claiming any special consideration from the Government and I trust that before this item goes through, the minister will intimate that he can find a way to do the square thing by Ontario as to the establishment of illustration stations in that province.

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not see how anybody could have interpreted my remarks as meaning that it was impossible to do anything for Ontario until the national debt was wiped out, or that I had any intention of ignoring that very important province. What I did say was that this work in Ontario, so far as illustration stations are concerned, had been carried on by the Conservation Commission to a certain extent, and in view of the fact that we were spending large sums of money on the Central Experimental Farm, in Ontario, we did not interfere, but that now the Commission was probably ceasing that work, Ontario was to be given immediate consideration. I think that is quite clear enough. Those are my intentions as minister. I have said half a dozen times, I think, tonight that I recognize how important agriculture is to Canada. We have an immense sum of money invested in that industry, about seven billion dollars, and I can assure my hon. friend I fully realize its importance. I should like to see this work developed, and I think it can be done with safety in many parts of Canada, to the very great advantage of the country as a whole. These things, however, are surrounded with difficulties. I may have lots of wishes, but it is another thing to get the money. I fully realize the importance of Ontario, and even admitted to my hon. friend opposite that Ontario might have been better treated. I fully realize the situation, and when we begin to select sites for our illustration stations this year, I can assure my hon. friend Ontario will receive earnest attention.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysboro): The minister stated that there were certain illustration stations in the county of Dundas, and other places in the province of Ontario. Just how many are there in the province of Ontario?

Mr. TOLMIE: About 16 or 17 under the Conservation Commission. Some are in Dundas county and others up near Galt.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many are there in Nova Scotia and where are they situated?

Mr. TOLMIE: In Nova Scotia there are seven situated in the following places: Kennetcook, Tatamagouche, New Glasgow, Sidney, Big Baddeck, Mabou, and Yarmouth.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for north Perth (Mr. Morphy), in which he conveyed the impression that I considered illustration stations were not of very much value.

Mr. MORPHY: I was referring to the hon. member for north Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), although it is possible that I may have said South Oxford.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That makes considerable difference. The hon. member for Westmoreland, (Mr. Copp), made particular inquiries to what was being done in New Brunswick, and when he found that there were a great many more farms in that province than he was aware of, he immediately turned round and said that he thought there was quite sufficient done for Ontario and referred to the large expenditure of about one quarter of the amount for experimental purposes in that province, a repetition of what the minister said. Last year I introduced a resolution dealing with this question, and that was the answer we got on that occasion, and I have been urging as strongly as I could the necessity for something along these lines in that province. Frequent reference has been made to the Conservation Commission and what they are doing in the way of establishing illustration stations. I do not know of a single illustration station that has been under the Conservation Commission. It is true there was one in the county of Dundas, but so far as western Ontario is concerned, I do not know of one. The member for Pontiac, (Mr. Cahill), was inquiring very diligently to-night about what was taking place at Kapuskasing, and as to whether the settlers were remaining there and increasing in numbers. I believe that yesterday he referred to this matter in the House and endeavoured to cast an unwarranted reflection on the late Provincial Government for what they did in this direction. I might remind the hon. gentleman that this farm at Kapuskasing was established to furnish employment for interned prisoners, large numbers of whom were employed clearing the land, and if they are not there to-day it is for the good reason that they were only to anxious to get away. I suppose he would use it as an argument against the colonization policy of the late Provincial Government in Ontario because the interned prisoners are not still on the Government experimental farm there. Had it not been for that government's policy, I doubt whether we should have had a farm there or not. We have a small tobacco farm of some forty acres, and it is almost self-sustaining from the revenue it gets. If you make comparisons between that farm and any of the others you will be convinced that it is an example to all demonstration stations in Canada. Its revenue almost equals its expenditures. Now, as I said before, I emphatically protest against this enormous expenditure on the farm at Ottawa being charged against Ontario, because it is not serving the purpose for which the experimental farms were intended. I do not intend to belittle the work done, but I contend that it is of equal value to all other parts of Canada as it is to Ontario, and when you find so many experimental farms, stations, and sub-stations established years ago, and new ones opened up in various omise, if we cannot do things for the province of Ontario. Do not forget that the parts of the country, there is not much force in the argument that we must econprovince of Ontario contributes about one half of the revenue collected in this country. My colleague from North-Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) made the statement that the district representatives were being paid by the Federal Government. They are not; they are paid by the Provincial Government and the municipalities in the counties in which they are located. It is true that a certain amount of the vote in aid of agriculture, which is divided pro ratio among all the provinces, is applied to pay the salaries of these district representatives; but in no sense is the Dominion Government contributing to the support of the representatives in that province.

Mr. DUFF: Has the minister any information with regard to the kind of agricultural implements which the Government has purchased for the different experimental and demonstration farms throughout Canada? Whether correct or not, my information is that these farms are supplied with implements purchased in the

United States and that the Government does not patronize the Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements. Is this true, or is any percentage of the implements used on these farms of American manufacture?

Mr. TOLMIE: All the implements used on the experimental farms are purchased in Canada. Only in very exceptional cases are implements bought in the United States. They are secured there only when they cannot be got in Canada.

Mr. EULER: The Government, I presume, does not buy from the Grain Growers.

Mr. D'ANJOU: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member from Matane (Mr. Pelletier) reminded the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) a moment ago of the promise he had made last year to establish two illustration farms in his county. May I remind the hon. gentleman that he had also promised to establish an experimental farm in the county of Rimouski. I hope I shall not offend my hon. friend from Matane by saying that the county of Rimouski is just as progressive as his own, as far as agriculture is concerned. I have no objection to having two illustration farms in his county, but I would like the minister to keep his promise as regards the establishment of at least one experimental farm in the county of Rimouski, whose agricultural achievements are so great that I do not know of any other county in the whole Dominion which could compete with it and it may well serve as an example to the others.

As the hon. gentleman does not understand the French language, I shall ask his deputy, whose knowledge of both languages is a proof of a keen intellect, to kindly explain to him what I have said. I insist upon an answer from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Just a moment; an answer is expected of the minister.

Mr. TOLMIE: I could not hear what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is no answer.

Mr. TOLMIE: If the hon. member speaks loud enough for my deputy to hear him I will be glad to give an answer to his question.

Mr. D'ANJOU: (Translation.) Last year, I had the deputy minister, who knows both languages, to act as interpreter. Here is the gist of my demands: I want the minister to keep the promise he gave me and to the hon. member for Matane as well. He promised to start an illustration farm in that county and, last year, he promised to establish one in the county of Rimouski. The hon. minister may say that the financial conditions of the country do not warrant such expenditure, but, in accord with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) and many others who have taken part in this discussion on agricultural matters I think that the Government will never spend too much to help develop this industry. Let us have less military schools and more agricultural colleges, more demonstration farms, more experimental farms. Nobody will grumble. I want the hon. minister to answer me and I would like to know, whether or not he intends to establish an experimental farm in Rimouski during the year.

Mr. TOLMIE: I quite agree with what my hon. friend has said with regard to the importance of agriculture. We have had an illustration station at Rimouski but it is being closed up and we are now looking for a more favourable location.

Mr. SEXSMITH: In asking the question a short time ago how many illustration stations were located in the province of Ontario and how many in the province of Quebec, I had not then the thought in my mind that the latter province, or any other province, had too many such stations. I did think, however, that Ontario might have a little more attention. The money spent on these experimental stations, or illustration farms, or whatever you choose to call them, is, I think, money well spent. The minister, in my opinion, in reaching out and trying to develop this experimental work, and educating people in regard to it, is doing a good thing and should receive encouragement from Parliament. He mentioned something about the work that the Conservation Commission has been performing in Ontario. Well, I know they have been doing a little work in the county of Dundas, but the whole of the central part of Ontario has not been looked at so far as I know—there has not been an attempt made by this Government to do anything to encourage the farming industry in that section of the province. I want to impress upon the minister the necessity of taking the district referred to into consideration

and giving it his best thought. Before sitting down I would like to ask what has been the nature and the extent of the work carried on by the Conservation Commission in the province of Ontario. We have been told that they had some sixteen or seventeen stations in the province, but what work did these stations perform? These few little experiments carried on by the farmer himself under the direction of the Commission do not compare with the work of an illustration or demonstration farm. Such stations are not of the same nature as demonstration or illustration farms. However, I do not wish to criticize the work of the Conservation Commission. No doubt it has been a good work but is not such as would be done by the farms to which I have referred.

Mr. CASSELMAN: The minister has stated that there are thirty illustration stations in the province of Quebec. Well, there have been sixteen such stations in my county, carried on under the Conservation Commission. The work done by that commission in the county of Dundas has been eminently satisfactory. It is highly appreciated by the farmers there and I entertain the hope that now the commission is going out of existence the work will be done under the Department of Agriculture. When the Conservation Commission undertook these operations in the first instance it was planned that the work would continue for a period of years. That period has not expired; nevertheless, the work is unfinished and unless it is continued on the farms selected by the commission a great part of the work so far accomplished will have lost its value. I would like to ask the minister if the work on these sixteen demonstration farms will be carried on now that the commission is to be abolished.

Mr. TOLMIE: In reply to the hon. member's inquiry I may say that we will go into the whole matter very carefully. It is impossible to say at present exactly what will be done, but no doubt such action will be taken by the Department of Agriculture as will afford an opportunity to carry on illustration farm work in that particular section where work was already being done.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): It is quite evident that the people who kick the hardest get the most. Apparently that is about the position of certain people in the province of Ontario. According to my hon. friend (Mr. Casselman) there are sixteen illustration stations in his county but to realize what they are doing, or what good they can be accomplishing, rather surpasses my imagination. There are hundreds of miles of Ontario territory north from the city of Toronto where the climatic and soil conditions are absolutely different from what they are in old Ontario, and where we have absolutely nothing of the kind that my hon. friend from Dundas has spoken of. That being so, I think we have a just cause of complaint against the department because of its treatment of that part of the province. The province of Quebec has thirty of these stations. Well, we do not begrudge them those stations and yet I believe Quebec has been promised to-night the establishment of a further number. Nevertheless, when we ask what can be done, or what will be done, for the province of Ontario it appears that nothing can be said. I think that bearing in mind the treatment extended to the other parts of the country the policy of the department cannot be defended. What do a few demonstration or illustration farms in one county amount to, a county where the climatic and other conditions differ entirely from those in other parts of the province. In northern Ontario we have districts where there has never, so far as I know, been one dollar spent by this Government in attempting to solve the difficulties which confront the settlers now located there, and the new settlers who are constantly going in. So far as I know not one dollar has been spent by this Goverment towards solving the difficulties which are confronting the settlers who have been there for years and whose number is being constantly augmented.

Mr. JACOBS: Put them out.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): No, we will not put them out. That is an important part of this province, and it is going to become a still more important part. But I say those difficulties should not be left to the farmers to solve, and it is the duty of this Government to do something to assist those men.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I am very pleased indeed that the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman) has thrown some light on the subject of what the Conservation Commission has been doing. He says that sixteen out of the seventeen illustration stations established in Ontario are located in his particular riding down in the southeast corner of the great province. He adds: "Of course, this work is not yet completed

and I want the Government to promise to complete it." Why, Mr. Chairman, the Conservation Commission are running a good percentage of the farming industry of his riding if they have sixteen stations in one county. I must sharply criticise the Government for having allowed the Conservation Commission to spend money, and especially to spend it all in one county, and then to come to the House and tell us what they have been doing for the great province of Ontario. We find that those seventeen stations are all located in one little county adjacent to Ottawa where the commissioners can run out in the morning and come back in the evening. Despite my good friend here, I protest against continuing those sixteen experimental farms in the county of Dundas. I have not anything against the member for Dundas, and I exonerate the minister, but the hon. member must have had a great pull with the Chairman of the Conservation Commission. Is there a summer resort in that county?

Mr. CASSELMAN: It is a farming county entirely.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I was asking the Chairman of the Conservation Commission. I was wondering if he had a summer resort there and that that was why the sixteen stations were established in one county. I am strongly opposed to spending so much money in one little locality, for the expenditure cannot possibly give the results that would follow if it were spread out over the province.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am glad we are getting light on something that has been rather a mystery to me. Some hon. members may remember that I moved a resolution last session dealing with our experimental farms, and the Minister of Agriculture attempted to refute the arguments that I advanced, but when I rose to reply the hon. member for Dundas got the attention of the Speaker and moved the adjournment of the debate, with the result that nothing more could be said on my resolution. I do not know whether it was because he had been so well taken care of and he was afraid that we would become aware of what had happened in Dundas, but he was apparently very anxious for the debate to close. Now the same arguments that have been advanced this evening for economy were advanced last year by the minister. "Yes", he said, "I realize that something should be done in the province of Ontario, but we must economize." I have been criticised tonight for referring to the enormous expenditure for farm labour under the head of civil government on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, which farm I contended did not serve our province in particular. To my surprise I see from the Public Accounts that there was an increase for ordinary farm labour on that farm of $54,000 over the amount expended last year. Yet we are told that there is not any money available for a few illustration farms in the rest of the province. The expenditure on ordinary farm labour was $163,831 last year according to the Public Accounts, in addition to the $94,000 paid under the head of civil government to men who are connected with the farm. I do not think the argument that we must economise has much force when we find that sort of expenditure going on. I would like to know if the $420 bonus that most of those farm labourers have been receiving is going to be continued. I do not think some of my hon. friends opposite need worry very much about the holidays those men are entitled to, for this $420 bonus occupies nearly one-half the space on both pages of the Public Accounts, and besides that there is that $54,000 increase over last year's figures for farm wages.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Inadvertently I have succeeded in raising a veritable hornets' nest in referring to the sixteen illustration farms in my constituency. I should have added that those sixteen farms constitute only one scheme. The idea was to experiment in one county, and it just happened that my county was selected. The farms were chosen and the farmers were given advice as to how to best develop their particular farms, but very little money was spent. The work is done entirely by the farmers themselves. It is true they get advice and instruction and some amount of guidance from agricultural experts, but this represents all the assistance given. The experiment has turned out so successfully that I think it might well be extended to other counties, for it constitutes a scheme of education which can be conducted at the minimum of expense and with the maximum of profit.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I am further enlightened on the work of the Conservation Commission and I wish to apologize to my hon. friend from Dundas if I said anything that hurt his feelings, because we were led to believe that there were sixteen or seventeen illustration stations in Ontario. Now we find that it is practically one scheme in one county, although perhaps

involving more than one farm. Put in that way, perhaps it does not sound so bad as giving Ontario credit for having seventeen stations when we really have only two. I understand there is one station in the tobacco district, and the other is this system which really constitutes only another station. I am more than thankful to my hon. friend from Dundas for giving us this information.

Mr. EULER: We have delved into this matter to some extent and I would like to get some further information in regard to the facts. I think the minister said the Conservation Commission had some seventeen stations of one kind and another in the province of Ontario, and afterwards we gathered from the hon. member for Dundas that sixteen of those stations were in his county, but he has since explained that they constitute only one scheme. I would like to know whether that scheme is only one of the seventeen stations the minister referred to, or whether the sixteen stations in the county of Dundas comprise sixteen out of the seventeen stations credited to Ontario; and, if so, where the other station is. I never heard that the Conservation Commission had engaged in any agricultural activities in western Ontario.

Mr. TOLMIE: The seventeenth is at Galt.

Mr. EULER: That is, there is only one other in addition to the sixteen stations in Dundas county?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): What crops are grown on those illustration farms, and what system of rotation is followed?

Mr. TOLMIE: The regular system is to follow certain rotations,—four years in Quebec, and three, four and five years in the western provinces. The usual crops produced under a system of mixed farming are grown under the illustration station scheme.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): Is more than one kind of crop grown? And do you have more than one rotation?

Mr. TOLMIE: Several crops are grown at the same time. You have your farm conducted under the supervision of a director, who carries on a certain line of work, and you have a chance of seeing the various rotations that are practised on the larger experimental farms.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose the minister is aware that the residence of Sir Clifford Sifton, former Chairman of the Commission of Conservation, is located in the district from which the member for Dundas comes, and that probably accounts for the fact that sixteen illustration farms are there.

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand it is not a fact.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's P.E.I.): The minister has told us that it has been the custom in these illustration farms to have a rotation of crops on one farm. I understand that the general object of the illustration farms is to give the rural communities the benefit of information gained at the central farms and other experimental stations. I suggest to the minister that he would carry out that purpose better if, instead of having a rotation of crops on one farm, crops were grown on each farm in the community. In that way you would be benefiting four, five, six or seven farmers, according to the rotation in a community; you would be encouraging more farmers and giving information and suggestion to a larger number of people each year.

Mr. TOLMIE: I shall be glad to give consideration to my hon. friend's suggestion. It would be rather more difficult to carry out. In fact, we expect all the farmers in the community to derive benefit from the work done on these illustration farms, through their observation of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): What proportion of the vote that we are now considering will go to the maintenance of illustration farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: About $33,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I suggest to the minister that as it is now about midnight and the discussion has been rather long—though I have no doubt it has been illuminating—we should report progress.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to keep the committee here at any length, but before we rise I would ask that we take up item number 4. I would like to take it up at all events, and if it should give rise to any prolonged discussion I would be quite prepared to have the committee rise then.

The CHAIRMAN: It is impossible to discuss item number 40 and item number 4 at the same time. Shall item 40 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The minister knows that if we take up item 4 to-night we shall be prevented from making any motion when we come to supply on the Estimates of this department some other day. I think it is only fair that we should not take the Estimates of the Department of Justice to-night.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, I quite understand that that is the fact. On the other hand, is it unfair that we should seek to open more than one department on the same day? I know that we have had a very prolonged discussion; I admit it has been most interesting.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let us go on with agriculture.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am perfectly frank; there is no disguise about the thing at all. I think it is fair that we should open up the two departments which it was announced we would bring forward to-day. My purpose is exactly what the hon. gentleman says it is; I do desire to have it opened. I do not desire to keep anybody here any unreasonable length of time; I am quite willing that we should report progress just as soon as this item has been regularly and properly brought up. I think hon. gentlemen will recognize that I am not asking anything unfair in that respect.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not think the minister should insist on going into the Estimates of the Department of Justice to-night, for another reason. At the time the announcement was made that the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department of Justice would be taken up, it had not been brought to the attention of the Government that the Opposition objected on account of the Auditor General's Report not being down. The Prime Minister stated to-day that he would not insist upon going on with the Estimates of any department in cases where a large number of the Estimates were dealt with in the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report. In looking at that portion of the report which deals with the Justice Department I find that items amounting to $1,644,168.38 are dealt with in volume 4—about one-half the total expenditure of the department. Under these circumstances, I think my hon. friend should not insist upon going into the Estimates of the Department of Justice at this hour of the night, in the absence of so many members on this side.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will the hon. gentleman let me see what are the particular items that he refers to as being in volume 4?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I am looking at the summary of the Department of Justice on page II-2, in which amounts aggregating the sum I have mentioned are referred to as being dealt with in volume 4.

Mr. BUREAU: We have been discussing Estimates of the Agriculture Department all day. I think it is only fair that the Minister of Agriculture, who has been under fire, should have a chance now to pass a few items. With regard to passing items of the Department of Justice at this late hour to permit the automatic working of the Rules of the House, I for one am against it. If the Minister of Agriculture does not desire to go on with further Estimates of his department, we should rise, report progress, and go to bed. The Minister of Justice says that two departments were announced. Well and good, but it was not expected by members of the House at the time that the Estimates of one of those departments would be taken up at five minutes to midnight, so that we would not have any discussion of the department as we generally have, and that they would try to play this—I do not call it a trick because we know what is coming. I for one am going to object to taking up at this time any of the Estimates of the Department of Justice. Let the Minister of Agriculture go on, and we will go through his Estimates.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sorry to see how the hon. gentleman feels about this—he is not going to call it a trick. I have put the matter in the frankest of language, and I do not see that I have anything to be ashamed of. There is some interest in getting along with the public business, and it is a matter of importance that we should not be left on Thursday or Friday, possibly without business for this House to concern itself with. I am not asking for discussion at this hour of the evening; I am asking to have this item called; that is all. I am not asking to have this item passed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We know that.

Mr. DOHERTY: Do hon. gentlemen at this stage of the session frankly think that it is absolutely necessary that they should prevent the operation of a rule that was passed in the interest of expediting

public business, and thus create a situation where on Thursday or Friday we shall not be free to go into the Estimates?

Mr. BUREAU: Under the rule, with the consent of the House, the minister can go into Supply.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to say now that he is ready to consent—

Mr. BUREAU: I will not consent unless the House consents. I do not stand here speaking for the House, but at five minutes to twelve, it is high time that the Minister of Agriculture should pass a few items or we should go to bed.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to point out to hon. members that there is now nothing before the committee. Item No. 40 has been declared carried, and unless some other item is called, this discussion is out of order.

Mr. DOHERTY: I asked the Chairman to call item No. 4.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I protest against this method of trying to prevent members of the House from exercising a right which belongs to them. When the new rule was passed, it was specially provided that:

> On Thursdays and Fridays when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

That rule was put there to give members of the House an opportunity of moving resolutions whenever the Estimates of one department came before the House for the first time. It is not fair to bring down the Estimates of two departments on the same day. We are quite prepared to expedite the business of the House; let us go on with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, and we will go as far as two o'clock if my hon. friend wants to keep us here; but we object that one of the privileges of members of the House should be dealt with in this way.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman gets very warm and talks about things not being fair. It is not my habit to try to do things that are not fair, and so far as my judgment goes, I am not trying to do anything that would indicate any unfairness now. In view of what the hon. gentleman has said, and the item having been called, I am quite prepared that we should revert to the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and go on.

The CHAIRMAN: In order that there may be no difference of opinion about the matter to-morrow or later I shall call item No. 4, and we may then revert to the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BUREAU: If item No. 4 is called, the same result is attained, and that is what we are objecting to. I think, with the consent of the House, the minister has a right to withdraw his instruction to call the item; he may tell the Chairman that he does not want to have it called.

Mr. DOHERTY: What I said was that item No. 4 having been called, I am quite prepared to revert to Agriculture. As to what is fair and unfair, we will settle that later on.

Mr. BUREAU: I object to item No. 4 being called. The minister wants to deprive us of a right we have under this rule. He says: "If you will consent now to let us go into Supply on the Estimates of the Justice Department on Thursday or Friday without any debate on the motion, I am willing to revert to the agricultural Estimates. Why does the minister endeavour to prevent a debate on his particular department? It is unfair at this time of the night to try to
12 m. railroad this thing through by brute force, and I want to protest against it because it is not right. Things have been going on nicely; everybody has been satisfied with the explanations given by the Minister of Agriculture, and I understand, from hon. members whom I have consulted, that they are willing to go on and pass items of the Department of Agriculture. I do not see why the Minister of Justice should butt in now and throw fire into the atmosphere. The Minister of Justice ought not to do a thing of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN: There must be something before the committee to justify this debate. Let it be upon the point of order, whether or not the resolution should be placed before the committee. I shall be glad to hear any hon. member before giving my ruling.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It looks like an extreme step on the part of the Minister of Justice to presume to call an item of his department and thus deprive hon. members on this side of a right which they have under the rule. If the position taken by the Minister of Justice is correct,

other ministers can call an item in every department of the Government and the rule will then be equal to being obsolete altogether. In that way the Government could railroad through every department at one sitting of the committee. If the minister's view that he is doing a fair thing in this matter is correct, it follows that the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Militia and all the other ministers could take the same step now, and then we would have all the departments in the same position. That was certainly not the meaning of the rule and up to this night, it was never understood to be the meaning of the rule.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want at this time—it is almost early morning—to discuss this matter at any length. I hardly think the Minister of Justice would wish to take in this House, any step that would prevent the Opposition from exercising any right which, under the rules of the House, we may have to discuss public questions. I am not sufficiently familiar with, nor have I studied sufficiently, the rules of the House to say whether the calling of an item by the minister will preclude us, on going into Supply, from discussing any question of public interest. But if there is any possibility of that, I have confidence enough in the Minister of Justice to know that he would not want to use that means of closing the mouth of the Opposition. If there be any chance of that interpretation being placed upon the calling of the item, I think we of the Opposition have merely to ask the Minister of Justice courteously to withdraw that procedure, and I am sure he will be glad to accommodate us—perhaps not exactly accommodate us, but do what I know he always wants to do, that is, preserve the rights which inure to the Opposition and which may possibly have to be exercised by the other side of the House as well as by this at no distant date.

Mr. DOHERTY: If there be a desire to make a motion in regard to this particular department on our seeking to go into Supply on Thursday I would have no desire to object because of the fact that this item had been called, but if the objection is merely to create a situation where we will be thrown back into the position that we will not be entitled to go into Supply without consent because of some question that it is desired to raise about something else I really think I might be free to suggest that there is some unfairness in that. Hon. gentlemen have spoken of me as bringing fire into this thing. I might frankly say that the fire seems to be on the other side. I have no warmth, no feeling, about it. It looked to me a perfectly normal thing to do. How does the business of this House proceed? Last evening we announced that we would take up these two departments and nobody took exception to that. Everybody seemed to think it was a perfectly natural thing that we might take up the two departments on the same day and all I now proposed to do was to carry out what everybody understood last evening was going to be done to-day, I find myself attacked as doing unfair things, unjust things, when I am simply carrying out the programme announced last evening. If we were at a stage of the session where the missing of an opportunity to raise a question of any kind on going into Supply might be involved, I would appreciate at greater value the objection that is made but surely at this stage of the session with but one department open with every day in the week except Thursday and Fridays as regards the department of Agriculture and if my position be correct the Department of Justice open for the making of motions I leave it frankly to hon. genelemen were exposed in many way it can be said that there is any possible injustice involved because we take a step this evening which will open up Thursday for a discussion of Estimates without a preliminary debate. I am perfectly free to say that if I could see that hon. gentlemen were exposed in any way to losing any right or any opportunity to discuss any imaginable question which they wanted to raise, I would not be disposed to insist. My one disposition in insisting on this matter was to expedite the business, and to make quite sure that on Thursday we will be able to take this thing up and go on with the discussion of the Estimates. Now I leave it to my hon. friends: Is there any ground to apprehend lack of opportunity? What will the situation be if we take up this item now? Every time we try to go into Supply, on any day other than Thursday and Friday, they will have the opportunity to make a motion and every day that we seek to go into Supply including Thursdays and Fridays, on any other department than Agriculture and Justice, they will have an opporunity to make a motion. Now, is it worth while getting so warm and bandying charges of

unfairness? Is it fair to say that what I suggest is unfair? There may be a difference of opinion as to whether I am absolutely within my right in doing this, but I do not think it raises any question of fairness or unfairness and I would put it to hon. gentlemen whether they are not willing to expedite the business of the House to that extent.

Mr. BUREAU: If the hon. gentleman thinks I am showing too much warmth in accusing him of unfairness I will try and state the case more cooly. The minister has not stated the case fairly. He has been unfair for this reason: the only day on which we can discuss matters generally is Tuesday. We have no other day. Monday is private members' day, so is Wednesday, and on Thursday the House automatically goes into Supply without any opportunity for discussion. The minister takes the ground that he is justified in going on with the Estimates of the Justice Department because it was announced yesterday that the Departments of Agriculture and Justice would be taken up. Now, if that reasoning holds good, the Prime Minister could read off a whole list of departments and say, we will take these up to-morrow, and then on the following day any of the ministers could come along at midnight and take up an item in his department. We would then be in the same position we are in to-day. I say it is absolutely unfair, and I say that without any heat and after thinking it over, because it will only leave us Tuesdays. The minister would deprive us of the opportunity of discussing public matters on Thursdays and Fridays. I think we have made a very fair offer. We told the Minister of Agriculture that if he went on with his Estimates we were willing to pass some items after reasonable explanations had been given, but here is the Minister of Justice seeking to deprive us of our opportunity of discussing public matters. If the minister does not see any unfairness in that, I cannot agree with him. To speak of warmth is beside the question. It is a matter of justice and right that we are asking. We do not wish to be deprived of a right. I am sure that the Minister of Justice, when it was announced last night that his Estimates would be taken up to-day, did not expect that an item would be called at 15 minutes past twelve. Nobody expected that. We expected that it might be called at an hour when we would be in a position to have a general discussion. The minister knows we do not want to start any general discussion at this time, and if he wants to be fair he will let the Minister of Agriculture go on with a few more items, and then the committee can rise and report progress, so we can go to bed.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. members in discussing the point of order now before the committee to remember that this is a question of interpretation of the rules, and not only a question of fairness. The chairman would be glad indeed to hear the opinion of any hon. member concerning the application of the Rules of the House before he gives his ruling.

Mr. BUREAU: Our discussion was for the purpose of having the minister withdraw his suggestion, so that any question as to the rules would be avoided.

Mr. DOHERTY: As hon. gentlemen seem to be so persistent in their view that there is some unfairness in the suggestion—and frankly I attach more importance to that than I do to the letter of the rule, a great deal more—while I do not see any unfairness involved—perhaps it is my obtuseness—rather than have hon. gentlemen entertain, as apparently they do, the view that I desire to do something unfair, I would prefer to withdraw the suggestion. I do not want, however, my withdrawal to be taken as a confession on my part—no doubt, it is my condition of invincible ignorance, which excuses a great many things—

Mr. BUREAU: Withdraw it without prejudice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am afraid that when I withdraw it I shall do so with a strong prejudice against the view entertained by the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to withdraw my request that resolution 4 be now read.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Justice having withdrawn his request that the resolution be now read, it cannot be considered as having been placed before the committee. My ruling upon the point of order is that the hon. minister was under the rules perfectly justified in asking that resolution 4 be now read by the Chairman, and thus placed before the committee for consideration.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I ask you a question, Mr. Chairman? Could all the ministers call the Estimates of their departments on the same day?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will allow me, I will first cite the rule and then answer his question. Rule 13, paragraph 4, provides that the rules of the House shall be observed in the Committee of the whole House, so far as applicable, except the rules as to the seconding of motions and limiting the number of times of speaking. Rule 31, section 2, provides that whenever Government business has precedence Government orders may be called in such sequence as the Government may think fit. The Estimates are Government business, and when the different resolutions in the Estimates are before the committee they may be called in such sequence as the Government may think fit. In answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), as to whether all hon. ministers could call the Estimates of their different departments upon the same day, I would say that if the committee would consent to dispose of those Estimates with sufficient speed to allow them to do so, the ministers would have that right except on Thursday or Friday when their Estimates have not previously been taken up. This is quite frequently done during the last days of a session. It must be remembered, however, that while any hon. member has the floor, and while any one item is before the committee no hon. minister has the right to propose any other item. When the Minister of Justice proposed that resolution 4 be called, resolution 40 had been carried.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then the only course which the Opposition would have to follow to prevent a minister from calling the items of any other department would be to keep on discussing the previous item.

The CHAIRMAN: The only course is to continue discussion upon the item then before the committee or move that the committee rise.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): May I point out that the Minister of Agriculture had carried his item and there was nothing before the committee? How could the committee continue discussing something that was not before it?

The CHAIRMAN: That is precisely the ruling of the Chair. Item 40 having been carried there was nothing before the committee, and the Minister of Justice, under the rules, had the absolute right to propose item 4.

Mr. DOHERTY: After all, perhaps the best protection of the Opposition lies in the fairness of the minister, and probably the best safeguard against interminable discussion is the good sense of our friends opposite. That seems to be the practical result of the raising of the question. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, March 16, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—Mr. Cockshutt.

Report of proceedings of the Conference on International Finance.—Sir Henry Drayton.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GASPE RAILWAY SERVICE

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the following recommendation made by the Quebec Board of Trade to the chairman and members of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, on February 3rd, 1921:

"We would also ask your commission to lend its influence in favour of the effort now being made by the Quebec Board of Trade, to remedy the painful situation in which the large population of the Gaspé peninsula—nearly 80,000—now find themselves owing to defective railway service and the absence of cold storage and refrigerator car service, needed to give their fisheries, which for two centuries have been amongst the most important in the world, an opportunity to furnish the cheap food of fresh fish to Canadian cities, and at the same time the fisherman of Gaspé coast a fair price for his catch. He now gets one-fifth of the price earned by the fishermen at Prince Rupert, who has these facilities. Our suggestion is that the Dominion Government should take over the 200 miles of railway from Matapédia to Gaspé, which runs for its entire length within sight of the fishing boat, and make it part of the Government Railway System."

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to take any action?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. The Government is not, at present, in a position to take over these railways.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. When did the Government, through the Canadian National Railways, take possession of the Quebec and Saguenay railway?

2. How many passengers have been carried on the said railway from the 17th March, 1920, to date?

3. What have been the net earnings of the said railway since that date?

4. What are the salaries paid monthly to the different station agents or caretakers along the line of the said railway?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Under Order-in-Council, September 24, 1919, the Quebec and Saguenay railway was transferred to Canadian National Railways for operation. As the road was still under construction and being operated by the contractors, that arrangement continued until completion of construction, October 1, 1920, when road was put into operation by Canadian National Railways management.

2. 39,742 passengers were carried from March 1st to December 31st, 1920.

3. Operating deficit March 1st to December 31st, 1920, $35,869.62.

4. Schedule rates.

Dr. MICHAEL FISET

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. What is the total amount of disbursements made to Dr. Michael Fiset of Quebec by the Postmaster General or any other minister since the 18th April, 1914?

2. How many reports have been issued to the Postmaster General or any other Minister of the Crown by Dr. Fiset since the date of his appointment by Order in Council of April 18, 1917?

3. For what length of time is Dr. Fiset supposed to give his services for which he receives the sum of $2,800 per annum?

4. Are there other officials, in any other part of the Dominion, who occupy a position of a similar nature to that held by Dr. Fiset?

5. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to keep the said Dr. Fiset in the present position at a salary of $2,800 per annum?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

Departments Generally—

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. No information.

Post Office Department—

1. Salary, $19,234.44. Bonus, $304.00.

2. None, to the knowledge of this department.

3. Full time.

4. No.

5. Dr. Fiset has been recommended for retirement from the Service, such retirement to take effect from the 31st March, 1921.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—

1. 1914.....$64.50.

2, 3, 4 and 5. No information.

61½

RETURNED MEN AS PERMANENT CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

Has the Post Office Department taken advantage of the Civil Service Act passed on September, 10th, 1919, as it applies to making returned men permanent who have given six months' satisfactory service? If not, why?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision in the Act referred to which would make it possible to appoint returned men, who have given six months' satisfactory service, to the permanent staff, except when vacancies occur and where men employed in a temporary capacity have qualified for permanent appointment by passing the necessary Civil Service Examination, and can be recommended.

PRINCE RUPERT LAND PURCHASE

Mr. DUFF:

1. What is the amount which the Government has paid to Vernon W. Smith for a piece of land measuring about 100 by 100 feet at Prince Rupert, British Columbia?

2. What other amount has been paid for excavating said piece of land?

Hon. W. McCURDY:

1. Purchased in April, 1913. Amount paid $95,000.

2. $20,005.51.

MULGRAVE—TENDERS FOR ICE

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Whtt are the names of all parties who tendered for supplying ice for the Canadian Government Railway at Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, for the present season?

2. What were the respective amounts of said tenders?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. S. H. Hagerty, Monastery, N.S.; James Dunlap, Leitche's Creek Station, C.B.

2. It is not in the interests of Canadian National Railways to make these tenders public. The contract was let to the lowest tenderer.

TRANSCONTINENTAL ENGINES

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the Government aware that several engines of the Transcontinental Railway were seriously damaged by frost on account of having been left exposed to the weather during the month of December last at the roundhouse at Parent?

2. If so, why were the said engines not shunted into shelter at the said works?

3. Are the workmen responsible for this damage still in the employ of the Government?

4. What was the approximate cost of repairing these locomotives?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. No.

2, 3, 4. Answered by No. 1.

INDIAN COMMISSIONER AT REGINA

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Has the Government purchased a house in Regina for the Indian Commissioner?
2. If so, who was the house purchased from and what was the price paid?
3. Does the Commissioner pay rent to the Government for the house?
4. Does the Government supply the said Commissioner with a motor car and chauffeur?
5. If so, what was the cost of the motor car and what salary is paid the chauffeur?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Yes.

2. James F. Bryant, $12,500, which is chargeable to profits of Greater Production.

3. No; the house continues the free residence provided at File Hills before his transfer.

4. The commissioner provides a car, for the use of which, on official business, he is allowed $60 a month for ten months. The reply to the second part of this question is in the negative.

5. Answered by the above.

POLISH IMMIGRANTS

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. Did the Government recently refuse admission into Canada of a large number of Polish immigrants?
2. If so, how many were rejected and for what reasons?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

From 1st October 1920 to 28th February, 1921, inclusive.

1 & 2. Polish—	
Indirect passage	12
Lack of funds	10
Lack of passport	4
Physically defective	1
	27
Polish Jews—	
Accompanying	1
Conjunctivitis	1
Feeble minded	1
Gonorrhœa	1
Illiteracy	3
Indirect passage	6
Lack of funds	28
Lack of passport	6
Stowaway	1
Trachoma	1
	49
Total	76

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

GRAND TRUNK PENSIONS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the arbitrator representing the Government in connection with the arbitration to determine the value of the Grand Trunk Railway System received instructions to take into consideration or make any allowance for the pensions due by the Grand Trunk Railway Co., to the employees of that system prior to the general strike of said employees in the year 1910?
2. Has the Government decided to re-establish for the said employees the pensions from which they were deprived at the time of the said strike?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Solicitor representing the Government has received instructions to bring before the Board of Arbitrators the matter of the striking employees of 1910.

2. The Government cannot consider this matter until they take possession of the road after the decision of the arbitrators.

RICHMOND—QUEBEC—RUNNING RIGHTS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the Government received any application from any railway company for running rights over the Grand Trunk Railway tracks from the Town of Richmond to the City of Quebec?
2. If so, from what company?
3. If not, would such an application be considered?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What is the average rate per mile paid to the rural mail carriers throughout the Dominion?
2. What is the average rate paid to rural mail carriers in the Province of Quebec?
3. What is the average rate per mile paid to rural mail carriers in the County of Richmond and Wolfe?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a fixed rate per mile for the payment of rural mail carriers in Canada?
5. If so, what will be the said rate?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The rate paid to rural mail carriers throughout the Dominion is decided by the system of public tendering. On account of varied conditions such as scarcity or abundance of labour, state of roads, cost of horse feed, etc., in the different localities, the adoption of a fixed rate per mile would be unsatisfactory, unfair and unpracticable. There being no uniformity in the rates paid, any figures regarding average rates for the whole Dominion or

even one particular province or district could not be anything but misleading.

AMALGAMATION OF OFFICES IN POST OFFICE

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it true that the Government, by way of an Order in Council passed on or about the middle of February last, has decided to amalgamate the Post Office Superintendent's service with that of the Post Office Inspector?

2. Is it true that the whole of the Outside Service of the Post Office Department, including the postmasters, the post office inspectors, etc., has been placed under the control of Mr. George Ross, of Toronto?

3. Is it true that said Mr. Ross occupies a rank similar to that of a deputy minister?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. The whole of the Outside Service will be under the control of the General Superintendent of Postal Service, who will be responsible to the Postmaster General. The position of General Superintendent of Postal Service has not been definitely filled.

3. No.

PENSION COMMISSIONERS—USE OF FRENCH FORMS

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the Board of Pension Commissioners provided with forms drafted in the French language for the use of persons claiming a pension?

2. Has Mrs. Marie T. Poiré or Mr. R. C. de la Chevrottière, her solicitor, of the city of Quebec, made application for the sending of such forms in French?

3. If so, has the Board of Pension Commissioners replied to Mrs. Poiré, sending forms drafted in the English language?

4. If so, why?

5. Does the Government intend to take the necessary steps in order that French forms be sent to persons speaking the French language?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Yes. The Board of Pension Commissioners uses forms printed in both languages, and French forms are employed whenever their use is indicated.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. The forwarding of forms printed in English to Mrs. Poiré was the result of a clerical error.

5. Answered by No. 1.

FEEDING STUFFS ACT

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What steps have been taken to enforce the Feeding Stuffs Act which was assented to July 1, 1920, gazetted December 4, 1920, and authorized effective January 1, 1921?

2. When will service be given under this Act?

3. Has any official been designated official feed analyst, under section 10 of the Feeding Stuffs Act? If not, what is the reason for the delay and when will such appointment be made?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Six inspection districts, each in direct charge of a competent district seed and feed inspector, were organized and inspection service provided from January 1, 1921. Thirty-one seed and feed inspectors have been appointed by the Civil Service Commission to work under the district inspectors. Three hundred and seventy-four certificates of registration of commercial feeding stuffs have been issued. Bulletin containing reprint of Feeding Stuffs Act and regulations thereunder has been generally distributed.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. By arrangement with the Department of Health, Dr. A. McGill, chief analyst for the Commercial Feeding Stuffs Act, 1909, is continuing to provide analytical service under the Feeding Stuffs Act, 1920.

SANDY BEACH WHARF

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many tenders were received by the Public Works Department for the repairs to be made at the wharf at Sandy Beach, county of Gaspé?

2. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders?

3. To whom has the contract been awarded?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1, 2 and 3. As the contract has not been awarded, information cannot be given at present.

ST. VALIER WHARF

*Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Is the Government aware that the wharf situated at St. Valier, county of Bellechasse, was damaged in November, 1918, and that no repairs have yet been made?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to recommend repairs necessary so as to prevent complete ruin of said wharf?

3. What has caused the delay in making said repairs?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes.

2. Matter under consideration.

3. No appropriation being available, work could not be proceeded with.

CANADIAN AIR BOARD

Mr. PROULX:

1. What are the names of the members of the Canadian Air Board and the Canadian Air Force Association?

2. How many departments have been created in the Air Board and Air Force, and what are they?

3. What salaries are being paid to the heads of departments?

4. Is it correct that the amount of salaries for heads of departments is partly dependent upon the number of employees they have?

5. Is it correct that the heads of departments get a raise of as much as $1,000 a year when they have 30 employees or over in their departments?

6. How many departments have 30 employees or over, and in these are so many really required?

7. Who is responsible for saying what number of employees are required in each department?

8. (a) Who is the responsible head of the Air Board, and (b) is he engaged on the work as much as he should be?

9. Why is the pay of certain officers and appointments in the Air Force reduced after they have served a certain length of time?

10. What measures, if any, are being taken to enforce the O.T.A. in the vicinity of Camp Borden?

11. If a man enlists in the Canadian Air Force as a mechanic, how much of his time is employed in actual work on aero engines and aeroplanes, and how much time on fatigues and useless squad drill by incompetent instructors?

12. Are Air Board employees authorized to carry unofficial passengers when flying aeroplanes?

13. Is it permissible to use Government aircraft on joy rides with lady passengers?

14. What has happened to the flying boat used on the trans-Canada flight, which was last heard of as lying in the Red river at Winnipeg? Is it still unnecessarily exposed to the rigours of winter storms and weather?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. The names of the members of the Canadian Air Board and the Board of Management of the Canadian Air Force Association are as follows: Honourable Hugh Guthrie, K.C.; O. M. Biggar, Esq., K.C.; Air Vice-Marshal Sir Willoughby Gwatkin, K.C.M.G., C.B., etc.; Captain W. Hose, C.B.E., R.C.N.; Lieut.-Colonel R. Leckie, D.S.O., D.S.C., D.F.C.; Lieut.-Colonel J. Stanley Scott, M.C., A.F.C.; E. Deville, LL.D., D.T.S.

2 and 3. The administrative duties in the Air Board are distributed under the following officers, whose salaries are as stated: Inspector General, C.A.F., $4,180; Director of Flying Operations, $4,500; Controller of Civil Aviation, $3,500; Technical Director, $4,500; Director of Equipment, $2,400; Secretary, $4,250.

4. No.

5. No.

6. None.

7. The Civil Service Commission in consultation with the Air Board.

8. (a) The chairman, Hon. Hugh Guthrie, K.C. (b) Yes.

9. The Canadian Air Force is organized as a non-professional force, the personnel of which in all ranks from the lowest to the highest undergoes normally one month's training every two years. Certain staff and administrative duties require for their performance a longer term, normally six to nine months, and to secure the services of competent officers and other instructional personnel for these duties which involve absence by the personnel performing them from their ordinary civil occupations for substantial lengths of time, special rates of pay are provided. These special rates do not apply if the service of any individual is prolonged beyond one year, and the pay receivable is reduced accordingly.

10. Under the Canadian Air Force Regulations "No officer or airman shall bring into or have in his possession in any barrack or camp intoxicating liquor." This regulation is being strictly enforced. There have been fourteen arrests made for breach of the Ontario Temperance Act, of whom seven were civilians and were dealt with by the local civil authorities. The fines collected in these cases totalled $1,150.

11. The approximate weekly time-table for an air mechanic in training is as follows: Lectures on engines, theory of flight, rigging and construction of aeroplanes, 24 hours; work in shops and on machines being flown, 20 hours; other military duties guards, drills, etc., 16 hours.

12. No.

13. No.

14. It has since November 21st been safely housed on the shores of the Red river, and has never been exposed to the rigours of winter storms and weather either unnecessarily, or at all.

Mr. CHARLES P. BUCKLEY

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is there an official in the Department of Railways and Canals named Charles P. Buckley?

2. If so, what is his present classification, and what is his salary?

3. From what classification and salary was he promoted?

4. Has this man ever been articled or studied law?

5. What legal right has he to his present classification?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Law clerk; initial salary $1,800, present salary $1,920.

3. Not promoted. Reclassified from old Division 2A., salary $1,700, maximum $2,100.

4. Not articled. Has had over 13 years' experience in Legal Branch.

5. He was classified by the Civil Service Commission.

GOVERNMENT PIER AT CHICOUTIMI

Mr. SAVARD:

1. What was the cost of fitting the Government pier at Chicoutimi with light?

2. What is the annual maintenance expenditure?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. $4,301.47 for poles, wire, lamps, etc., including $1,750 for plant installed in 1916 and now in use.

2.

1914	$671.25
1915	671.25
1916	512.90
1917	160.23
1918	336.77
1919	466.67
1920	420.31
1921	499.86

BONUS TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Is it the intention of the Government to grant to the postal employees (letter carriers) the same bonus as that of last year?

Mr. WRIGHT:

Is it the intention of the Government to continue paying the salary bonus to Civil Servants during the coming year?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: In reply to the first question I wish to state that the matter is under consideration. The same answer applies to the question of my hon. friend from Battleford (Mr. Wright).

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to bring forward this session a Bill for the retirement and pensions off of civil servants?

2. If so, when will it be presented?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This question, as in the case of all questions relating to legislation not brought down, can only be answered by stating that any information regarding it will be given in due course.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. PARENT:

1. What are the names of the employees of the Money Order Branch in the following Post Offices (Head Offices): Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S.?

2. What is the rank, according to the new classification, of each one of said employees, and their present salary?

3. What is the number of years of service of said employees?

4. What is the annual actual revenue of each one of the above mentioned Post Offices?

5. Who are the employees in charge of said branch in each one of said offices?

6. Who are the officials in charge of the Registration Branch in the main post offices of the above mentioned cities, the rank and salary of each one of them?

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ROUND HOUSE AT ST. FOY

Mr. PARENT:

On the Motion for a copy of all letters, reports exchanged between engineers and officers of the Canadian National Railways concerning the demolition of the round house at St. Foy, opposite the Quebec bridge, the removal from that place of a mechanical staff to a place called Charny on the other side of the St. Lawrence River; the proposed demolition of the station on the main line of the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec bridge

Hon. Mr. REID: There are no letters or reports that were exchanged between officers of the Canadian National Railways in the Department of Railways and Canals with reference to this matter. I would therefore suggest that the motion be dropped.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member who gave notice of the Motion is not present.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion stands.

WHARF AT ST. MICHEL, QUE.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, telegrams, reports, memoranda, tenders and contracts, having reference to or in connection with the repairs of the wharf situated at St. Michel, County of Bellechasse, Quebec, from October 1st, 1918, to date.

Hon. Mr. REID: Is this wharf maintained by the Department of Railways or by the Department of Public Works?

Mr. FOURNIER: It is under the Department of Public Works.

Motion agreed to.

FORTIFICATIONS OF QUEBEC CITY

Mr. C. G. POWER moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the ancient walls and fortifications of the city of Quebec, having for all military purposes become obsolete, it is expedient in order to better preserve these valuable heirlooms as a historical monument for future generations, that their upkeep and control be now vested in the National Battlefields Commission.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion came up for discussion on a previous occasion when the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) stated that he would have an investigation made by his officers into the practicability of carrying out this proposition. In a few words the situation is that the walls and fortifications of Quebec are rapidly crumbling away; that it would require a considerable sum of money to keep them in a fit and proper condition; and that—I think this is generally admitted—they no longer serve useful pur-

pose in so far as military necessities are concerned. I think it is universally recognized that in these days of high power artillery, and other implements of warfare which we now have, the walls of any fortified town, however well protected, cannot resist for any great length of time, so that for military purposes these defences have become obsolete. On the other hand, the associations connected with the walls and fortifications of Quebec, and with the city of Quebec itself, are such that, to my mind, and I think most hon. members will agree with me, it would be a pity to see these monuments of our country's glorious past disappear. It should be our duty, in order to promote a true Canadian spirit to encourage so far as possible a reverence and admiration for the memory of those of our forefathers who have accomplished much on this continent to make Canada the nation which it is and to enable it to reach that higher status to which we hope it will attain. These are the considerations which have permitted me to once more place this motion on the Order Paper. I may say that the proposition has been received by the newspapers of Quebec city and elsewhere, with considerable approval. It is not a matter in which politics intervene, for Conservative and Liberal journals alike have given the project their blessing. The different public bodies in the city of Quebec have also, I understand, on several occasions passed resolutions favouring it. I do not know that there is any more to add except that if the Minister of Militia has not had time on account of his numerous occupations to look into this matter since March 16th, I think it was, last year, when the resolution was first debated, I would like him to give this subject very serious consideration during the coming year. Should he transfer the cost of the upkeep of these walls and fortifications to an independent body such as the National Battlefields Commission he will undoubtedly relieve his department of a burden which should not belong to it and which, from a military standpoint, does not make for the efficiency of our defences in Canada.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia): The House will well remember the occasion last year on which my hon. friend brought this matter to its attention and the very excellent address which he delivered at that time.

[Mr. Power.]

I remember, too, in replying to my hon. friend upon that occasion I intimated that inquiry would be made into all questions pertaining to the ancient walls and fortifications of the city of Quebec to see if it were possible to meet the suggestions contained in his motion, which was to the effect that the Government should hand over these ancient walls and fortifications to the Battlefields Commission—a Commission which was established a number of years ago and which still continues to function.

During last summer I had the pleasure of looking over those fortifications myself, and I instructed an engineer of the department of Militia and Defence to examine them and report thereon. According to that report I may inform the House that it would not be considered proper, at the present time at all events, to transfer the whole of these walls or structures to the Battlefields Commission. Some parts of the fortifications are still in use, and will continue to be in use by the Department of Militia for a long time to come. There are portions of the fortifications which are not used, and which I agree with my hon. friend are rapidly falling into decay, and considerable expenditure will have to be made at some time in the near future if these walls are to be preserved in their ancient grandeur and strength. Moderate expenditure might be made from time to time which would probably maintain them in a condition suitable for their historical value and associations, but to rebuild them would involve, according to my information, a very large amount of money.

I think I might give the House also a brief report in regard to those portions of the walls which should be handed over to the Battlefileds Commission, and as to those portions which, in the opinion of the engineers of the Militia Department, it would be necessary to retain for the use of the department. For this purpose the walls have been divided into sections, and those familiar with the city of Quebec will readily locate the various portions from the description which I shall now give to the House.

Section 1 is described as a section from Mountain Hill to the intersection of Des Ramparts and Canoterie streets. It consists only of the walls at the top of the cliff and a very narrow strip of ground adjoining the street. This portion is not used for military purposes and might be handed over.

Section 2 runs from the above point to the foot of Palace Hill comprising the walls and face of the cliff. This section is of no use for military purposes and might also be handed over. The property at the foot of the cliff and fronting on Canoterie and St Valier streets is now being valued by the department of Public Works with a view to offering it for sale.

Sections 3 and 4 comprise the Dominion Arsenal site. They form the northern and western enclosures of that site, which is used for ordnance and other military purposes, and possession of these portions should be retained.

Section 5 runs from St John's Gate to St Louis Gate. It consists of rampart walls and the St. John, Kent and St. Louis Gates. It is of no use for military purposes and might also be handed over.

Section 6 comprises that portion from St Louis Gate to the face of the cliff. This section is of no use from a defence point of view. It comprises the walls enclosing the ditch of the Citadel. The Citadel itself, consisting of casemates and buildings, is used for housing the garrison and should be retained; but section 6 might be handed over to the Battlefields Commission, if desired.

Section 7 consists of the ramparts along the face of the cliff to the southeast corner of the Citadel. It forms part of the walls of the buildings of the Citadel, and should be retained.

Section 8 is a section running from the southeast corner of the Citadel to the present site of the Post Office. It consists of the wall facing the Terrace, which is already leased to the city of Quebec. This section is not used by the Department of Militia and Defence and might be handed over to the Battlefields Commission.

To recapitulate, I might say that of the sections I have enumerated, sections 1, 2, 5 and 8 might be handed over to the Battlefields Commission if the House so decides; sections 3, 4 and 7 should be retained for the purposes of the department; and section 6 might also be handed over if there is any special reason for such action.

The question of cost is something that the House will have to deal with. As hon. members are aware, we make an annual grant to the National Battlefields Commission. The grant in the Estimates this year for the purposes of that commission amounts in all to about $51,600. It will be found at page 62 of the Estimates. If the work of repairing these walls is undertaken, a considerable amount of money will have to be provided.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister allow me a question? Is there any item in the Estimates this year for the upkeep of the walls?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, there is no specific item in the Estimates of the Department of Militia and Defence, nor in the general Estimates for the upkeep of these walls. Any repairs that have been made from time to time have been defrayed out of a vote for the department under the heading of "Engineers' Services". But as time goes on more extensive repairs will be needed. I have asked the officers of the department to prepare a scheme and as nearly as possible to estimate the annual cost of the upkeep of this property. As soon as that is available I shall lay it before the House, and then I think the time will have come for some definite action to be taken in regard to these ancient walls and fortifications.

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this motion, I desire to bring before the House something which is so cognate to the subject under discussion that I am sure you will not consider it out of order. I refer to improvements or repairs to the fortifications of the most ancient of upper Ontario's forts—those at Kingston.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member would be distinctly out of order in discussing the fortifications at Kingston, because this is a specific resolution having to do wth the fortifications in the city of Quebec. The rules are very clear that under these circumstances the debate must be restricted rigorously to the specific subject before the House. Therefore, I do not think the hon. member would be in order.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, many of the remarks of the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) have my entire sympathy. I have felt for some time, particularly when I was occupying the position of Minister of Militia, that unless the fortifications of the Citadel of Quebec are put in repair at an early date the walls will entirely crumble away. I think it will be a lasting disgrace to this country if those walls and fortifications are not preserved for future generations. The hon. member spoke of the glorious past. Well, I think we might also consider the glorious future of this country. I feel, as I felt at that time, that

something should be done along the lines of the resolution by handing this property over to the National Battlefields Commission. I also realize that a considerable portion of that property is required for military purposes. If the country is in a position to build other barracks or accommodation for military purposes in the city of Quebec, then, indeed, the whole property might with wisdom be handed over. But having regard to the statement made by the Minister of Militia, I am satisfied that the hon. member for Quebec South will view the situation in the same light and will feel that the purpose of his motion will be met when the minister brings down the report to which he has referred.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratification at hearing the very comprehensive statement that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) has just made to the House. The arrangement that he has proposed would seem to meet the military requirements, and, at the same time, the necessity of maintaining this beautiful landmark as an historic monument for future generations. It is the custom in the older countries of Europe, such as England and France, to preserve such historic landmarks, not only on account of their beauty as architectural monuments, but also as a lesson in history to present and future generations. There are few landmarks which are so instructive or so capable of giving inspiration to the people of our country as those which are the subject of this debate. It is true that we have the fortifications of Kingston and others of Ontario, and also the Citadel at Halifax. These military works at Halifax, Quebec and Kingston should, to my mind, be preserved as a lesson to present and future generations. The best arrangement, I think, would be to transfer to the Battlefields Commission those sections which are not used for military purposes and keep under the department, as suggested by the minister, those that are used. I am sure that the House will vote, and the country will appreciate, any expenditure which may be necessary for the upkeep of these military works, which will be of such value to coming generations.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I have just one word to add to the very interesting remarks which have just been made by the member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien). The upkeep of the walls of the city of Quebec is a matter of interest to us all, especially to those who happen to represent the constitutency in which they are located. In this connection it might not be out of place to direct the attention of the House to what a former Governor General of Canada, Earl Grey, did for the city of Quebec when he created what we call the Battlefields Park. Earl Grey took an interest not only in the Battlefields, but also in the walls of the city; he made certain improvements in those walls which are much admired by tourists. If it was the object of Earl Grey to emphasize the fact that these walls should be preserved for future generations, he went far toward accomplishing that object, and those who follow in his footsteps will be acting wisely indeed.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to reply, and I must call the attention of the House to the circumstance that the debate is closed if he does so.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) for the evidence which he has given us of the interest which he takes in matters affecting his department as brought before the House by private members. I wish also to apologize to him and to the House for my somewhat premature suspicions regarding the work which he accomplished during the recess in this connection. I had thought that this ministerial promise had met the usual fate and that the work had been neglected. I may say that the minister has astonished as well as pleased me by the able and intelligent report which he has brought down. The report shows that the officers of his department have really done some work; that they have taken into consideration the claims made by members on this side and have studied the question thoroughly. The report seems to be very complete, and I assure the minister that the citizens of Quebec will be grateful to him that he has done good work for his country, and—what is, perhaps, more important to him—that his department will be materially benefited thereby. I suppose that the best I can do under the circumstances is to accept the report and the explanations given by the minister—which I consider to be sufficient—and ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

THE CASE OF W. H. TAPLEY

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Governor in Council should cancel the privileges extended to one W. H. Tapley of Montreal, under the provisions of the Ticket of Leave Act, and that he should be re-arrested and sent back to the penitentiary to finish the term of the sentence imposed upon him in the best interests of justice and the community.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year, on the 5th of May I moved in this House a resolution calling for the production of copies of letters, telegrams, documents and correspondence in reference to the release from the penitentiary of one W. H. Tapley and one E. L. Baugh. At that time the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) replied in this way:

It is impossible to assent to the passing of this resolution. It is very well recognized in the House that correspondence with regard to applications for tickets of leave is of a confidential nature and is not to be brought down. There are numerous instances in which the matter has been brought up, and the last time I recollect its being discussed was in 1913, when the subject was discussed on both sides of the House, and when the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier entirely concurred in the view that these papers were not of a kind that ought to be ordered to be brought down.

The motion was dropped at that time. As you will see, Mr. Speaker, in a certain way I was balked and prevented from obtaining certain information under the assumption that this was the practice in years past. I have no intention of discussing the practice at that time. There may have been different circumstances, on account of which our late and revered leader thought that at that time, in 1913, it was not proper to put before the House certain correspondence in connection with release under the Ticket of Leave Act. If I present this resolution to-day, it is not that I have any ill-feeling or grudge or something personal against this Mr. Tapley of Montreal, and indeed, I might say that I have none against anyone. I am presenting this resolution in order to bring before the House the circumstances which at present obtain in regard to this matter. Mr. Tapley is very well known in the city of Montreal and the whole district as a usurer and money lender. For years past, before he was convicted and sent to the penitentiary, he was extorting money, against the law known as the Money Lenders' Act, from different persons at exorbitant rates of interest, running as high as 120 per cent, if not more in certain cases. What happened was this. One day in 1914, Mr. Tapley was arrested, and after trial before the Court of Kings bench, he was found guilty of rape and incest upon Lorita Tapley, his daughter, and he was sent to the penitentiary for a term of thirty years, being sentenced by Judge Lavergne on March 25, 1914. Since that time, I might say that many people have been at peace and liberty in Montreal. Last year, however, about the month of February or March, this gentleman appeared in Montreal after having obtained his conditional release under the provisions of the Ticket of Leave Act. Since that time, he has endeavoured to revive all the old judgments standing in his favour against different persons in our city, and lately there appeared editorials in regard to the matter in the press, especially in the Montreal Star, which, by the way, is a good paper—sometimes I agree with it, and most of the time I do not agree with it, but in this case, I think the campaign in that paper was a good one. In different editorials which appeared in the Montreal Star from the end of December to the middle of January, facts were presented to the public which I and some other people in Montreal though ought to be brought to the attention of the House. In the Montreal Star of 23rd December, 1920, the following heading appears:

Montreal shark puts the screws on.

And there follows a compendium of a judgment of the Circuit Court of the city and district of Montreal from which we see that this man, on a judgment for $20 obtained interest at the rate of 120 per cent per annum and five per cent per annum on $79.80. This case, I might say, was handled on behalf of the defendant by one of the friends of the Minister of Justice, Mr. Frank Curran, K.C., of the city of Montreal, who is one of the eminent members of our Bar. This gentleman proposes to discuss this case when it comes up in Court for trial and to try to have the provisions of the Money Lenders' Act applied in reducing the rate of interest charged by Mr. Tapley. Later, on the 3rd January, 1921, some more facts were brought out by the Montreal Star to the public at large under the heading—I will not read the whole article; I shall be satisfied with quoting the headlines:

Three more relate their experiences with Tapley—all cases based on ancient judgments and seek 120 per cent interest.

On January 4, 1921, other facts were brought to the knowledge of the public, one statement being that:

They had fallen behind in their rent and the landlord was already in Tapley's clutches. Cost them great deal to get out.

On January 5, 1921, this heading appeared:

When court was kind to Tapley he revived old game.

At the time Tapley came out, the civil authorities lifted the interdict which took away his civil rights, and he immediately started his old game and practice. On January 8, 1921, we have another editorial in the Montreal Star dealing at length with the judgments he has, amounting to over $40,000 and it states:

All of them are alive and he may proceed to collect. Has been inactive for a week now. A typical Tapley move.

On January 11, 1921, we have an explanation of a case where a loan of $20 grew to $350 thanks to the ways and methods of Mr. Tapley in doing business with different people to whom he had lent money. On January 11 there is another article reporting an interview which a representative of the press had with Mr. Tapley, and in which he said that he did not care an iota—I will not use the other expression, which is more vulgar—for anybody or any court; that he would go on and do as he used to do before, and that he had, while working in a bank, learned how to gauge borrowers. I have received numerous letters from different people in Montreal who have been unfortunate enough to deal with this man. I had many cases to defend against this man a few years ago, and I had given an interview in a newspaper regarding this case. I received one letter which I think it might be of interest to read to the House because it deals with this matter and, in a certain way, with the popularity of certain members of the Government:

Montreal, January 17, 21.

P. F. Casgrain, K.C., M.P.,
Sir: C. J. Doherty—

I would like to put the prefix "Right Hon." but the letter does not bear it.

—C. J. Doherty arrived at G.T.R. station, morning, so popular that not a soul was there to meet him. This is the weakling you want to get after. Leave no stone unturned until you make him tell how he let that —— Tapley out.

I will not use the qualifying expression.

Mr. Casgrain, you are the only man who has the courage in the House of Commons to make him answer you and the public. Every one of us owe you a debt of gratitude for the able way you are handling this case. Keep right at it, Sir. Don't take no for an answer.

And the letter says:

Make this four-flusher answer you.

I will not say that.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I said, I will not say it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would draw the hon. members' attention to the circumstance that he cannot read from any letter or document any reference in respect to a minister or a member of this House which he could not say as a member, and I hope he will be very guarded in reading statements reflecting on any member.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I bow to your ruling. The letter goes on to say that it wishes me success and hopes that I will obtain a favourable answer, and it is signed by I. B. Hamilton. Section 12 of chapter 150 of the Statutes of Canada, 1906, the Act which deals with the conditional release of prisoners, or the Ticket of Leave Act, states that under certain circumstances, when a person, who has been released under ticket of leave, obtains his living and acts and does certain things by means which are dishonest—I have not the correct translation in English here; I have the French version in which paragraph (b) reads:

(b) qui lui paraît se procurer sa subsistance par des moyens malhonnêtes.

It may be that the means which this gentleman is taking to obtain his living are legal in a certain way if he can get away with it, but the question is as to the honesty of his methods, and I humbly submit that when such facts as I have brought before the House to-day are known to the minister, he will surely see to it that my motion is granted, or at least that a proper explanation is given to this House and to the people at large if there was any real excuse or reason for letting this man out of jail after having served only a few years of his sentence.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (acting Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) who has brought this matter to the attention of the House, may I be permitted to say at the outset that it is my duty to absolve the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) from all knowledge and responsibility in connection with the matter? As a matter of fact, I think that the Minister of Justice was not in Canada at the time action was decided upon in connection with this case. My hon. friend who has moved the motion is fully aware of the practice which has obtained in this Parliament, I suppose I am safe in saying, since the days of Confederation down to the present time, namely, that

documents are not laid before Parliament relating to criminal cases where clemency is sought, or in cases where clemency has been exercised by the Crown. It has been stated, and I believe the statement is accurate, that only in three cases since Confederation—very important and outstanding cases—has Parliament seen fit to order that papers be produced. The reports made in connection with such cases are of a highly confidential nature. If they were not treated with the strictest confidence it is very doubtful whether reports could be obtained in many instances.

Now, in the particular case under consideration, representations were made that cast very serious doubt upon this man's guilt in connection with the charge upon which he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of thirty years. The crime was a most revolting and abominable one. Certain public bodies in the city of Montreal took action in the matter, among others the Salvation Army, which, I suppose, was the most active of the participants in this case. The man's two sons, who had served nobly in France, one of them wounded, and the other coming back without a leg, on their return to Canada also took a deep interest in the case. The chief witness, in fact the only witness in the case, absolutely withdrew the whole evidence given at the trial upon which the man was convicted. This evidence was withdrawn in a sworn statement by the only witness in the prosecution. Explanations were given as to why the original evidence had been given in the prosecution against this man, and one very prominent body in Montreal, as I have said, the Salvation Army, went fully into the matter, making an elaborate report, and the officers of the department likewise investigated the case as exhaustively as possible, with the result that there is very grave doubt as to whether the man was actually guilty of the crime with which he had been charged. He had served, including remission earned under our law, some seven years of his term in penitentiary, a very substantial period. His conduct had been good, grave doubt existed as to his guilt and under all the circumstances it was considered a proper case in which to make a recommendation to his Excellency the Governor General, that he be granted a ticket of leave—not that he be free, but that he be permitted to serve the rest of his sentence under the ticket of leave system, which imposes upon him very strict conditions with which he must comply for the next twenty-three years of his life; otherwise, he is liable at any time to be rearrested and made to serve the rest of his term.

My hon. friend's motion asks that this man be rearrested and sent back to penitentiary. When ticket of leave is granted under the Ticket of Leave Act, it is absolutely forfeited and the man must go back to jail if he commits any indictable offence. An indictable offence involves absolute forfeiture of ticket of leave. Revocation of his ticket of leave takes place upon his conviction of an offence punishable on summary conviction under this or any other Act. If he commits an indictable offence, forfeiture takes place immediately; if he commits a minor offence, revocation may take place forthwith; and, in either case, he goes back to prison. But in addition to these facts, if he violates any of the conditions of his ticket of leave, he is liable to go and serve the balance of his term. In connection with all tickets of leave granted, the following conditions are imposed:

1. The holder shall preserve his license and produce it when called upon to do so by a magistrate or a peace officer.
2. He shall abstain from any violation of the law.
3. He shall not habitually associate with notoriously bad characters, such as reputed thieves and prostitutes.
4. He shall not lead an idle and dissolute life without visible means of obtaining an honest livelihood.

And he must comply with any other conditions which His Excellency the Governor General may impose. Then there is the other clause of the statute referred to by my hon. friend, which imposes further conditions. Section 12, subsection 2, provides as follows:

If it appears from the facts proved before the justice—

That is, in the event of the man being rearrested or charged with any offence.

that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the convict so brought before him is getting his livelihood by dishonest means, such convict shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Act, and his license shall be forfeited.

The law is particularly plain upon this point, and the procedure in such cases is exceedingly simple. If the man whose case is now under discussion is guilty of getting his livelihood by dishonest means, his ticket of leave is forfeited and he goes back to prison. But the fact that he is living dishonestly must be established. From what I have learned from the statement of my hon. friend who moved this motion, this man seems to have been a money lender

who holds certain judgments against certain debtors. They are apparently judgments of the court, and so long as they stand I assume they are valid judgments; and I do not think that any one would suggest that a creditor in pursuing his rights under a judgment could be held to be getting his livelihood by dishonest means. I know nothing of the circumstances or conditions in regard to the debts which led up to the judgments. All that my hon. friend has to say on that score may be absolutely true, but this is the question that confronts us: Is the man living a life in accordance with his ticket of leave or his license? Is he free from crime? If he is he will not be molested. Is he obtaining his living by dishonest means? If he is, he will be arrested. There are courts in the city of Montreal competent to try such matters and reach a proper conclusion: I am sure the House is not such a tribunal.

My hon. friend's motion simply asks that the license, or ticket of leave, granted to this man be set aside, and that he be arrested and sent back to the penitentiary to finish his term. The motion asks us to do something in this House contrary to the plain meaning and effect of the Ticket of Leave Act. The Act declares—that is, this Parliament has said—that under these conditions this man shall be permitted to serve the balance of his sentence at large so long as he lives up to the conditions imposed upon him under his ticket of leave and under the Act of Parliament. My hon. friend's motion seeks practically to set aside the provisions of this Act of Parliament, and the license granted under that Act, and re-arrest this man. I think when the matter is clearly placed before my hon. friend, he will see that the position which he has taken is hardly a sound one, much room as there may be for comment upon the actual condition which exists in regard to this matter in Montreal. I know nothing of these facts, but from my hon. friend's statement I take it that the man has obtained judgments in respect of debt against some people in that city, that he is a pretty ardent creditor and is pursuing the debtors unduly or with great vigour as the case may be. But the law gives him that right. If the judgments are wrong they will be set aside in the civil courts. If he is breaking the law, bring him before the magistrate and have him re-committed; but so long as he lives up to the license that has been granted him under the Act of Parliament that man should not be molested.

Motion negatived.

QUEBEC RIOTS OF 1918

On the proposed motion by Mr. Casgrain,

That, in the opinion of this House, the proper measures should be adopted in order to insure to the citizens who sustained any losses on account of the so-called Quebec riots in 1918, proper indemnity for such losses.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am ready to proceed with the motion, but I am informed that there are other members on this side who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. They are not here at present, however, and for that reason I would like to have the motion continued.

Mr. SPEAKER: The resolution stands. I take it that the resolution next in order, in the name of the hon. member for West Quebec (Mr. Parent), is practically the same motion. Perhaps under those circumstances the hon. member would consent to drop that resolution.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Resolution No. 15 of the hon. member for Charlevoix and Montmorency?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, it stands.

Mr. PARENT: I would like my resolution to remain.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member could not debate it until the preceding resolution is disposed of. As a matter of fact he could not debate it this session at all.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Then I will withdraw my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolution 15 (Mr. Casgrain) dropped. Resolution 16 (Mr. Parent) stands.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, work on the Hudson Bay railway which was commenced in 1910 and continued to the end of 1918 should be resumed as early this year as possible, and the project completed without any further delay.

He said: Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that in 1911 an important election campaign was fought in Canada. The main issue during that compaign was the question of reciprocity. In the West, however, there were a few other questions which were very important, in fact not much less im-

portant, than the issue alluded to. These were the transfer to the Prairie Provinces of their natural resources, and the completion of the Hudson Bay railway which at that time had been started. Owing to the fact that the Conservative party at that time were not prepared to submit a policy upon the question of reciprocity which met with the approval of the western people, they laid particular emphasis upon the other two issues referred to and gave them much prominence in their platform and in their speeches. I shall not now discuss the question of the transfer to the provinces of their natural resources; that matter is dealt with in another resolution which stands on the Order Paper in my name. However as to the Hudson Bay railway and its completion, I wish to read a clause or plank in the platform of the Conservative party at that time. It is known as the Halifax platform and clause 3 of the document reads as follows:

> Construction of the Hudson Bay railway and its operation by an independent commission.

That was a plank or pledge, in the platform of the late Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden who, during his western tour in that campaign, had this to say about the project.

> The Conservative party has been committed to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway since 1896. The road will be built by the next Conservative Administration without one day's unnecessary delay. It will be operated by an independent commission on behalf, and in the interests, of the people, with full control of rates.

It is hardly necessary for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that that pledge has not been implemented, that the road has not been built, and that delays—both unnecessary and otherwise—have taken place. In brief the situation is as follows: For a period of almost half a century the Hudson Bay Railway project has been before the people of Canada. The history of the enterprise is most unique. There never has been, nor is there now, any party or party leader opposed to the undertaking. On the contrary the construction of the railway has been advocated and promised by all political parties and leaders from the time of the government of Sir John A. Macdonald to the present, the only point of disagreement being as to what party or what government could best and most expeditiously construct the road. The feasibility and practicability of the Hudson Bay route was investigated by different expeditions and commissions. Reports were duly presented and on the strength of these the Government of the day, that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, decided to build the railway and were strongly supported by the then opposition, under the leadership of Mr. (now Sir) Robert Borden. The work was commenced in 1910. On the change of Government in 1911, operations were stopped pending further investigation by the new Government, and re-commenced in 1912, the announcement then being made that the road would be finished in 1915. The outbreak of the war caused no cessation in operations, in fact the work of construction was even accelerated. Most of the work on the road and nearly all that on the terminals was done in the years, 1915, 1916 and 1917. An item of $1,000,000 was in the Estimates of 1918 to complete the road but practically no work was done that year except the small amount to complete the bridge over Kettle rapids.

The war ended in 1918 and so did the work on the railway. The situation was then, and is now, as follows: The grade is completed from the Pas to Port Nelson, a distance of 424 miles. Steel is laid 332 miles involving the construction of two steel bridges at a cost of over $700,000. The total cost to date is approximately $14,000,000 for the railway, and work on the terminals has cost over $6,000,000. It is necessary to lay only 92 miles of steel to connect the railway with the terminals, and the estimated cost is $1,700,000. And now after all these years, after carrying on the work throughout the war period, after about $21,000,000 has been spent, and just when the end is in sight, it would appear that the Government has abandoned, for an indefinite period, the project to disuse, deterioration and decay while deciding to go on with other public works, mainly in the East, an action that on the face of it passes my comprehension.

This project has been before the people of Canada for over half a century. It came up at the time of the entrance of Manitoba into the Confederation in 1870. I well remember when a very young boy in Winnipeg being interested, as everybody was, in the election campaign of 1887, the candidates there being Hugh Sutherland and William B. Scarth, the latter the candidate of Sir John A. Macdonald's Government. The only question at issue was the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and the only point of interest to the people was which one of the candidates could best bring about that desired end. The Government of the day made a strong bid for support, and as a result their candidate won out by about twelve votes, I think it was, purely and simply on that issue.

In 1896, before the general election was held, the then leader of the Conservative

party and Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper, had this to say re the proposed construction of the Hudson Bay railway:

I cannot understand why any hon. gentleman should be induced to denounce and endeavour to hold up to ridicule, as impracticable, a work upon which not only the sentiments of the people of Manitoba and the Northwest are centred to-day as upon no other question, but a work that I believe, having studied it carefully for many years, is of the most vital consequence to the progress and development of that great country. Now, Sir, I have always been recognized in this House as one who believes thoroughly in Manitoba and the Northwest. Indeed, I may say that, in my judgment, the rapid development and progress of Canada as a whole depends more upon the development of that great prairie region between the Red river and the Rocky mountains, than upon any other scheme that can be devised.

All hon. members will recollect the result of that general election. The matter came up in the second session of 1896 by a question from the gentleman who is now member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), and in reply Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that an investigation would be proceeded with, as it was the duty of the Government to do so, and afterwards the matter would be gone on with at the earliest possible date. That investigation was proceeded with in various ways during the next few years. In 1906 the matter again came up in this House on a resolution by Mr. W. E. Knowles: That in the opinion of this House it is urgently necessary that the Government should take all possible steps for the speedy construction of a railway to the shores of Hudson bay. The hon. Thomas Greenway, speaking to the motion, mentioned the fact that thirty years before he had been a member of a committee that took evidence in this connection. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster)—who I am sorry to see has left his seat—had some very pertinent remarks to make on the question at that particular time. He spoke as follows:

With reference to the special one which has been brought up to-day, I believe the time has come—

That was in 1907.

—when the Hudson Bay railroad should be more than an academic question, just to be talked of sympathetically. I believe it ought to be built, and it cannot be built now any too soon. I believe the best plan for building it would be to add the sympathy of the Northwest provinces to the sympathy of the Dominion Government as the central power, join all these sympathies together and make the sympathy practical, and have the road built on fair conditions up to the great northern port of Canada. I think without doubt that the prophecy that was hinted at by the mover of this resolution, and the sentiment expressed by myself, cannot be held to be true until it is actually put into experiment; but I believe that a four months' season is perfectly feasible for that northern route. If the old Hudson Bay company, a hundred years ago, got their punts in there through the ice and storms, and made their ports with great regularity, and had an average season of between three and four months for a long period, what can be done with modern forces of invention, with vessels built of any degree of strength you wish, and with any amount of motive power you want to put into them, in comparison with those early pioneers? So I believe it is perfectly feasible to have an open route there and a commercial route as well for four months and possibly a good deal longer period, if the proper attempts are made for carrying out the experiment to a practical conclusion.

A little later he said:

The opening up of this route may work as great changes in that section as the Tehuantepec railway which has just been opened across the Mexican peninsula and the Panama canal, ten or twenty years hence when it is completed will work in connection with Atlantic and Pacific trade routes in the central part of this continent. I should like to see Canada get her short line in the north built as quickly as possible, and I believe that it will greatly enhance the value of Canadian products and of Canadian lands and the wealth of the Canadian nation as a whole.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier in that debate said:

I agree with every sentiment which has been uttered here that there could be no difference of interest between the East and the West. What is doing good for the West is doing good for the East, and vice versa.

In 1908 there was what might be called a full dress debate in this House in connection with that resolution. Fourteen hon. members, both of Conservative and Liberal complexion took part in it. The West, of course, was represented, as was also Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the result of the debate showed the House was practically unanimous in the conclusion that the work should be gone on with. If you permit me, Mr. Speaqer, I shall read a few brief quotations from the speeches made at that time. The gentleman who is now Sir Richard Lake, the late Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan, spoke as follows:

Let me also say that which I think has not been called attention to this evening, namely, this route will be most useful from a military standpoint.

I intended to discuss the question from that standpoint myself, but I am going to let the words of Sir Richard Lake suffice:

Should unhappily we ever be in a state of war in Canada, such a line of railway would be most invaluable to Canada and to the Empire, and it would also be invaluable as affording a safer trade route than any now existing for the food

supplies of the Mother Country. Even if we look at it from a certain point of view, it would give us an immense advantage over any rivals we may have in the furnishing of that food supply, because there can be no doubt that the northerly route would be the safest for the transport of food products to the United Kingdom. It would afford a short route also, the shortest of all routes, by which Imperial troops could be quickly and expeditiously and safely conveyed to the Far East. . . . We do not look upon that as an enterprise in the ordinary acceptation of the term; we look upon it as an absolute necessity to the continued development of our great provinces in the Northwest.

Mr. A. A. McLean, the then member for Queen's, spoke as follows:

It really seems to me in looking at the map that every man east of the Baie des Chaleurs ought to hold up his hand for the construction of a railway to Fort Churchill, provided they are convinced of the navigability of Hudson straits for even five months in the year. The industrial communities of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would thereby secure easy access to the northern part of this continent for their manufactured products by securing direct water shipment and avoiding the heavy tolls charged on the different railways, while so far as regards the agricultural interests of Prince Edwad Island and Cape Breton, contiguous to the route, there is every reason to suppose that they would be able to find a ready market among our own people for all they have to sell.

Mr. George W. Fowler, then representing King's and Albert, and now in the Senate, and who recently presided over a committee that investigated this project and made the last report in connection therewith, said:

The question of the Hudson Bay railway is a very important question to the people of the West. I do not believe that a more feasible route for a new transportation line can be found than by way of Hudson Bay. For my part, though coming from the extreme East, I am strongly in favour of the construction of this road.

The late Prime Minister, then Mr. R. L. Borden, made these remarks:

In regard to the general question, the subject is one of intense interest to the people of the West. That is perfectly apparent to any gentleman who has gone to the West and who knows how thoroughly the people of Manitoba and the two other provinces are convinced that the Hudson Bay route will give to them an outlet which is absolutely necessary to the full and complete development of their country.

Mr. McCarthy, who then represented Calgary, spoke along the same lines. And I need not read the speech made by Hon. Dr. Roche, who subsequently occupied a position in the Cabinet of Sir Robert Borden. Dr. Schaffner, now Senator Schaffner, who has been a consistent and persistent advocate of this route all along, also spoke to the same effect. I wish to read in this connection an extract from the speech of Mr. J. Herron, of Alberta, which refers particularly to the benefit that the establishment of such a route would confer on the cattle industry. He said:

I would like, however, to say that one phase of the Hudson Bay route which especially commends it to the favour of the people of Southern Alberta, lies in the advantage that it will offer in connection with the shipment of cattle from that range country. Our wild stock raised on the prairies do not take kindly to transportation by rail. It is the long railway journey from Alberta to the sea-coast that takes practically the cream off the business of cattle raising on the western plains; and if we had a railroad to Hudson Bay, it would give us the advantage of a shorter railway journey by 1,000 miles. For that reason alone the people of Southern Alberta are specially interested in the building of that railroad. I would be glad to see the Government take up the question in a practical way and carry it to a termination instead of simply using it for political purposes from year to year, and letting it end at that. With these remarks I merely wish to state that I will support the resolution.

As I have intimated, we have statements there from six different provinces, all emphatically in favour of this project; and the statements are made by gentlemen on both sides of the political fence.

In 1910 the work was commenced by the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier by the construction of a bridge over the Saskatchewan at The Pas. The question, however, again came up in this House in 1911 on motion of Mr. D. B. Neely, then member for Humboldt. I refer to this as I wish to give two or three more quotations, one of which is from the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals at that time, the late Hon. Frank Cochrane—and this is very emphatic and definite:

I want to tell him now that this Government will carry out the promises they made when in Opposition. There has been no change of policy in reference to the building of the Hudson Bay railway... There will be no further delay than is absolutely necessary for the checking up of these surveys.

Sir Robert Borden, then Mr. Borden, Prime Minister, said on that occasion:

We expect to proceed with the construction of this road, to preceed with it as soon as we can possibly do so, having regard to what is demanded by the interests of the country both east and west, namely that the very best route shall be selected.

The only question raised at that time it will be noticed was the checking up of surveys and the location of the route. The House will be interested, I am sure, to hear a quotation in this respect from the remarks of the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) on that occasion, he was somewhat doubtful as to the Government's bona fides in the matter. He said:

But the attitude of the present Government with regard to the Hudson Bay railway now appears to be that this road is going to be changed, to be delayed, and perhaps indefinitely postponed. That is not a satisfactory condition of affairs.

If, Mr. Speaker, it was not a satisfactory condition in December 1911, it is certainly no less unsatisfactory at the present time. After the conclusion of the election campaign of 1911 the work was stopped, the reason given being that what had been done by the previous Administration needed investigation, and that the question of the route would have to be looked into further. This was done, and in 1912 the work was recommenced. During 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, the war years, the greatest amount of work was done on this road. It has always been difficult for me to understand how it was that when we were straining every effort to bring the war to a successful conclusion the greatest amount of work was done and the most money was spent on this project. I can only explain that by the assumption that the Government thought the war might last a considerable length of time and that it was necessary to get the Hudson Bay railway finished in order that it might furnish one important link in the chain of preparations that were being made for the successful conclusion of the war. A great many people thought that if the Hudson Bay railway had been completed when the war broke out, supplies and reinforcements could have been got over much more quickly and thus have materially assisted in bringing about the desired end. However, without going into the details, I may say that approximately three-quarters of the total amount spent on the project was spent during those years.

In 1918 the Estimates contained an item of $1,000,000 for the completion of the road, and it was intimated at that time that by the use of certain material which the Government had on hand the road could be completed for that amount. At the beginning of 1918 all there was to do before going on with the laying of steel was the finishing of the bridge over the Nelson river at Kettle Rapids which bridge cost approximately $400,000 but the completion of this bridge was all the work that was done that year; the money voted was not expended. Some of us in the House at that time urged that if the work was not completed it should at least be gone on with and the rails laid eighteen miles further on in order to connect up with a couple of trestles over the Limestone river and thus prevent their being washed out by spring freshets. Nothing, however, was done, and these trestles have since been lost.

In 1919 the opinion began to prevail out in the West that the Government did not intend to go on with the railway, and as everyone out there was interested, resolutions were passed by various public bodies and delegations came down to Ottawa from Provincial Governments from boards of trade, from Municipal Councils, from Grain Growers Associations and other public associations throughout the West. Delegations from the Provincial Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the Winnipeg Board of Trade, the Saskatoon Board of Trade, from Boards of Trade of the Pas, Moosomin, Belford, Yorkton, and other places interviewed the Government. I might say that at this time the western members got together and in a caucus which they held passed a very strong resolution urging on the Government that no further delay be incurred in connection with the completion of this project. I shall not read the resolution in toto; I quote simply a couple of clauses from it:

Therefore, it is resolved that in the opinion of the subscribing members of the House of Commons that to leave the road incomplete is to waste a great part of twenty millions of dollars, and that this and not preceding Governments will be held responsible for such waste.

Further down it says:

That the railway is a national undertaking long overdue and until the enterprise is complete, it will be a disturbing element in western thought and Canadian politics. That the experience gained when in Manitoba the Canadian Pacific monopoly was broken and southern railway connections brought added traffic will be repeated, and the resources to be developed by this railway should assure an increase of traffic on existing systems.

This was signed by all but two of the western members, on all sides of politics who were then present.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the construction of the Hudson bay railway was a plank in the platforms of all the Dominion parties. It was a plank in the platforms of the parties of the western provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta. It was supported by all the leaders of both parties from the time it first became a public question until the present, including the present leaders of the three parties in this House; yet in the face of this we have the unsatisfactory condition which exists.

I do not propose to go into the question of the feasibility or the practicability of the route; that would appear to me to be simply a work of supererogation. Investigations have taken place; expeditions have been sent out; evidence has been taken by commissions; committees of this House and of the Senate have reported at different times during these years, all practically with the one result as summed up in the last report of the Senate, which was submitted last year, and which, in epitome, said that the Hudson Bay route was feasible and practicable and urged that it be gone on with. One government commenced the work; another government stopped the work in order to envestigate certain features of the project and the procedure in general. Then, after some delay, the work was again resumed rather briskly, but after a number of years, without any reason whatever being given, the work was stopped.

The West is solid for this project, and I am satisfied that the bulk of opinion in the East is favourable to it. The situation in the East has probably changed in recent years, and I know personally that newspapers which formerly opposed this project are now in favour of it. There is no reason whatever why the East should oppose it in any way. Some say that the territory through which the Hudson Bay railway passes is a barren waste and the idea of its being an overseas route is impracticable. We well remember however the statements made when the Canadian Pacific railway was under contract and construction in the first instance, how papers in the East said that it would never pay and how they generally ridiculed the idea that there would ever be any settlements on the western plains. The same statements are now being made as regards the Hudson Bay railway and the north country generally, with the same reason. The arguments adduced at the time the work was started are still good. The western plains are still 1,000 or 1,500 miles nearer to the markets of the world by this route than by any other. It provides an additional route, as was argued at that time. It also provides a natural and exclusively Canadian route, as was also argued then. The evidence brought out shows that cargoes can be shipped over that route by rail and water; that return cargoes can be obtained, and that the straits can be navigated. A casual glance at the map will show that Hudson bay is still in the same position, and it looks as if it were providentially placed there in order to be a great outlet for the products of the West.

Not only are the old arguments good, but since the Hudson Bay railway has been started, additional arguments and reasons for its completion have come to the fore. It is now known that there are in that district resources of which we had not dreamed at the time the Hudson Bay railway was first projected. And the bay itself is an important asset. A few years ago the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway was projected and constructed by the Ontario Government to tap the clay belt in northern Ontario. By means of that railway, discoveries have been made which have put Ontario on the map as a mining country, and the benefits of that railway cannot be overestimated. Some such situation as that may occur, in fact is taking place, with regard to the Hudson Bay railway. There is, within fifteen miles from Mile 82 on the railway an important gold deposit which is rapidly coming into prominence and which may yet take its place as a producer alongside that famous district of northern Ontario. I might say also, to give another instance of what the Hudson Bay railway has done for that northern territory, that one of the engineers on the railway, along with a companion in the year 1915, while on a prospecting expedition in that territory, discovered a body of copper sulphide ore from which 26,000 tons have already been shipped to Trail, B.C., at an expense of approximately $50 per ton, the amount realized being over $100 per ton. Thus it was, that the Mandy mine was discovered and brought to the attention of the public. Within a few miles of that mine, there is a deposit of copper, a similar sulphide ore, not nearly so valuable per ton, but much more extensive, which after two or three years of diamond drilling at an expense of probably half a million dollars, has proven up to the extent of sixteen to twenty million tons of an average value of eight to ten dollars per ton. These are a few items showing the situation with reference to the mineral resources up in that country.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member favouring the construction of the Hudson Bay railway because of the resources that may be developed in that northern country and for transportation inland, or because

of the facilities for transportation overseas?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The original argument for the Hudson bay route was that it would facilitate transportation overseas. But since the road has been under construction, it has been shown that the natural resources, not only in the district, but in the bay itself, are such as would fully warrant the construction of the railway, simply for the purpose of developing those resources by opening up the country, and connecting with the bay itself if the other questions were left out of consideration altogether. Thus, instead of one argument, we have now three arguments for constructing and completing that route at the earliest possible date.

Mr. EULER: Will the hon. member state definitely for how many months in the year one can count on the Hudson strait being open? Is it not the case that it will be open for two months only?

Mr. CAMPBELL: As I said before, I did not purpose going into the question of navigability of the straits and the feasibility of the route generally, on account of the fact that so many commissions have taken evidence on this matter and there is so much evidence that I could take up the time of the House from now until late in the evening going into this question. But as the hon. member asks me what I think, I will tell him, that from the evidence submitted, it is safe to say that the strait will be open for navigation for a period of four months in the year, and that with modern aids to navigation which were not possible in years past, such as the aeroplane, wireless telegraphy and various other instruments that have been discovered within recent years, that period might readily be extended to five months. Personally, I think I am safe in saying that. There are gentlemen who know the situation, who have lived up in the district, who have investigated the matter thoroughly, who will go further than that. There are others who will not go quite so far. If I were to go into this question fully, I would take up more time than I think would be necessary, and I take it for granted that the Government were fully satisfied on this point before they expended $20,000,000 on the project.

In that northern country, in addition to the resources that I have mentioned, there are extensive water-powers. Those on the Nelson are estimated to amount to between two and three million horse-power. The Hudson Bay railway runs for a great distance almost parallel to the Nelson river, and some of those water-powers could be used in connection with the railway itself. There are great areas of pulpwood in close proximity to the water-powers. Besides—and I just wish to mention this fact—notwithstanding statements that have been made otherwise, there are immense areas of land which are suitable for agriculture and which will eventually be developed. In a government publication issued by the Natural Resources Development Branch of the Department of the Interior, this statement is made:

> One of the principal factors in bringing it into prominence, however,—

That is the district and its resources.

> —was the construction of the Hudson Bay division of the Canadian Government railways.

The House is familiar to some extent with the writings of the Messrs. Tyrrell who have travelled that country extensively during the last twenty-five years, and in a book issued by them a statement is made that the Hudson bay itself will be looked upon in the future as a national asset; that it contains immense fishing resources and in the surrounding lands are to be found iron, galena, graphite, mica and other minerals.

The construction of this railway is of paramount necessity to the West.

Canadian Finance is an independent financial journal published in Winnipeg. It is non political and is edited by men who look upon matters from a sound sensible, and practical standpoint. It says:

> The development of the untold resources of the North is dependent to a great extent upon the railroad facilities which the Hudson's Bay Railway will provide.
>
> For this reason, if for no other, the railways should be proceeded with energetically. Western Canada needs it and desires no unnecessary delay in its completion.

That is another statement that will furnish an answer to the question of my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). The Hudson Bay railway is to the Western Provinces what the Intercolonial was to the Maritime Provinces and what the Canadian Pacific was to British Columbia. With this difference, that not only were definite promises made but agreements were entered into between the Government of the day and the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia respectively regarding these two railways, whereas in connection with the Hudson Bay railway

we have simply the statements of different governments and their leaders regarding its construction. Is the word of this Government as good as its bond? If so, this railway will be constructed just as these other railways have been. But if the promise made to the people of the West is not as binding as the promises made to the people of these other parts of Canada, then presumably the project will be allowed to lapse and nothing further be done. We take it, of course, that the Government has regard for its promises and will go ahead with this railway as it is in duty bound to do.

The West and the Government itself appear to be increasingly confident in the success of this railway. If hon. gentlemen will look at the map which used to hang in the Railway Committee room, hut which I have not seen since the new Railway Committee room has been opened, they will find that nearly all, or a great many at all events, of the branch lines which have been constructed recently and are being constructed in the West have been projected with the idea of ultimately connecting up with the Hudson Bay railway. Delegations were here during the last two years from the different parts of the West, one from Moosomin and Yorkton, with the idea of getting a line from the Estevan coal fields almost straight north to connect up with Hudson Bay Junction and the Hudson Bay railway. The line running out of Melfort northeasterly from that point it intended eventually to link up with the Hudson Bay railway, and Saskatoon, and Calgary. I might quote other instances but these are sufficient for the time being. Hon. members will find by the map I have referred to, that fourteen charters have been granted for railways to the Hudson bay, most of them from the west side, but one or two from the east side. Before concluding I might say that as far as I can make out no real reasons have been given for abandoning this project. The only reason that is put forward at the present time is the matter of economy. You may recollect, Mr. Speaker, having read the statement of Artemus Ward, who intimated that he was at the time of the Civil War, ready to sacrifice all his wife's relations on the altar of his country. That seems to be the attitude taken by the Government at the present time. They are prepared to sacrifice this project but they are not prepared to sacrifice other things nearer home. In view of the lavish expenditure of 1919, and of the proposed expenditures in the Estimates which have recently been brought down, wherein provision has been made for Toronto Harbour works, the Welland canal, the ever present Trent canal, a new dry dock at Esquimalt and St. John Harbour works it would seem that one particular undertaking is being sacrificed in the interests of economy, and other new ones brought forward. I had intended to take up the question of providing rails and ties for this railway but shall defer doing so, except to say that the course of the Government in the last few years has shown some of us conclusively and emphatically that there does not appear to be any intention on the part of the Government to go on with this project, but rather to let it lapse into deterioration and decay. I think I am safe in saying that every year the work is allowed to stand as it is will mean the loss of $1,000,000 at least and possibly more. Hon. gentlemen will readily understand that a railway with 324 miles of steel completely laid, and 92 additional miles of a dump, will, if left to the by no means tender mercies of the elements, soon suffer great depreciation and loss.

In conclusion I wish to say, what perhaps is not generally known, that the West itself is paying for this road. In 1909 in a discussion on an item of Supply there appears in Hansard the following:

> Mr. Lake: It was understood by this House, I think, that the money to be expended on the construction of the Hudson Bay railway was to come from a special fund to be created by the sale of pre-emptions.
>
> Mr. Graham: Yes.

It would appear to me unnecessary to read any more in this connection. I made inquiry last year, and got a statement to the effect that approximately $28,000,000 of these pre-emptions had been sold in Western Canada up to that time. Unfortunately, I have not the statement with me, but that is the amount in round figures. Of that $28,000,000 approximately one-half had already been collected. This money, according to the statement I have just read, is intended to be applied to the construction and completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

If ever there was a case made out for any public work in Canada it has surely been made out for the Hudson Bay railway. If ever solemn promises and definite pledges have been given by any political party or its leaders, they have been given

in connection with this railway; but these solemn promises have been broken, and not even a plausible excuse has been given. The only conclusion that some of us can come to is that there must be behind the Government some special interests who are opposed to the construction of this road and are preventing further work being done, such interests being, for reasons best known to themselves, not in position to show their hand at the present time. I now beg to move the resolution seconded by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox).

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to discuss the resolution, but rather to raise at this juncture a point of order. It seems to me a resolution of this character comes within the category of those which the rules of the House provide cannot be submitted by a private member. It must be manifest to every hon. member that if the resolution passes, it involves at once either the expenditure of public money or the introduction of an appropriation for the purpose. It virtually amounts to a direction by the House for large immediate commitments. It would occur to me that if it is competent for a resolution of this character to be introduced by a private member, it should be just as competent for a Bill involving the same result to be so introduced. In fact, I do not see any value whatever in the well-known reservation that financial commitments are to be initiated by the Government alone, if resolutions of this character can be introduced and discussed. At all events, I submit that thought to yourself, Mr. Speaker, for consideration. I know that no one will be disposed to dispute the wisdom of the rule that acts of Parliament or resolutions involving expenditure of public money should be introduced only at the initiation of the Government, because otherwise there seems to me to be no restraint which the Government, as those fundamentally responsible, can exercise over expenditure. Furthermore, the members of the House themselves are put in a very difficult position if the House is to be committed, either by resolution or by Bill, to large expenditures at the initiation of a private member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister has raised a very intricate point of order, and one on which I would not care to give a decision off-hand. The hon. member whose name has been submitted as the seconder of the resolution has risen to speak, and I would prefer that for the present he go on with his discussion of the resolution. I would prefer to reserve my decision on the point of order in the meantime, and perhaps I shall be able to give it later on in the discussion.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): If I might be permitted on the point of order, while the general ground as stated by my right hon. friend is correct, I think the rules of the House permit an expression of abstract opinion that does not in itself call for public expenditure, and I am inclined to think, and I submit it for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution of the hon. gentleman comes within that rule—that it does not call for an expenditure of public money. On the merits of the question I do not wish to say anything at all. I just wish to submit that thought for your consideration on the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be quite competent for any hon. member to discuss the point of order, but I would prefer that discussion to come a little later on when I am prepared to give a ruling. In the meantime I would like the seconder of the resolution to proceed with his address.

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in seconding this resolution I wish very briefly to deal with one or two points which I consider of vital importance to the people of the West, and incidentally to the people of the whole Dominion. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Compbell) has gone into the matter very fully, and brought out a number of very important points as to why this project should be completed. He has shown that a great asset of the Dominion of Canada exists in this route up to and through the Hudson bay, and I think there can be no question that this asset is at the present time deteriorating and being allowed to go backward instead of forward. I am intensely interested in the development of the natural resources of this country, and particularly of those resources in the great Hinterland of the Northwest more or less tributary to the Hudson bay. I cannot think of anything that would tend to the development of those resources more than the opening up of that country by the Hudson Bay railway. There is one other reason which impresses itself upon my mind as to the necessity of doing something along the line of opening up this route, and that is the fact that at the present time the West is carrying a very heavy burden in the shape of high freight rates. These freight rates have the effect of causing trade and production to stagnate, in that

supplies shipped into the West have to be carried over a most expensive system of transportation, and the products of the West have also to be shipped out over that same system. I believe that the development of the Hudson Bay route would overcome that difficulty to a certain extent.

The belief prevails very strongly throughout the West that eastern interests are in some way opposed to the opening up of the Hudson Bay route. Consequently, we believe that the delay in completing the project has been inspired by those interests. That belief does prevail very strongly throughout the West. The people of the West have been looking forward for this railway for a great number of years. I might state that at the annual meetings of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association we have dealt with this question year after year for probably 15 years. A resolution has been passed at every meeting after discussion, and in every case carried by a unanimous vote.

As to the difference in distance for supplies going into the West or produce coming out of the West, if we take some point in the middle West, say the town of Kindersley, which is a prominent central point, we find that the difference in distance to the ocean outlet from Kindersley is almost 1,100 miles in favour of the Hudson Bay route via Nelson as compared with a point such as Montreal. In the constituency I have the honour to represent, which produces a great deal of produce in the shape of both beef and grain, the difference in distance from almost any point in the constituency is over 1,200 miles. This is something which should surely appeal not only to the people of the West but to the whole Dominion, for the more prosperity we have in the West, the more prosperity we have in the whole Dominion. As to the present state of the road, I have not seen it personally, but I have discussed it with people who have been over it, and I wish to quote a short extract from a western newspaper written by a man who is thoroughly conversant with the road and has been over it. He says:

> The ties under those 333 miles of finished track from The Pas to Kettle Rapids are rotten, so rotten that a slow moving train which creeps out twice each month is derailed time after time from spreading rails. The writer was on this train two trips out this past summer, and saw the box cars turned over on their sides, the ties shattered into rotten bits and the rails warped out of shape, because the track is not being taken care of. It is a disgrace to the railway department to so neglect a priceless asset of the Canadian people, and the time will come when somebody must be called to account for this condition of things.

Hon. members from the West have on many occasions drawn the attention of the Department of Railways and Canals to the state of this road, and are anxiously pressing that some attention be paid to it, so that the present condition shall not continue.

I do not intend to go into the question of the feasibility of the route because that has been conceded by both the old political parties, and has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Nelson. I should like, however, to refer to the fact that a Senate committee was appointed last year, consisting of 12 members and in their final report I find this:

> The committee had in view the securing of information on the following points:
>
> (1) The length of the season during which the bay and strait were reasonably navigable, having in view the presence of ice, the occurrence and persistence of snowstorms, the advantages to be gained by aids to navigation, such as wireless telegraphy, lighthouses, fog signals, and hydroplanes.
>
> (2) The style and size of vessels to be used for the carrying trade.
>
> (3) The relative merits of the two ports, Nelson and Churchill, and the relative cost of the development of each port.
>
> (4) The fishing resources of the bay and strait and of the rivers emptying into the bay.
>
> (5) The mineral resources of the country tributary to the bay.
>
> (6) The utilization of the country for the production of meat and furs to be obtained from the reindeer and musk ox, which would subsist upon the extremely nutritious grasses grown there.

This committee was appointed on April 22 of last year, and, after holding fifteen meetings and examining twenty-one witnesses brought from different parts of the Dominion, who had a knowledge of conditions, they submitted their report on June 4. I shall not read the whole report because it is rather lengthy, but I desire to quote the following:

> Your committee makes the following findings upon the evidence adduced before them:
>
> (1) That the Hudson Bay route is feasible and will probably in time be profitable.
>
> (2) That the season of navigation under present conditions is at least four months in length and may by reason of improvements in aids to navigation be considerably increased.

I would draw the attention of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), who made inquiries as to the length of the season, to the paragraph I have just read.

> (3) That in the opinion of this committee sufficient care was not taken in the selection of Nelson as the terminus of the railway, and that the Government should not make further important expenditures upon this port without first making a new and thorough examination into the relative merits of Churchill and Nelson as a terminus of the railroad.
>
> (4) That the waters of the strait and rivers tributary to the bay teem with fish and valu-

able marine animals, and we believe that the bay is equally well stocked but there has not yet been sufficient data collected as to the extent of the fisheries of the bay to enable an authoritative statement to be made as to their value.

(5) That the mines already discovered in the Hudson bay district are of sufficient number and richness to indicate the existence of great potential mineral wealth.

(6) Your committee feel that they cannot too strongly endorse the value of the suggestion of Mr. Stefansson as to the cultivation of the reindeer and musk ox, and would urge upon the Government that the Department of the Interior be empowered to take hold of this matter, earnestly taking advantage of what has been done in this regard by the United States Government.

(7) Your committee, although it is somewhat outside the scope of their mandate, cannot close this report without making some reference to the national value of the explorations of Vihljalmur Stefansson. He has completely revolutionized our ideas of the region within the Polar Circle. He has demonstrated that it is possible for white men to live and thrive in that northern region though drawing from no other resources than those afforded by the country itself, and he has proven that those lands which were looked upon as barren and utterly worthless will eventually be a valuable asset to Canada. The committee ventures the hope that the Canadian Government will not be unmindful of the great services performed by Mr. Stefansson, whose reward so far has not been commensurate with the national importance of the work he has accomplished.

(8) Your committee expresses its thanks to the gentlemen who have voluntarily come forward and given valuable evidence upon the important matters under consideration.

(9) Your committee submit herewith an extract in narrative form of the evidence given before the committee, and beg to recommend that one thousand copies of this report and the extract of the evidence be printed in pamphlet form for general distribution.

All which is respectfully submitted.

GEO. W. FOWLER,
Chairman.

I do not wish to detain the House any further, but I would say that we recognize the necessity of economy at the present time. In looking over the Estimates one is struck by the fact that the Government seems bold enough to put an item there for $5,000,000 for the Welland canal, a project which cannot have any immediate result. Such being the case, surely it is not out of place to request that they consider the completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to give a ruling on the point of order raised by the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen), but if any hon. member desires to be heard, he may speak on the point of order now.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the point of order is well taken. The fact that an hon. member introduces a resolution for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the House on the subject with which it deals by no means binds the Government to any action involving the expenditure of public moneys. I think there are precedents in support of this contention. If the point of order were sustained, the effect, in my opinion, would be to preclude any member of the House of Commons from expressing his views on any important subject affecting the welfare of the country, or of learning the opinions of other hon. gentlemen. After all, a resolution dealing with any public work must ultimately involve the expenditure of public moneys. For instance, the resolution of my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power), asks that the walls of Quebec be maintained; and that, as well as any other resolution having for its object the erection of a monument, say, or the performance of any other public work, would ultimately mean the expenditure of public money, if the proposals put forward in the resolution are to be given any effect at all. Now, I do not think it is the intention of the rule to preclude the expression of views by the House on public questions which might ultimately involve public expenditures. The resolution of the hon. member does not necessarily bind the Government; there would first have to be a mandate from the Governor General in Council before public moneys could be spent. I do not think it has ever been the intention of Parliament to prevent members from merely advocating that certain necessary public works should be done. In this case, very many members of this House have decided that the building of the Hudson Bay railway should be completed. I understand that the works have been suspended. To-day an hon. member gets up and asks the House to concur in his opinion, that operations should be resumed. Of course, the resumption of the work would necessitate the voting of money; but that vote would not be by reason of this resolution; it would be in consequence of a resolution introduced by the Government upon which a Bill would be founded. I submit, therefore, that the rule is not applicable in this instance, and the point of order is not well taken. If the Prime Minister's point of order were upheld, hon. members would be prevented from suggesting necessary public improvements for the good of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Bourinot says—

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order. Some of the speeches from which I quoted were

delivered in a debate similar to this. The matter under discussion was to the same effect as the resolution now before the House, and I might mention that (as a matter of precedent—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will pardon my interrupting him. I think I can very well anticipate his line of argument on the point of order, and possibly it might be well for me to suggest that the contention which he evidently intends to advance is sound. Bourinot says, at page 410:

A practice has grown up in the House of allowing the introduction of resolutions by private members, when they do not directly involve the expenditure of public money, but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant.

It seems to me that the resolution now before the House is entirely covered in the phraseology of the extract I have just quoted. I also find, in May, 12th edition, at page 468, the following:

In like manner, motions advocating public expenditure, or the imposition of a charge, if the motion be framed in sufficiently abstract and general terms, can be entertained, and agreed to by the House. Resolutions of this nature—

And I call the attention of the House particularly to the following sentence—

—are permissible because, having no operative effect, no grant is made or burthen imposed by their adoption.

It seems to me that there again the authority points to the resolution as being in order. But in looking up the journals of the House I find two cases particularly in point. In 1892, on the 14th of March, Mr. Denison, seconded by Mr. Tyrwhitt, moved:

That, whereas the new United States canal at Sault Ste. Marie is being constructed of a depth of 18 feet, and whereas it is proposed in that country to deepen their canals on the Great Lakes to not less than 20 feet, and whereas the proposed increase in depth has already been made at the mouth of the Detroit river, in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the Soulanges canal and the other canals in the river St. Lawrence should be deepened to 20 feet.

Obviously that resolution was in almost direct terms an authority to expend public money. There was also in the year 1885 a resolution moved by Mr. White (Cardwell) seconded by Mr. Wright:

That in the opinion of this House, the full sessional indemnity of such members of this House as have volunteered, or may volunteer, for service in the North West, and whose services have been or may be accepted, should be paid on their departure from Ottawa.

That resolution in its terms clearly involved the expenditure of money. Taking the general view, it does seem to me that if the House were unduly to restrict hon. members in moving motions of this character it would serve to circumscribe debate to a very marked degree, because after all very few resolutions are moved which would not in themselves, if carried into effect, involve the expenditure of public money. It seems to me that the better principle would be to widen the rule as much as possible in order that the sense of the House may be taken upon these matters, it being understood in all cases that these resolutions merely involve an expression of opinion on the part of the House and that they do not affect the constitutional method of placing upon the Government the responsibility of initiating all legislation which has for its object the expenditure of money. Therefore, under all these circumstances, I must rule that the resolution is in order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: (South York): I just wish to say that from my long experience in the House I think your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely in the right direction, and does protect freedom of debate. But there is a feature of the subject we are now discussing as to which we should have some information, and perhaps the Government will now tell us why the work has been stopped and give us good reason for such action. I think that is the most important consideration for the moment and I would like to have some information on the matter, if that be possible, at this stage of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member understands that he has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand that.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I would like to say a few words on this resolution. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) stated that the building of the Hudson Bay railway was a plank in the platform of both parties for a number of years. That is true. The railway was commenced by the previous Government, and the work was continued by the Administration of Sir Robert Borden from the time he assumed office in 1911 until the cessation of operations on account of the war. The hon. member must therefore understand that the Government did proceed with the work, and carried it on just as quickly as possible until the project, in common with others, had to be temporarily discontinued at the time of the war. The hon. member also stated that

he could not understand why the work could not be proceeded with and that he could not get any sufficient reason for it. The reason has been given him from time to time. The financial conditions of this country are such that we have been prevented from proceeding not only with the Hudson Bay railway but many other projects. Those financial conditions are entirely different now from what they were in 1910 when the construction of the railway was begun. There is another important fact to be borne in mind. The construction of many other railways in the Prairie Provinces was commenced prior to the war, and it is necessary that these lines should be extended and completed. Quite a few members from the West are pressing for railway extension in their respective constituencies and rightly so for the reason that many settlers are living thirty, forty, fifty and even sixty miles away from a railway. I had a deputation from one of those constituencies yesterday asking for the carrying out of pledges that were made ten, twelve or fifteen years ago. The farmers who composed that deputation told a tale that was really very pitiful respecting the hardships from which they suffered for want of railway communication.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister give one or two instances of the kind of railways of which he speaks, and also tell us if those have been under construction and abandoned?

Hon. Mr. REID: My hon. friend himself has appeared before me with a deputation urging the continuation of railways that had been started but not completed—railways projected into a territory where the farmers many years ago were promised railway communication but the promise remained unfulfilled. When my hon. friend states that the construction of the Hudson Bay railway has been abandoned he states what is not a fact. The construction of that project has not been abandoned, but its progress has been delayed until the financial conditions of Canada will permit of the resumption of the work. Three hundred and ten miles of the Hudson Bay railway have been built. The hon. gentleman urges that the line for that distance should be operated. We did put a train on twice a week, but even in the case of a train running every two weeks there was not sufficient traffic to pay the wages of the train crew. The revenues from that operation were such that it was a very heavy loss.

The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) has told us the whole story of what was originally intended and what is expected when we do proceed with the completion of the Hudson Bay railway. That is, the Government and this House must decide, when we are again in a position to continue to build the other ninety miles, to complete the elevators and wharves at Port Nelson, and to build steamships to run from that terminal port to Liverpool. That must be done; otherwise, if we do spend several more million dollars in completing that line to Port Nelson, the very minute that was done, the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) would stand up here and say: The building of the railway to Port Nelson is absolutely of no use unless you go ahead and complete the elevators and wharves there and build stamships so as to be able to ship your grain from the West right through to Liverpool.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every hon. member has received a copy of the Estimates and he realizes that I have had to submit to this House Estimates to the amount of some $170,000,000 in connection with our railway situation. Hon. members also know that railways are urgently required in the Western provinces to relieve settlers who are many miles from a railway. With the financial condition such as it is, the amount of money to be expended on railway construction must necessarily be limited. My own opinion is that whatever money we may have to spend in further railway extension should be spent in the construction of railways into those settlements where they were promised railway accommodation many years ago, rather than allow those people to continue to suffer and build the Hudson Bay railway on to Port Nelson. That is my judgment at the present time, but I wish to state that so far as the policy of completing the Hudson Bay railway to Port Nelson is concerned and having a water route from there to Liverpool, I have never changed my mind that that should be done whenever the financial condition of the country will allow the work to be undertaken.

The hon. member for Nelson has mentioned the item in the Estimates for the Welland canal. I can quite understand why he did so. There are many other items he could have referred to, but these are works that must be proceeded with and that are of great advantage to the country at the present time. The Welland canal has been in use for many years, and when the deepening and enlarging of that canal is

completed great advantage will accrue to the West, and that advantage will be immediate and entail much less expenditure than would the completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

The hon. member also stated that great developments have taken place along the 310 miles of the Hudson Bay railway now in operation. The only way in which I am able to judge of those developments is by the traffic offered to the railway, but so far I have not had any applications for additional cars to handle any traffic from the territory it serves.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Might I correct a statement made by the minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member desires to ask a question he may do so with the permission of the Minister of Railways, but he is not in order in correcting a statement. However, at a later stage, he will have his opportunity to do so on speaking in reply.

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. member states that there have been many deputations and resolutions from boards of trade urging the extension of the Hudson Bay railway. I might also tell him, what I am sure he already knows, that there have been many deputations and resolutions from boards of trade for a great many other extensions of railways in the West, and they all have good cases. They have waited for the construction of railways that were promised them many years ago, and they certainly deserve a great deal of sympathy. I have every confidence in the West, and I believe that all the transportation facilities that can be given to our Prairie Provinces should be granted. Any route whether via the Pacific or via the Hudson Bay railway or via the St. Lawrence, that can be developed to serve the West should be established, but at the present time I cannot see where it is possible for the Government to undertake many of the works that are being asked for. In 1910 when this railway was started it only required about $130,000,000 to cary on the affairs of this country.

What position are we in to-day? Instead of $130,000,000 we are faced with an expenditure of $300,000,000, and then on top of that greatly increased expenditure we have a big annual loss in connection with our National railway system. And that is not a loss that we are going to get rid of for some time. I intend a little later on to go more fully into that feature, but I want to tell the House now that there is a deficit of at least $20,000,000 per annum on the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental that is here to stay for many years, because the earnings are such that we cannot get a sufficient revenue to pay the operating and fixed charges on those roads. Now, it may possibly be that even though there is that deficit it pays the country to have those roads, because we are receiving very large revenues from the industrial and other development along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. But even though that may be, there is a deficit of $20,000,000 that any Government for many years to come will have to make good in the Estimates. Then there is another portion of the road on which there is a very large deficit this year, and that deficit will continue, although I hope it will decrease from time to time.

But what the hon. gentleman now asks is that the Government go out and borrow money at six per cent interest to complete the Hudson Bay railway, and thereby add further deficits to our National railway system, for undoubtedly if we build that road to Port Nelson and operate it there will be a very much heavier deficit. I cannot for the life of me see how any hon. member could support such a resolution, which really means that I must come to the House for a large sum to expend on the Hudson Bay railway this session. If the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) could supply more money for the construction of railways during the present year, I want to say frankly that I would use it to extend some of the railways in the West to the territories where the people have been suffering so long from lack of railway accommodation, instead of continuing the Hudson Bay railway through a country where there are no settlers at all at the present time. That is the policy I would carry out. Therefore, while I am in sympathy with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, I must ask that the matter be deferred until financial conditions are better than they are at present. When that time arrives, the Government should proceed with the work and carry it to a conclusion, and also carry out a policy of trying to connect Port Nelson with Liverpool by ships that must be specially built for that route. That being the case, I certainly oppose the resolution and hope the hon. member will withdraw it; if he does not, I hope the House will reject it.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to discuss this resolution at any length, because I cannot pretend to have any very extensive knowledge of the matter under debate. I quite understand the desire of western members to have this road built, but I am not so sure that the carrying out of the project would be as great a benefit to the country as a whole as it would be to the western provinces in particular.

I may say at the outset that if the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) had stated to the House that the Government had definitely decided not to continue the construction of that railway at any time, I believe he would have met the wishes of a large majority of the people of Canada. We have spent already on that road something like twenty-one millions of dollars, and we have practically nothing for it. We are told that the harbour at Port Nelson, which has been under construction, is an impossible harbour in any case. Some six or seven million dollars have already been expended there, I am informed, and have been practically thrown away.

The member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) has referred to a report that was made by the Canadian Senate during the past year. I read that report with considerable interest when it was sent to me some months ago, and after doing so I could hardly understand why the committee reported in favour of the construction of this railway. There can be only two main objects for the construction of this road; both were mentioned by the member for Nelson. One was that it would develop and open up the country which is contiguous to the Hudson bay; that minerals would be developed, and so on. I agree entirely with the Minister of Railways that if this is the only reason for the construction of the road, the money might better be expended in affording transportation facilities to people in the West who are more entitled to them. The other reason given is that it would provide the means of transporting overseas the grain of the West. Now, in order to do that without great loss, transportation must be possible over a very considerable portion of the year. The hon. member for Nelson stated that the Hudson straits were open some four months every year, possibly five months. I have not had time to look up all the extracts bearing upon that in the report of the Senate committee. I quote, however, from "Authorities quoted and Extracts of Opinions," on page 11 of the report:

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Captain Anderson says as to safe navigation during the summer season, year by year, the question is open to individual opinion. The seasons vary considerably. Some are excellent and some are bad. Navigation in Hudson bay may be relied upon from the 15th of July until the 15th of October, with an extension of a week at either end according to the season.

At the most, that would be a period of about three months. I quote further:

Mr. Harling says, for the three midsummer months, any ordinary vessel could navigate the Hudson bay and straits with comparative safety.

Herbert B. Saunders says that in his opinion the season under ordinary conditions should open about August 1, and vessels can remain in safety at Port Nelson until October 27, which practicaly gives a working season of three calendar months.

And so on. Then, there is an opinion here to which I attach considerable weight. Mr. O'Hara, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, says:

Experiences in navigating Hudson bay widely vary. One captain has a favourable voyage and reports few difficulties, and naturally is very optimistic as to the route. Another has a bad voyage and his opinion is entirely the reverse. Some ships have come safely through, though at times, from ice or heavy weather, they report having been in serious situations.

Then he adds:

In all the reports, however, the utmost caution appears to have been the sole cause of a successful outcome. Difficulties in the nature of magnetic variations, varying currents, ice, fog, heavy gales and heavy seas are not infrequently referred to in the reports of Hudson Bay navigators. These conditions may not be so bad as they actually appear and may be regarded by navigators as all being in the nature of their day's work. Yet, it is sufficient to make one hesitate to take a favourable view of that route, even allowing for more than ordinary conditions of navigation.

The last sentence, in the opinion of the deputy minister, should make every member hesitate before committing this country to further doubtful expenditure on this railway. In view of the evidence adduced before the committee it is rather surprising to me that the committee does recommend the construction of the railway.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): May I ask the hon. gentleman if he will read the evidence of Captain Wakeham, on page 11?

Mr. EULER: Yes, I will read that also if you like. I am not saying that these opinions all coincide, I have read three extracts which state that the period of navigation would be three months. I will read Captain Wakeham's opinion; I do not even know what it is and do not de-

sire to suppress anything. I quote from the report:

> Captain Wakeham says that he agrees with Captain Gordon in fixing the date for the opening of navigation in Hudson strait for commercial purposes by suitable vessels at from the 1st to the 10th of July. I consider that navigation should close from the 15th to the 20th October.

That also would be only three months; that bears out the opinions which I have already quoted. But under all the circumstances, with these opinions varying as they do, I think it is fair to assume that year in and year out one could not even count upon three months of safe navigation. Indeed, you cannot, according to the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, count on any particular period when navigation is reasonably safe. But even if under the most favourable conditions ships can navigate through Hudson straits for three months of the year, while I am not a marine man and know very little about shipping or the cost of doing business of that kind, I question very much whether ships can be operated profitably on that route for such a short period of time. I question very much whether these vessels carrying grain to Europe would have a return cargo in any case; and if they are to be constructed so as to be in a position to navigate these straits in safety they must have a special construction which, I understand, reduces their carrying capacity something like twenty-five per cent and necessarily increases the freight cost.

That brings me to another point of supreme importance at this time; it has been mentioned by the Minister of Railways. Even if this road were built, even if it did relieve to some extent the situation in the West, and even if it did assist in the carrying out of the grain, although it would not carry out the grain in the same season in which it is produced, I believe it would show a tremendous deficit. Sir, we have come to the point where we do not want, with our eyes open, to increase the deficits that are now being shown by the National railways. Another reason why I would oppose this resolution is that I am one of the few members, counting members not only on this side but on the other side, who are favourably disposed towards public ownership of railways. The National railways are showing tremendous deficits and the fact of those deficits is being used day by day by those who are interested, and others, as an argument against public ownership; not fairly, in my opinion, and if we add to the National railways deliberately, railways which can show nothing but a deficit, then we are damning the cause of public ownership for a generation or two, and I for one would not like to see that. I believe, therefore, the continuance of the construction or the completion of this road would be merely throwing good money after bad. It is of no particular consequence to me whether the construction of the road was begun or continued by a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government; in fact, I am inclined to think that both parties were perhaps playing a bit of politics as regards the western country, but I am not concerned with that. This House should now consider whether this road is in the interest of the people of Canada as a whole, whether it is going to be a paying proposition and if it is not, then we should cut it out without any consideration.

The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) has thrown out a suggestion that there are special interests opposed to the construction of this railway. I do not know what he means by that, but I know he will believe me when I say that as regards myself, there is nothing of that kind at all. The opinions I have formed are from reading reports and public discussions and discussions in the press. I do not claim to have any particular authority to speak on this question, but that is my opinion as I have given it. As I stated a moment ago, I am one of the few members of this House who are in favour of public ownership of railways; but if there is one road that I would like to see private interests take up and construct, it is the Hudson Bay railway. There is little likelihood of that, for private interests are too shrewd to entertain the thought. I wish the Government, instead of making the announcement that it is merely postponing construction, would state that the Hudson Bay railway cannot be considered a practical enterprise and that it is definitely abandoned.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, there are, in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell), two words which make the discussion of it more than an academic one. Those two words are to be found in the third line of the resolution which reads:

> Should be resumed as early "this year" as possible.

What the hon. gentleman wants is that this House should commit itself to a recom-

mendation to the Government that this work should be carried out this year. With that feature of the resolution, I am afraid I cannot agree. We understand clearly the objects which prompted the hon. gentleman and his friends from the Prairie Provinces in advocating the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. The farmers in this country wish to cheapen production and also to cheapen transportation, and in this respect, they are on sound economic grounds. If all the other industries of Canada would, like the farmers, try to cheapen production and also to cheapen transportation, such action would be greatly in the interest of the country. If the Government would develop our natural resources, and particularly our waterpowers, giving the latter as a grant to city industries, this would offset the necessity for protection of city industries, and would thereby facilitate this Government taking measures to protect the farming industry just as well as other industries of the country. But I do not believe the remedy advocated by the hon. gentleman would be of much avail in obtaining for people of the West the relief for which they are looking. We have in this country a vast system of railways, a considerable portion of which has been nationalized and is under Government control. Unfortunately, it has not been put to the best advantage to which it could be put. For instance, I think the Transcontinental railway is not taken full advantage of, and if the Government or the business managers of the Canadian National railways would look into the matter a bit more seriously I think they would find their way clear to assist the western farmers greatly in cheapening the transportation of their products and also in settling various problems which embarrass them in the marketing of their goods.

Many opinions have been cited already by previous speakers. I think nobody will question the authority of a great navigator who was also heard in the investigation on this matter. I speak of the Arctic explorer, Captain Bernier. What did he say, and he is corroborated by other witnesses who have already been quoted? Not only does he say that the navigation season by the Hudson bay route would be limited to three months, but he states that it would be impossible to use that route except with specially constructed ships. I quote from his evidence at page 39 of the report:

> About the end of October ice comes down and closes the straits so that after October there is danger of the ship meeting that old ice during a gale. It is very important that ships should be built especially for ice navigation. The Fram was built for ice navigation and survived. The Guss, afterward called the Arctic, is a ship that has done eleven years and is now as good as ever; also the Roosevelt. These ships were built especially for ice navigation, and they have stood the test, they have done their work, and they are proofs that for navigating in Hudson bay and the Arctic ocean, where there are four different kinds of ice it is necessary to have ships especially built for ice navigation. It is a mistake—

I wish to emphasize this:

> It is a mistake to send in tramp steamers. They may sometimes hit a piece of ice, and if it is old ice the ship is done for. The ship should be double-framed forward and have thicker plates.

As to the length of the navigation season Captain Bernier says:

> I think, with properly constructed vessels you could navigate from the 15th of June until the 1st of November.

I doubt very much if in the face of these facts, established as they are by unquestionable evidence of navigators who know what they are talking about this House should recommend the Government to undertake at this juncture under the present financial conditions of the country further expenditure on this project. I would favour this project if it were clearly shown that it would relieve the situation for the western farmer, but I do not believe that it would afford him proper relief. After constructing the road, you would have to secure specially constructed ships to provide transportation from the end of the rails to the European ports. The argument has been made, and if it were sustained by sufficient evidence it would have some force that the natural resources of the district to be traversed by the Hudson Bay railway would more than offset the sinking fund and interest on the investment, but if we are to take the statement just given to the House by the Minister of Railways, my hon. friend is flatly contradicted in that respect. The minister has just told the House that he tried to put on a twice-a-week service.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It was not properly operated.

Mr. VIEN: I should be very glad to hear from the hon. member when he speaks again, anything which would justify me in changing my opinion, because I am absolutely in sympathy with the farming class of Western Canada in their efforts to cheapen the transportation cost of their products. But surely in the case of a

resolution involving such a large expenditure of money as this, we should look at the matter in the light of facts as established by unquestionable evidence.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The evidence is not new.

Mr. VIEN: I do not say that either the argument or the evidence is new, but I belive that if the Minister of Railways had seen his way clear to paying operating expenses on that road he would have been anxious to please that section of the country because the Government have no sympathy to lose in the country at present, and if they could satisfy only one section of the country they would go to it right away. In view of the large railway deficits we have to meet this year, if the Minister of Railways had thought that the operation of this section of the road would have been a paying proposition, he would have taken advantage of the occasion and operated it so as to reduce the deficits, but he did not do it because he found out after his experiment that he could not even meet operating expenses. It may be possible that the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the road was not properly operated and that it did not traverse the country it should have, to get the traffic. It would be illuminating for the House and for the Minister of Railways to hear from the hon. gentleman on that point, but at the present time I do not think this House has sufficient evidence before it to show that the natural resources of the country to be traversed by that road would justify the expenditure. If it were otherwise, I would change my opinion, but even then there would always remain the question whether a three months' season of navigation, and of navigation that is impossible except with specially built ships, would justify the expenditure. For these two reasons I do not believe the House should be ready to express an opinion advocating any further expenditure on the road this year, and until such evidence as I have mentioned has been given, I am very sorry that I shall not be able to vote for the resolution.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): I just wish to make a few observations on the resolution. First of all, I wish to quote a short extract from the evidence of Captain Bartlett of Polar fame. He says:

> I would consider navigation on the Hudson bay route safe from the last of July to November, but ships constructed to contend with the ice and with a good ice pilot on board could navigate the bay from early in July until late in November.

I do not intend to discuss the feasibility of the water end of the Hudson bay route because I presume that is a matter that the Government settled before they launched on this enterprise. I understand that the late Minister of Railways himself went up to Port Nelson and selected that site. I jotted down during the debate one or two items which I intended to bring to the attention of the Government. I had intended to ask what was their policy in regard to the Hudson Bay railway, but I need not ask that question now, because I have already been informed on that point by the Minister of Railways. I gather from what he says that even if he had the money, he would rather build other lines of railway, so I take it for granted that the policy of the Government is that the Hudson Bay project is a dead letter. To my knowledge this Hudson Bay project has been a political football at general elections in this country since 1882. I very well remember seeing in the city of Winnipeg in 1882 big placards to this effect "Vote for Captain Scott, who will build the Hudson Bay railway." Now, Captain Scott is dead and gone to his reward, and the Hudson Bay Railway project is still a political football, and I have not the slightest doubt that this Government is keeping this football in readiness for the next general election. I do not intend to take up much more time of the House. While the member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) was speaking, it occurred to me that if he were a supporter of the Government and if his constituency were opened up in order that he might become a Cabinet minister, the Hudson Bay railway would be built.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Promised.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Yes, of course. Now, when the Government required a Cabinet minister in Victoria the people there got a dry dock; and when they required a minister in St. John, what did the people get? Why, an expenditure for this year of $1,835,000. The simple fact is that the hon. member for Nelson is on the wrong side of the House. He ought to have got into the Cabinet, and then we should have had the Hudson Bay railway. However, it is too late now. We find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have obtained a charter—I think it was last session—running into Cumberland House. There is no doubt, in my mind, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, that energetic and successfully-managed transportation company, is heading

for the Hudson bay, and it is quite probable that it will get there first. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, tells us that the Welland ship canal will give relief in the West long before the Hudson Bay railway, but it will take a long time to complete that canal down to tide water at Montreal. I think, therefore, I am justified in coming to the conclusion that so far as this Government is concerned the Hudson Bay railway is a dead letter. However, as I said before, and repeat now, the people of the West will speak for themselves at the forthcoming general election.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I should be very glad if the conclusion of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) were correct; so far as this Government is concerned I hope they will not build the Hudson Bay railway. My hon. friend declares that this railway has been a political football for a number of years. Well, I cannot conceive how that railway could be mooted, unless it were for political purposes, to be made a political football of. The first report we ever had that I know of on the feasibility of navigation in the straits was by a man named Gordon, appointed by the Sir John Macdonald government, who put parties at certain points along the straits and left them there for a year, had the ice measured, and had a look-out as to the time that the straits were navigable. They were exchanged each year. I am speaking now from memory and probably may be wrong, but I believe that in 1896, or 1895, when the Liberal government came into power, these parties were discontinued. The report is most interesting and shows clearly that the straits are not navigable for more than three months of the year—that is to say, of course, reasonably and safely navigable. The captain who has generally gone up with Government ships through the straits and to the bay for the last few years has told me time and again that it would be necessary to keep two dredges working all the time while the water is open in order to clear the harbour at Port Nelson of the silt that washes down from the long stretch of river. If that be the case, and I think it is, any member of this House can calculate for himself what that would cost per year. Then we should have to build elevators if we were to ship wheat through that route, and if we could ship only three or four months of the year, hon. gentlemen will see for themselves what the proposition means. Navigation closes about the first of November, and we all know that we do not get any great quantity of crops from the West in a condition to ship much before that time. It would therefore be necessary to carry crops over until the next year. Some of us at least have an idea what it could cost to carry over that grain in elevators for a year in the form of interest and waste.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): They do that now at Fort William.

Mr. NESBITT: It is said they do that now at Fort William, but they have the opportunity to move it by rail if they want to, and in this case they would have no such opportunity. I believe it is an established fact, so far as investigation has demonstrated, that you would have to build a particular class of ships for this navigation—to navigate for how long? For three or four months of the year. You would require to have an expensive class of ships, wooden breasted, with a short range, capable of turning quickly in the ice jams, to get clear of the floes. These ships could not possibly compete on other routes with the steel ships built now for carrying grain. They would cost a great deal, purely and simply for three or four months' navigation. They would take out, in the summer months of 1921, wheat harvested in 1920, and in the meantime it would have to be carried over in elevators. I do not believe that it would be possible to reduce the cost of transportation one particle by the Hudson Bay route, and that is why I am opposed to this proposal. As to the feasibility of building the railway from the financial point of view, I absolutely agree with the Minister of Railways that it would be suicidal in the present state of our railway problem to add to the difficulties with which we are already burdened. We can hardly comprehend what this country is up against in the present railway problem.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT: It is no fault, let me say, of the present Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. NESBITT: Not a bit. They were forced into these conditions. As a Liberal I went out on the platform in 1904 and advocated the building of the Transcontinental, and if I gained any votes by so doing then I ought to be arrested and put into jail.

Mr. HOCKEN: We will give you a pardon.

Mr. NESBITT: It was a horrible mistake, in my judgment. As a Liberal, I voted in this House for the guaranteeing of the bonds of the Canadian Northern from Port Arthur to Montreal. Again let me say that if that vote had helped to guarantee those bonds I ought to be, not arrested, but executed, because there was built a line of railway that was absolutely unnecessary in this country. That is one of the positions in which we find ourselves at the present time. Why have we been obliged to take over the Grand Trunk? Because we owned a great mileage of railways without any feeders and with one end practically sticking up in the air. The Transcontinental railway, the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern were lines without feeders. We are taking over the Grand Trunk Railway which practically touches every hamlet in Ontario and the probabilities are that if properly and capably managed the system will eventually assist in reducing the cost of operating railways in this country. The railway question in Canada is now of such a nature that I would like to see a committee of the House, representative of all parties appointed to thoroughly investigate every phase of the situation and, if possible, endeavour to find a solution of the problem. For it is a problem; and when hon. gentlemen get up here and blame the present Government for the position in which this country now is with respect to railways they are only doing so from political motives. Personally, I am not talking from a political standpoint.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friends opposite need not laugh and jeer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NESBITT: As a matter of fact, business matters should not be discussed from a party standpoint; I never look at them in that way myself. We are supposed to be business men in this House. Whether that is true or not, and regardless of whatever party is in power, I want to see the country governed in a businesslike way and not in accordance with politics. I care nothing about the getting of votes. I do not like to pretend to advocate something merely because it is popular, and nobody in this House can accuse me of doing anything of that kind during the time I have had a seat here. I was surprised and sorry to hear my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Reid, Mackenzie), suggest that there was politics behind this project, and that the road would be built if there was a by-election going on in the West. That may be true, I am not saying it is not, but what I maintain is that politics should not be interjected into the discussion of a business matter in this House. Projects of this kind should be discussed absolutely and purely from a business standpoint; and if any hon. member can prove that the Hudson Bay railway will be a paying enterprise for this country I will vote for it no matter what the ordinary expenditure will be. But I do not believe that such a thing can be proved. I do not believe it is possible to derive a paying revenue from the Hudson Bay railway in the life time of any man in this House.

Therefore, as we now have deficits in the operation of our railways amounting to probably fifty or sixty million dollars, without counting the interest on the investment, we may just as well make up our minds, so far as the railways are concerned, to face the situation. The first phase of the situation we have to face is this: We must ask the labour unions and the railway unions to get together themselves and reduce the cost of railway transportation so that railway rates can be lowered in Canada. Because the rates now charged on the Canadian railways, both freight and express, are such as to render it impossible to make a business enterprise succeed. We have to face the situation and the quicker the railway unions themselves recognize that fact the better it will be. They must recognize the fact that if they do not get together and agree to reduce the wages that are now being paid by the railway companies they will kill the goose that lays the golden egg, because the companies will be forced to cut the railway services to such an extent that thousands of men will be turned out of employment. I repeat that we may just as well face the situation. It is up to this House no less than to the Government of Canada—because we are all in a sense part of the governing body—to face the situation. It is up to this House to see that the transportation charges of this country are in some manner reduced. The wages that the railway companies are now paying under the McAdoo award are impossible if we are ever going to lower the cost of transportation. When any business man in Canada ascertains what the freight rates to Vancouver or to Calgary are he will be astonished. If he is not astonished then it is not possible to astonish him. The railway rates must be reduced

in order to lower the cost of living in this country. These charges affect the price of every article that enters into the cost of living no matter what it may be. Let me repeat, hon. members may just as well quit playing politics and get down to business. They may as well face the situation and in some way find the means of making these railways reduce their operating expenses, and thus bring about a reduction in the cost of transportation.

Mr. THOMAS HAY (Selkirk): I wish to say a word on this subject before the close of the present debate which is of very great importance, at any rate to Western Canada. I do not agree with some of the remarks made by the last speaker, particularly his statement that even were this line then completed it would not be possible to take out the grain crop of 1921 over the route. I think that is a mistaken impression, an impression that a great many people in Canada entertain at the present time with respect to the Hudson bay route. I believe that the great bulk of the grain crop of Western Canada could be shipped through this route the very year it was grown. We know, particularly those of us from the West, that this has been one of the established trade routes between the Old Country and Western Canada for something like two hundred and fifty years. During that long space of time the straits and the bays have been navigated, often by vessels of a very antiquated type, and with very few accidents indeed. I maintain, and I think I am safe in making the statement, that in the case of the type of vessels especially designed for a route of this kind, there would be no difficulty in navigating Hudson straits for a period of perhaps five months in the year. The bay itself is accessible for a much longer period of time; the difficulty about navigation is on account of the ice that accumulates in the straits. I do not, however, agree with the mover of the resolution that it is wise to commit the Government to the expenditure of so many millions of dollars in advance of the provision of other facilities. I do not think there would be very much use, for example, in completing the railway unless good terminals were provided. There is very little traffic of a local nature along that line, consequently its completion to the bay would be of very little use to the people of Western Canada unless the harbour was also completed. Therefore I do not think it would be wise in the face of our present financial difficulties and the deficits on our national railway system to commit the Government at this time to a further expenditure of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 in connection with this work. But I do want to say that I am in favour of the completion at the earliest possible moment of the Hudson Bay railway and terminals, because I am satisfied that the proper development of Western Canada rests largely upon that completion. Therefore I would urge upon the Government the necessity as soon as financial conditions permit of doing something to complete this railway. In view of the reasons given, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment:

That all the words after the word "railway" in the second line of the resolution be struck out and that the following be substituted in lieu thereof: "shall be resumed as soon as financial conditions permit, and that the project be completed with the least possible delay."

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, as a Westerner I can remember taking part in an election in the city of Winnipeg in 1886 in which this Hudson bay railway question was the foremost issue. We then had the promise that the rails were on the ocean, telegrams to that effect being produced from the Cumberland Steel company,—which afterwards proved to be forgeries. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. This railway was started by the Laurier Government. It is not going to be finished by the Meighen Government; that is quite evident. This Government has fiddled along with this proposition until some of us have ceased to dance to the music. I have in mind a meeting of a delegation with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid), which was highly amusing to some of us western members. He first gave us as a reason why the road could not then be continued that it was then impossible to buy rails. Well, information that had been widely disseminated from a world-wide known firm of New York brokers was produced showing that rails could be bought in unlimited numbers at $64.50 a ton. This information surprised the Minister of Railways and he shifted ground; he told us that even if rails could be got ties were not obtainable. It was then the month of March, 1919, and of course ties were got out in the winter, so we could not get them. Another setback occurred to the minister—a member produced from his pocket tenders to get out a quarter of a million ties and have them on the road by July. We were then told by the minister what to western men was the most surprising thing of all,

that all railway contractors had dismantled their outfits in the past five years, and that a track-laying outfit could not be got on the road in time to do anything in 1919. For the benefit of those who have not seen a track-laying outfit, I may say that it is a flat car with a little derrick at one end and attached to it are half a dozen other flat cars with conveyers bolted on their sides on which are carried the ties and rails to be laid. Under pressure any railway contractor would put one together in twenty-four hours, and quite leisurely in six days, so as to be ready for use on the road. Then the minister tried to tell us that this Government was really in earnest in its intention to build this railway. If we went away dissatisfied and incredulous, do you blame us?

Now, perhaps that sort of experience has something to do with the dissatisfaction in the West to-day with regard to the building of this railway. I will say here and now that if we were beginning this enterprise and involving ourselves in an expenditure of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 I would unhesitatingly condemn it, for I yield to no man in the House in my desire for economy. But when we see the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) bringing down a Budget which involved a deficit of $50,000,000 to $100,000,000, and expenditures being made, as the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) has stated, for purely political purposes, I think the West has a right to look to this long deferred hope of seeing the railway completed. It is a matter now of an expenditure of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, and not of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000. And remember, the funds have been provided and are ear marked in the sales of pre-empted lands—$28,000,000, without counting the interest, was provided to look after the financing of this proposition.

At this stage of the matter I am not going to argue that the straits are navigable. That question was looked into by the Government before the project was entered upon, and we have acted upon their judgment. So I will take that question as concluded. Now, it is a question of using what we have got there or else seeing it rot—of preserving it from destruction and making some small use of it—and of finding out whether the resources of the bay and the country that would be opened up are worth an expenditure of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000.

Last year, with two other members of this House, I was out in that country half way from Norway House to Hudson bay. There are great areas of pulpwood. True, the trees are not large, for the country seems to have been burned over within the last forty or fifty years, but with proper fire regulations there is a pulpwood industry available for development. We crossed fifty to one hundred miles of clay belt. There is a clay belt on the Hudson bay railway 100 to 125 miles wide very similar to the land in which Cochrane lies and capable of future development. Only last night I was talking to one of our geological men, and he said: Climb a hill in any part of that country and it looks as though quite half of the expanse that is disclosed to view is water. The waters of all those lakes swarm with fish. At one portage a ground sheet eight feet square was let down a foot or two into the water and lifted up again, and the whitefish were so thick that four of them were brought up on that sheet. The waters there teem with char or lake trout. There is a big local industry available all along the lakes and rivers contiguous to that railway. There is no reason to doubt—indeed there is every reason to expect, from the reports that Mr. Stefansson brought back of life in our northern waters—that the fisheries of the bay will at least equal the fisheries of Labrador, which are among the best in the world. By the carrying out of the Hudson Bay railway project these fisheries will be opened up and will offer traffic.

Now, the criticism has been made that the road is not yielding any return. Well, if you run a road three hundred miles into a wilderness and end it nowhere, what return can you expect from it? The country there is still a wilderness; the road after it leaves the Pas does not serve any settlement. There is a possibility of industrial and mining development along the route, but it will not come until the railway has been constructed. These are the grounds, then, upon which it is sensible to urge the completion of that road. To sum up, we are expending moneys that are not productive. Any expenditure for the completion of this road promises to be productive. We are expending large sums which go to make up our present deficit. If it is practicable to make expenditures on propositions which are new, which have been taken up since the Hudson Bay railway was started, surely it is wise to spend moneys which have been ear-marked and really provided for this venture. If it is contended that by so doing we would be seeking to develop a country that is if no use, then we might just as

well say that we have already developed the portion of Canada which is of use, and that we should forget all our foolish talk about natural resources and about the possibility of a great future for Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, the trend which the discussion has taken and the amendment which has been offered enable me to bring the House one or two thoughts which, I think, are worthy of consideration. The first has been presented to this House to-day by every speaker in the debate and is being presented in the country by almost every newspaper and on every platform; and organizations are at work throughout the country to promulgate and promote the idea—that the Government is under great financial obligations now by reason of its railway deficits, I grant that, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with what the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) said here to-day. But the thing that impresses me in this connection is; how long are these deficits unnecessarily to continue? We are running four systems of railways in this country to-day, outside of the Canadian Pacific. We have the Intercolonial—and it is called a system; we have the Transcontinental—and it is mentioned as a system, one whose operation has been attended by enormous deficits—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. He has not yet gone very far from the subject, but I do want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that under the resolution now before the House I do not think it would be in order for hon. members entirely to forget the Hudson Bay railway and to discuss deficits on the Government-owned railways.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. We have all these deficits, and what I want to point out is that we must stop them. We have all these systems of railways, and it is incumbent upon the Government—and I believe they recognize their duty in that regard—to put an end to these deficits by a great consolidation and co-ordination of these different systems—practising economics, stopping unnecessary duplication of lines and services of all kinds. When you do that, these deficits will begin to end. I hope, therefore, that we will soon have an early discussion of this whole matter. I was somewhat disappointed to-day when the Minister of Railways did not set a day for the discussion that he said it was intended to have on this question. I hope he will let us all know when that discussion is to take place, and that an effort will be made this session to put an end to the unnecessary deficits which are impressing the people and prejudicing them against public ownership of the railways that we now have.

As to this particular question of opening up the Hudson Bay route, I agree that the road has been promised and that an effort ought to be made to complete it. It may not be the proper thing to do it just now; the minister has given fair reason why the matter ought to be deferred. The mover of the amendment has offered a still better reason, and I intend to vote for that amendment. But the thing that impresses me most of all is the necessity for giving attention to these deficits, and I hope that we shall soon have a statement from the Government that a consolidation of the railway systems which have been taken over will soon be under way.

Mr. C. E. LONG (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a few words in regard to this proposal, which is one of interest to every western man, especially to those of us who are farmers. I attended a great number of meetings of the Senate committee that was appointed to investigate the possibilities of the Hudson Bay Railway project, and one thing I noticed in connection with the work of that committee was the great interest taken in the proceedings by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell). I do not suppose that any proposal which has come before the House has received such undivided attention on the part of the hon. member as this one did. Certainly, if any of us have interfered in any way with the ultimate success of the hon. member's undertakings, it is not because we lack respect or appreciation of the efforts he has put forth in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government.

I rather resented, Mr. Speaker, the closing remarks of the hon. member for Nelson; they convinced me rather more than anything else of the lack of strength in all his previous arguments. Some reference has been made by other speakers to the Hudson Bay Railway project being used as a political football. I have been watching political events from the western viewpoint more or less closely for the last couple of years, and I seemed to see in my hon. friend's closing remarks that one reflection which we all resent in the handling of political questions—that because some of us

dared in the past to oppose the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay railway to Port Nelson, we were under the insidious influence of some great interest; our hands were tied; we were unable to show the reasons for our opposition to the policy which my hon. friend has enunciated in his resolution. Well, that is one thing that would tear me from my seat in the rear portion of this House quicker than anything else, because I realize that I got into trouble with some of my former friends because I dared to refuse to sign a certain petition calling upon the Government immediately to engage in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway to Port Nelson. I am very sorry that the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox), closed his remarks with very much the same inference—that we were under the influence of eastern interests. I want, from my place in the House, to refute the allegation just as strongly as I can, and I think, in doing so, I voice the opinion of my fellow members on this side of the House. On the other hand, I can perhaps excuse my hon. friends for that inadvertent attack upon our parliamentary standards, because I know, from what I have seen, that they are becoming overly engrossed with the political success of their movement, although I must say that I am very sorry to see them using such means to further their object.

I attended the meetings of the committee last year, and I have certain reasons for stating that we should not proceed immediately with the construction of the railway from Kettle rapids to Port Nelson. I must confess that, as a farmer, I have become more or less selfish, and we farmers may be excused for becoming somewhat that way. So I acknowledge that one great reason why we, as western farmers, want the railway constructed is because it will give us a shorter route to Europe. It has been used as an argument on many public platforms that it would be a shorter route, and, therefore, naturally more economical, but from what I have read in the committee's report, that is not a proper conclusion to draw.

A few points came out, not so much in the report, as in the investigation, which would show that Nelson harbour, as a harbour, would be absolutely without success as regards transatlantic traffic. The expense necessary to put that harbour into condition for transatlantic traffic is so great that I do not think we are justified in going ahead with the work. One engineer stated that it would require the removal of about 7,000,000 cubic yards of dirt before transatlantic ships would be able to approach that island which those who favour the project speak of as their terminal facility. The price of removing that dirt would be almost one dollar per cubic yard, so that there you have in one item alone an expenditure of $7,000,000 necessary for the removal of dirt. That is of very great importance and one of the things that have not been brought to the attention of our western farmers when these matters have been discussed. The harbour itself is of such a questionable character that it is very doubtful whether I could, at the present time, support the resolution of the hon. member.

I wish to read a few extracts from a certain article appearing in a paper which claims to have a superior class of literature in its columns. I will read this because it gives the conclusion which I arrived at after attending many meetings of the committee. Referring to Henry Hudson it says:

> In the original tragedy only half a dozen or so of men suffered. In the modern tragedy—

Referring to the building of the Hudson Bay railway.

> —being enacted in the clay-mud at Nelson harbour, the entire 8,000,000 people of Canada are to suffer untold burdens of taxation, because of the wanton and criminal waste of money going on there in a weak and futile attempt to make a harbour in the mud flats, while a perfectly good rock-bottom harbour exists at Fort Churchill, 180 miles north, by water, 100 miles north by land.

Then it goes on to speak of the project as political jobbery. It says:

> Aside from the cost of the railway line, almost, if not quite, $10,000,000 has been expended in the harbour mud, and it will require twenty years to build a harbour there, if it is at all possible, and will require constant and heavy dredging to keep it clear of the millions of cubic yards of clay carried down by the river annually. It shows the utter criminal disregard of the present Government for the vital interests of over one-half of the Dominion, which could be beneficially served by this splendid national highway.

That is rather a severe condemnation of this Government in proceeding with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. I rather think I would agree with that conclusion, were those the facts, but what appears to me to be a difficult task this afternoon is to make that statement coincide with the attitude taken by hon. members opposite in regard to the same matter. They criticized this Government for not going ahead and building the

road. This magazine, which I understand assumes a superior position in regard to matters of advice, claims that it is a crime to go ahead with this project. Therefore, I certainly cannot be accused of wrong-doing if I am confused in forming an opinion in regard to this matter. The writer, a man by the name of Bert Huffman—

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): What is the name of the magazine?

Mr. LONG: Wait a bit. If I told you now, you might leave the room. The writer goes on to say:

> I am not writing this in political bitterness or projudice. I did not walk from Kettle rapids to Port Nelson and back, 190 miles, for the fun of the thing. I am a producing farmer, owning a fine farm within twenty miles of Calgary, and I am interested in transportation from the standpoint of a western farmer, and I am also interested more deeply as a Canadian citizen, in seeing this splendid national project made a permanent, beneficial property, for the Canadian people rather than to see it bungled by political manipulation into a perpetual curse and bill of expense.

That is precisely the conclusion that I arrived at as regards Nelson harbour. There are many more things that might be said about the matter, but I must not occupy more of the time of the House. That article appeared on the 14th July, 1920, in a magazine known as the Grain Growers' Guide. I believe the conclusions which that gentleman arrived at in his personal investigation of the situation at that harbour are about what one would arrive at if he had followed as carefully as the hon. member for Nelson and myself did the evidence given before the Senate committee. My position at the present time is this: I place great emphasis on the third recommendation of the Senate committee which reads:

> That in the opinion of this committee sufficient care was not taken in the selection of Nelson as the terminus of the railway, and that the Government should not make further important expenditures upon this port without first making a new and thorough examination into the relative merits of Churchill and Nelson as a terminus for the railroad.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that if this road is built to Nelson, so far as the transatlantic feature of the road is concerned it will be an absolute failure. A very good friend, supposed to be, at any rate, of the policy of nationalization of railways, the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid), called the attention of this House, inadvertently perhaps, to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway was now endeavouring to get an outlet on Hudson bay. I agree with him, but the Canadian Pacific railway is not heading for Nelson. If I am not mistaken they are looking to Churchill harbour, and from what little I know I would advise this Government, if they are going to the bay at all to make at once for Churchill harbour. Therein is the only hope of our western farmers obtaining a profitable outlet through the bay to the markets of the world. For that reason, I take the stand that I must certainly oppose the resolution that has been presented by the hon. member for Nelson.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I think in the few minutes that remain before six o'clock I can say what I wish to say upon this question. I am very largely in agreement with the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. Long), who has just spoken. There is no doubt of the fact that the building of the Hudson Bay railway has been a very live question in Western Canada for a great many years. The opinion of the people of that portion of the Dominion on this question may have been right or may have been wrong, but back of it lay a strong desire to take advantage of the fact that the greatest inland sea in the world brought its tide water within five or six hundred miles of the centre of the great wheat producing areas of the western prairies. The fact that Churchill is but little further from Liverpool than is Montreal is a striking reason for the faith of the West in the project.

There are undoubtedly strong differences of opinion as to the practicability and feasibility of the ocean route from Churchill or Nelson to Liverpool, but I am convinced that perhaps not in our day, but ultimately, this route will become one of the great trade routes of the world. Unquestionably, great aids to navigation are being discovered almost every year, and I do not think it is too great a stretch of the imagination to conceive that this great natural highway will be utilized in very large measure to carry the commerce of America and Europe.

There is also the question of the development of the natural resources that lie along this railway. They are very great, both in pulpwood and minerals, as recent discoveries have shown, and that factor itself might justify the building of the road even if it were a little ahead of its time. I am in cordial agreement with my hon. friend from North Battleford as to the mistake that was made in making Nelson the terminus. I think a huge mistake was made when this was done, and if it is defi-

nitely settled that Nelson is to be the terminal point, an annual expenditure of a large sum of money will be required to keep it in shape for the harbourage of vessels.

However, I am bound to say this, that in the consideration of this whole question we must be governed at the present time by one fact largely, and that is the present financial condition of this country, and it is for that reason I cannot bring myself to support the motion of my hon. friend from Nelson (Mr. Campbell) whose thought I know is very much bound up in this matter. I think, moreover, that no very great harm will come from postponing for a year or two further expenditure on this road until we can get our financial condition in this country cleared up. We have seen by the Estimates that have been brought down recently the vast expenditures that are called for; we know that the burden of taxation will rest very heavily on the Canadian people for a great many years, and the imperative duty lying before this Parliament, so far as the finances of the country are concerned, is to bring our expenditure within our income, and that at the earliest possible moment. I believe this road will ultimately become a great highway, and if the financial situation of the country warranted the expenditure, I would be disposed to support the motion, but on account of the considerations I have mentioned I think it is well to postpone further expenditure for the present. I think the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Hay) pretty well meets the needs of the situation at the present time.

Amendment (Mr. Hay) agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is now on the main motion as amended.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have a few words to say but as it is six o'clock I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an hon. member who has spoken to the resolution cannot move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING: But he has the right to close the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He may have the right to close the debate but not to move the adjournment thereof.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) has the right to close the debate but before he speaks it is my duty to advise all other hon. members who have not yet spoken upon the resolution that the hon. member is about to exercise that right and that if they desire to speak, they must do so now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the hon. member cannot move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING: It being six o'clock there is no need for him to move the adjournment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a very unusual proceeding for an hon. member who is closing a debate upon a substantive motion which he has introduced to move the adjournment of that debate, but I am under the impression that this has previously been done. The hon. member may prefer to speak now.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Do I understand that my remarks will be in the way of closing the debate?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak without closing the debate. The substantive resolution as amended is all that now remains before the House.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. member desires to make a few remarks, there is no objection but otherwise as it is six o'clock, the House must adjourn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. member desire to close the debate now or wait until the House meets again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I may speak to the point of order, I would point out that the motion to adjourn requires a seconder. The very fact that it requires a seconder seems to debar the hon. member from making that motion because no other hon. member can rise to second the motion. Although it is of no great importance in this debate, I do not think it would be a good rule to establish that an hon. member closing a debate can move its adjournment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: What is the motion before the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The resolution submitted by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) as amended by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Hay). The hon. member for Nelson now desires to move the adjournment of the debate in order that he may make his reply when the House meets again. That motion, the legality of which is questioned by the right hon. the Prime Minister, is not necessary as one of the rules provides that if at six o'clock on Wed-

nesday, a motion on the Order Paper is under consideration, that question shall stand first on the Order Paper of the following day. I think there is considerable force in the point raised by the right hon. the Prime Minister that an hon. member who is closing a debate has no right to move its adjournment owing to the fact that no other hon. member has the right to take the floor for the purpose of seconding the motion. If obliged to do so without further consideration, I would feel disposed to so rule, but at this time, the motion to adjourn the debate is quite unnecessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I prefer to take your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House adjourned pursuant to rule.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1921

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.,=first, second, or third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abbatoirs. *See* Health of Animals; Live stock

Abitibi District, 3075
Grievances of settlers, 2510

Accounts. *See* Finance; Public Accounts

Accredited Herd. *See* Health of Animals

Adams, Capt. Henry C., and Canadian Navy Enquiry, 901; qu. 1237

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5, 40, 66, 110, 154, 188, 230, 244, 262, 313, 351, 397, 448, 479. Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Campbell), adjournment, neg.; Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) non-confidence, neg. Address agreed to, 561

Ad Hoc Judge, 1084. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Courts. *See* Vice Admiralty

Adulteration of Food Act Amdt.
Administration, 3129
Maple Products, 888. *See also* that title

Advisory Council of Scientic Research. *See* Research

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air

Aeroplanes. *See* Air

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Age Limit. *See* Prisons

Agenda. *See* Prime Ministers' Conference

Agrarian Party. *See* Progressive Party

Agricultural Colleges, 1034

Agricultural Gazette, 1074

Agricultural Implements, 91, 492, 417, 583, 666, 3179, 3372, 3394, 3492-6, 3508, 3631
United Grain Growers, and, 418-9

Agricultural Instruction, 1029

Agricultural Machinery (Standardization of Parts) 584; Res. (Mr. McCoig) 666; Amdt. (Mr. Henders) 670

Agricultural Shows, grants to,
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1238; withdrawn, 1247

Agricultural Societies, 1074. *See also* Exhibitions

Agriculture. *See also* Immigration; Soldier Settlement; Unemployment
Agriculture Act in Great Britain, 3186
Aids to, 1245
Appropriations limited, 1029
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Cold Storage warehouses, 1038
Conservation Commission, 3964
Cow-testing associations, 1036
Deputy Minister, salary, 950
Dairying. *See* that title
Decline of in Great Britain, 3186, 3237
Department
Civil Service appointments, 1045
County fairs, assistance to, 1123
Deputy Minister, salary, 950
Estimates, 917, 1024, 1074, 1116, 4506-13
Destructive insect and Pest Act, 4512. *See also* that title
District Representatives, 1033-4
Duff, the late Hon. James, work of, 1033
Eggs. *See* that title
Experimental Farms, 4512. *See also* that title
Fruit inspection, 1041. *See also* Fruit
Grasshopper plague, qu. 838, 1027
Health of Animals. *See* that title
International Institute of, 1116
Land suitable for, 845, 872
Live stock. *See* that title

Agriculture.—*Con.*
National Dairy Council, 1126
Potato-growing and diseases, 1032-3, 3224, 3442-73, 3525
Production, 135-6, 872
Products, decline in value, 3487
Publications, 1073
Seed and Feed Control, 1125, 4513
Seed fairs, 1126
Seed Grain. *See* that title
United States, in, 3188
Wright County, condition in, 922

Air Board, estimates, 3776

Air Force,
Camp Borden, qu. 1820, 3777
Preference in Civil Service appointments, 4483

Air Service, 3776
Forest patrol, 4495
Topographic Survey of Northern Canada, 856

Alaska boundary, 4494

Alberta
Coal, price at mine, 1251
Coal production. *See* Fuel Supply Problem, Natural Resources
Highways, grants, qu. 821
Industrial Research Commission, 1267
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Prohibition plebiscite, 3901, 4374-88
Supreme Court, qu. 576

Alcohol. *See also* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Prohibition; Proprietary; Special War Revenue
Certificate of provincial analyst, 3786
Customs duty, 3705
Excise duty, 2725-6
For medicinal purposes, 3729, 3957

Alderson, Mr. George B.
Claim of for compensation, 924, 1052, 2270-4, 4508. *See also* Health of Animals

Algernon Rock pier, qu. 1383

Alice Arm, wharf, 3976

Aliens. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections; Immigration; Naturalization;
Franchise, and, 3103
Naturaliation, 2441
Wives of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Election Act Amdt. Bill

All Night Sitting. *See* House of Commons

All Saints' Day. *See* Civil Service Holidays

Alpine Club, 4494

Alward, Mr., and Transcontinental, 1657

Ambassador at Washington, 185, 357, 525, qu. 671, 2400-23, 3635. *See also* Canadian Representation in the United States; Prime Ministers' Conference
Delay in appointment, 786
Fordney Bill, 512. *See also* United States

Amendments to Supply. *See* Supply

American Consuls. *See* Customs and Excise Bill; Trade; Trade Commissioners

American Markets. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade; United States

Amery, Col. L. S., 1532

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
Resignation
Enquiry as to date, 1069
Received, 1001
Reported, 464, 469, 478, qu. 577
See also Representation

Amherst drill hall, 2739

Amqui Station, 382, 1176, 1233

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 235. Demand that Government resign—amendment introduces no new issue, 235; congratulations to mover and seconder—tributes to former Prime Ministers—speech of Leader of Opposition—Unemployment insurance—old age pensions—League of Nations; tariff, 238; Alliance with Agrarian party; leader of Agrarians an out-and-out free trader—by-election in Peterborough—principles of Liberalism, 239; invitation to Liberal Unionists to cross floor—mandate of Government—immediate election would delay redistribution; increased representation, 240; seceders should have consulted their electors—Laurier administration and the tariff, 241; Daniel Webster and the clamourers, 242
Budget, 3348. Canada's debt and annual growth of expenditures, 3348; increase in trade, 3349; increase in population, 3349; Canada's present and future growth and progress, 3351; moderate protection necessary, 3351; reciprocity with United States, 3353; home market and transportation, 3354; fruit growing, 3354; Opposition and protection, 3355; Farmers' Party platform, 3356;

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 3357, 3360; Winnipeg strike, 3359; Depopulation of rural sections and increased price of commodities, 3361
Feeding Stuffs Act, qu. 965
Inspection districts, qu. 1624
Toronto-Guelph-Sarnia highway, etc., qu. 4252

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 469. Congratulations to Prime Minister; free trade and protection—the "yellow peril", 471—markets of the world, 472; exports; Farmers' Platform; abuse of tariff no argument against protection, 473; free trade in England; armaments do not prevent war; Assembly of the League of Nations—the amendment; redistribution; election, 474
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen), 1803
Housing, 1152
Oleomargarine Act Amdt., 3881
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2678
Proportional representation, 1537

Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 2637-9, 2357-60

Animal Contagious Diseases Act
Administration, 1048
Powers under, 4508
See also Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 2031; 1r., 2942; 2r., com., 3r., 3011

Animals, Cruelty to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Annapolis County
Fruit growing in, 1046
Inspectors, 1041

Annapolis public building, 2741

Annexation. *See* United States

Annual Drill. *See* Militia

Annuities Branch, 4524

Anodynes, elixirs, etc., duty on, 3709

Anse Aux Gascons wharf, 3991

Anse St. Jean, wharf, 4536

Antelope in Western Canada, qu. 1134

Anticosti Island, squatters on, 1514

Antigonish Public Works office, 2818

Appendices
Canadian National Railways
Employees' pay, qu. 1737, 1815

Apples. *See also* Fruit
Export to Great Britain, 1501, qu. 1714
Markets for, 1469
Tariff on, 126

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 42 (for 1921-2, for $71,499,703.70). Res. 1674; 2001; 1r., 2045; 2r., com., 2100; 3r., 2116
2. Bill No. 222 (for 1920-1, for $14,681,810.-14; and for 1921-22, $371,044,471.26). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4577

Arbitration. *See* Grand Trunk

Arbitrations and Awards, Railways, 3015

Arbitrators, Judges as. *See* Judges Act Amdt.

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 244. Grand Trunk employees' pensions, 244—omissions from Speech—dissolution—election, 1917; "Knots and Lashings"—railway problem, 245; Can. Govt. Merchant Marine—Prime Ministers' Conference, 246; Imperial relations; League of Nations; no mandate—Purchasing Commission, 247—overtures to Quebec, 248; Mr. Gauthier, severance of connection with Liberal party, 250; inconsistent attitudes towards tariff, 251; Lafontaine and Cartier, 252; Minister of Immigration, 253
Agricultural Shows, M., 1238-46; withdrawn, 1247
Auditor General's Report, 1385
Banff National Park, 4495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2911
Board of Commerce, qu. 599, 602
Budget, 3557. Financial operations, 3557; rigid economy in national expenditure necessary, 3558; military expenditure, 3558; Winnipeg strike, 3560; Grand Trunk shareholders, 3560; Prime Minister playing the game, 3562; Credits to Greece and Roumania, 3563; Members of Parliament directors of companies selling to Government, 3564
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill, 2230
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2252

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Proposed Special Committee, 1440
"Squatter" and "Pioneer," Ss., qu. 1382
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2032
Canadian National Railways
French language, 4331-3
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1767-97
Canadian Press Limited, qu. 564
Civil Service, religious holidays, 1384; qu. 1499
Confidential messengers, 1334
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3007, 3919-36
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, Dr. Cartier, 3821
Debates, translation of French Speeches, Res. 698
Defamatory libel; publication of judicial proceedings, 2149, 3933
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4237-40
French Trade Agreement, 1174
Grand Trunk Railway
Loan, 4138
Shareholders, list of, 3320, 3560, 3740
Harbours and rivers, 3975-81
Highways, grants to provinces, qu. 2098
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 2247
Inland Revenue Collector at St. Hyacinthe, Dr. Cartier, qu. 3904
Inquiry into public services, qu. 604
Interim Supply, voting of, 2011
Kirkwood Steamship Company, qu. 564
Militia supplies, sale to Roumania, 2245
Mondou, Mr.—Yamaska election, 3594
Montreal and South shore bridge, M. 2211-19
Montreal, public service, qu. 604
Naturalization Act, 1914 Amdt. Bill (Aliens who served in Allied Armies) 2441
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4031-34
Oil, leases, qu. 564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2265
Paintings in Senate Chamber, qu. 566
Parliament Buildings, 3994-4002
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 3423
Prime Ministers' Conference, qu. 564; 3320
Privilege, correction of Official Report Société des Artisans, 230
Public Accounts, 1069
Public Buildings, Nova Scotia, 2758
Public documents, destruction of, qu. 599
Purchasing Commission, 2024
Returns, enquiries for, 2009, 2775, 3320
Ross rifle, statement of Rev. Canon Scott, qu. 599

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Roumania and Greece
Dominion Canners, purchases, qu. 1001
Interest on loans, 1072
Loans to, qu. 478, 564
Militia stores, sale to, 2245
Tappert, Rev. N., qu. 1673
Welland canal, 2025, 2979-98

Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Archives, 4533. *See also* Public Records
Biggar, Mr. H. P., qu. 2343
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, 2947
Provision for, 2945

Arctic Expedition, 4106, 4113

Argentine, Beef, competition with, 1039

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 367. Congratulations to Prime Minister—Mandate of Government and its supporters, 367; redistribution, representation of West; freight rates; Wheat Board, 368; price of wheat—grain investigation, 369
Canadian National Railways, 3038
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4467
Gravelbourg-Swift Current Railway, 3053

Armistice Day
Shipbuilding contracts after, 1683
Thanksgiving, 2555

Armistice Day Bill (Mr. Mowat) 1r., 2618; Transferred to Govt. Orders, 3207; 2r., com., 3773; 3r., 3776

Armouries for Public Meetings, qu. 901

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M. (North York)
Civil Service bonus, 2109

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget, 3424. Western Ontario industries, 3424; Imports of manufactured goods and exchange, 3425; canning factories, 3426; manufacturing industries generally, 3427
Business of the House
Bills reported by Standing Coms., 3761
Butter substitutes, material for, 3745
Canal tolls, 2969
Civil Service Retirement Act Amendment Bill, 4273
Flax Industry, 1401
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway, 744
Highways west of London, 4307
Illustration stations in Western Ontario, 948
Immigrants along national railways, 3070

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E.—*Con.*
Inland Shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu., 2192
Rates—control, 1497, 2557, 2966-9
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 607
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4193
National Research Council, 2702
Ocean shipping, Govt. control, qu. 3530
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Co., 3343, 3421
Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Inland Shipping Rates), 1497, 2556
United States railways, 1576
Welland canal, 2969

Army Worms, 1028

Arsenic, 1027

Arthur Young Company, 2781, 4465. *See also* Address; Civil Service; Post Office; Printing Bureau
Employment of, 551
Payments to, qu., 4251

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, firearms, 3900-6
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 309
Imports for home consumption in 1920, qu., 602
Pensions, widowed mothers, 637
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4056
Soldiers' Pensions, insurance and re-establishment committee, final report, 4056

Artisians, Canadiens Francais, La Société des, 82

Ascension Day, 2626, 2775. *See also* Civil Service
Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ashley, Sergt. T., C.M.S.C., qu., 3090

Assembly. *See* League of Nations

Atholstan, Lord, 1515
La Presse and, 3248

Atikokan, additional tracks, 1017

Atlin District, B.C., Judge, 1080

Auditing. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Auditor, Independent. *See* Canadian National Railways

Auditor General
Railways, audit by, 1189

Auditor General's Report, 597, 958, 2247
Comparison with Estimates, 1108
Delay in bringing down, 737, 903, 1791
Penitentiaries, purchases for, 1104-5
Travelling expenses of judges, 1088
Unprovided items, 4535
Vols. I and II, 642; Vol. III, 788, 1396; Vol. IV, 737, 1176, 1385, 1388

Australia and New Zealand
Trade and steamship services, 1223, 1468, 1493

Austrian and German Imports. *See* Customs Act Amdt. Bill; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Authors. *See* Copyright

Automobiles.—*See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Driving while intoxicated, 3911
Theft, 3913

Backus, Mr. E. W., 4173-4224. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Baie Ste. Catherine Steamship Service, 1822, 1971

Baie St. Paul liquor seizure, qu., 696; qu. 1132

Balance of Trade, 97, 3219, 3264, 3366, 3397 *See also* Address, Budget, Trade

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 3201. Tariff question, 3201; war indemnity, 3202; Roumanian and Greek loans, 3202; present economic conditions, 3202; financial situation, 3202; Laurier Government, 3204; railway problem, 3204; taxation, 3204; Easterr Townships, 3205; military and nava expenditure, 3205; League of Nations, 3208; military service, 3206; immigration policy, 3206
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4446
De Martigny divorce, 4112
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 741
Housing, 1143-9
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224
Unemployment and Labour, 1373

Balfour, Hon. A. J., and protection, 3417

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Pierreville postmistress, qu., 3208

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Brant, steamer, 1982
British preference, 3485, 3553
Liberals, and, 3616
Budget, 3209. Revenue, 3209; Imaginary letters and Mr. McMaster, 3209; private business of ministers, 3210; tariff revision, 3210; position of Mr. Fielding on tariff, 3211; Naval affairs and expenditure, 3212; fiscal policy of Farmers' and Liberal parties, 3213; boot and shoe industry in Quebec East, 3214; Mr. King's speeches in Eastern and Western Canada, 3214; position of Mr. Gauthier, 3215; Quebec representation in Cabinet, 3216; attitude of Quebec, 3216
Business of the House
For tomorrow, 2148
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill (Public harbours) 2229
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2259-60
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Balance sheet, 1920, errors in, 1697-8
Canadian Press comment, 1704
Creation of company, 1908
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710
First annual report, 1694
General statement, 1272; shipbuilding, 1272, 1279; shipping rates, decline in, 1273; cost of construction, 1274; operating costs, 1275; routes and sailings, 1275; exports, 1276-77; operating results, 1277; assets, 1277; liabilities, 1278
Halifax-Newfoundland route, 1686
Information, 1440
Operating profit, 1867
Preference to Canadian products, 1280
Quebec port, alleged discrimination against, 1271
Sailing routes, 1275, 1733
Ships on Great Lakes, 1914
Vessels, names of, 1962
Canadian "Inventor" 1890
"Champlain," 1980, 1995
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 786
Champlain, steamer, 1980, 1995
Chicago Drainage Canal, 1851
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4475-84
Naval Service, preference, 4484
Dry docks, 1690
"Esperanto," wreck, 4341
Fisheries
Breeding establishments, 4036
Dominion and Provincial jurisdiction, 2105

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Fisheries—*Con.*
Inspection of pickled and canned fish, 2183
Lobster hatcheries, 4036
Overseers in Lunenburg, 2179
Salmon fishing licenses, 4342
Icebreakers and steamers, repairs, 1979, 1994
Imaginary letters, 3209, 3174
Johnston, Mr. Alex., re-appointment, 644
Life-saving service, 1990, 1991
Lighthouse and coastal service, 1996, 2174
Signal service, 1997, 4040
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
"Marie Lydia," schooner, 1985
"Narbethong," steamer, 2175
Naval Service estimates, 4010-36
Navigation, season of, 1994
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4010-36
Ocean and River service, 1736
Pilotage, administration of, 1999
Pilots, pensions, 2000
Public Harbours, 2229
Repairing of ships at Quebec, 1988
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1992
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 652
Sherwin-Williams Paint Co., 372, 3484
Shipbuilding, 1272, 1683, 2081
Contracts, 1872, 1884, 1972, 1902
Correction as to value, 1683
Depreciation, 1886
Details of construction, 1874
Dominion Steel Company, 1691
Extra fittings, 1894
Figures, 1931
Imperial Munitions Board, 1869
Interest on cost, 1887
Lemieux, Mr., speech on, 1684
Newspaper comment, 1934
Operating profit, 1866
Opposition to, 1892
Price per ton, 1873
Progress in debate on, 1729, 1931
Sinking fund, 1885
Shipyards, Government loan to, 1883
Swan, Mr. D. D., Consulting engineer, 1997
Tariff—speech, Montreal, Nov. 15, 1920, 363
Welland canal obstruction, 1990
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, investigation, 1988
Yamaska by-election, 3251

Ballot Boxes, Convicts working on, 1092

Banff National Park, 3986, 4495

Banking and Commerce, Com., 962

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 36 (notice to creditors of suspension) 1r., 1069; 2r., com., 2556. (See No. 3)
2. Bill No. 37 (French Version) 1r., 1069; m. for 2r., 2557. (See No. 3)
3. Bill No. 118. 1r., 2618; 2r., com., 3909, 3143; 3r., 3146. Senate amendments. 3772-4068

Subjects and sections discussed:
Additional security by trustee, 2913
Adjustment of rights of contributories, 2929
Affidavit upon registration, 2910
Alternative powers—court to await prior action, 2937
Assignment of book debts, 2922
Available Act of bankruptcy, 2909
Claims, priority, 2935
Commencement of bankruptcy, 2910
Discharge of Trustee, 2934
Dismissal of petition, 2910
Dividend, 2930-31
French version; correction, 4170
Jurisdiction of Dominion and provinces, 2924
Leased premises, 2935
Liability of officer, director or agent of company, 2940
Local newspaper, 2909
New trustee may be substituted, 2916
Penalty for removing goods, 2938
Permission limited, 2920
"Person," 2910
Procedure in Quebec under Civil Code, 2924
Proof, power to admit or reject, 2935
Proposal of composition or management, 2911
Removal of goods; bank deposits, 2920
Remuneration, expenses and costs, 2930
Remuneration of trustee, 2933
Search warrants, 2936
Securities—secured creditor to value, 2935
Stay of proceedings, 2912
Trustee may apply for directions, 2918
Trustee may apply for sale of property, 2920
When misrepresentation or fraud, a defence for contributory, 2928

Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1084

Banks. *See also* Finance; loans
Canadian, deposits outside Canada, qu. 1623
Dominion Notes and gold reserve, qu. 1234
Taxation, and, qu. 2192, 3664

Banner Oats, 1033

Bar Association. *See* Canadian Bar Association

Barbed Wire, 3328, 3495

Barnard, Mr. C. A., 1846, 1930

Barnhill, Mr. A. P., 1609-10. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

Bass River, wharf, 3989

Battlefields Memorials Commission, competitive designs, 2566

Beatty, Mr. E. W., and immigration, 1127, 1356

Beauce, appointment of Judge, 1081

"Beaver" Canadian, Ss., qu. 1673

Beef Cattle. *See* Cattle Embargo; Live Stock

Beef, Dressed, export of, 1039. *See also* Cattle Embargo

Beer Containers, Marking, 3786

Beet Sugar, 301, 3426, 3456

Béland, Mr. H. S. (Beauce)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 157; Election, League of Nations, 157; speeches of Sir George Foster and Mr. Rowell; International Justice; Article X; registration of treaties; expenses, salaries of officials. 158; Canada's share; Imperial federation; centralization; local control; Lord Burnham, 159; unrest and dissatisfaction, 160; Government has outlived mandate; representation, redistribution will not greatly help Agrarians; tariff issue, 161, 162; Quebec situation, 162; Canadian National Railways, Board of Commerce, 163; Board of Pension Commissioners; International Joint Commission; Peace Conference; Assembly of the League of Nations, 164
American implements at Experimental Farms, qu. 492
Auditor General's Report, 914
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1519
Business of the House
Monday, Government business, 2148
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Second reading by consent, 2889
Saturday sittings, 2818
Canada Year Book, 1425
Canadian Association for Prevention of Tuberculosis, 3142

Béland, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Private ownership, 1498
Canadian representation in the United States, 2400-28
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2492-2502, 4268-73
Coal importation, 1248
Cocaine and morphine imports, 3130
Coffee, adulteration of, 3141
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3146, 3958-71
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4437-42
Demobilization, 2285
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4065
French Trade Agreement, 1175
Fuel Supply, Special Committee, evidence in French, 4251
Government railways, boards of management, 1658
Governor General—reported appointment of Lord Byng, 4435
Grain elevators, 1442
Health
Medical officers, 3133
Immigrants, for, 3132
Housing loan, 4552
Immigration, 2575
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4351-5
Income Tax, extension of time, 1272
Maple Products Act Amdt. Bill, 2150, 2193, 2557-60, 2618, 2890
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1652
National Resources, 892
Maple industry, 892
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2263-7
Parliament Buildings, 4000
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096, 2709-11
Polish Battalion for service in French Army, 4055
Pootmans, Mr. G., and Belgian loan, 3379
Purchasing Commission, 2018, 2020, 2024
Quebec riots, 1508
Quebec Union Telephone Company, 3343
Returned Soldiers
Pensions, insurance and re-establishment Special Committee, 732, 4055
Relief for, 2688
Revenue, expenditure and debt, qu. 2099
Scientific Research, 1430. *See also* Research
Statutory expenditures, 1422
Unemployment, 4551

Belfast, linen yarns. *See* Linen yarns

Belgo-Canadian Pulp & Paper Company, 3049

Belgium. *See also* Loans
Credit to, qu. 577, qu. 1001, 3347, 3377
Pootmans, Mr. G., 3379
Purchases in Canada, qu. 736

Bell, Dr. Graham, secretary, 2377

Bell, Major Graham A., 1609-10, 1666, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Bell Telephone Company, Signal Service, 1998

Belly River water rights, qu. 2943. *See also* Irrigation

Bermuda
Steamship service to, 1488
Trade agreement, rejection of, 1271. *See also* Canada-West Indies
Trade relations, 2253

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright

Berry Boxes and Currant Boxes
Amendment of Inspection and Sale Act M. (Ethier), 4106, 4114

Berthierville telephone, qu. 1233

Bertrand, Mr. Joseph Tetu, 4079

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Agricultural Shows, 1244
Chief Justice, income tax, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4468-80
Experimental Farms, 940
Flax-growing, 1392, 1395
Fruit inspectors and Civil Service Commission, 1045
Highway construction in Ontario, 3027, 3033, 4295
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4214-18
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3855-88
Parliament Buildings, 4075

Bi-Cameral System. *See* Ministers

Bienfait, Briquetting plant at, qu. 673, 4499. *See also* Coal; Lignite; Natural Resources

Biggs, Hon. F. C. and Highways, 3036, 3037, 4290, 4448. *See also* Highways

Bills. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Private Bills Discussed; Speaker. For Public Bills see individual titles

Binder Twine, 3227, 3328, 3365, 3481, 3493, 3505. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Exemption of fibre, 3746

Biological Board, 2189

Birchard, Dr., grain laboratory at Winnipeg, 1228

Birds. *See* Migratory Birds

Bituminous. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Blair, Mr. William J. (Battle River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 376; General election unfair to West; no demand; marketing of farmers' grain; at mercy of grain dealer; elevator practices, 377; position of elevator operator; screenings and dockage, 378; overages; Winnipeg Grain Exchange; Wheat Board; participation certificates, 379; Mr. Woods' statement; investigation necessary
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 1343

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 313; Congratulations to Prime Minister; unjust criticism of Government, 313; effective prosecution of war; trade expansion; merchant marine; re-establishment, 314; Soldiers' Settlement Act; soldiers' insurance; expenditure of Ontario Government, 315; trade with United States; exchange; declaration of policy by leader of Agrarians; investigation of grain trade, 316; performances not promises; leader of the Opposition, 317
Alcohol, tax on, 3731
Criminal Code amendment, 3899
Debates, translation of French speeches, 702
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4201
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2267

Blondin, Hon. P. E., 536, 552. *See also* Postmaster General
Payments to, qu. 567. *See also* Ministers, Post Office

Blood Indian Reserve. *See* Indians

Blood-Testing of Animals, 1050

Blouin, Mr. Joseph. *See* Quebec Riots

Blue Books, printing of, 1485. *See also* Printing Bureau

Board of Commerce, 163, 401, 441, 3169, 3604. *See also* Address, Budget
Appointment and work, qu. 602
Total cost, qu. 599

Board of Directors. *See* Canadian National Railways; Management

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Board of Trade Reports
French forms, 2819, 3320, 3375

Boards of Trade, 1465. *See also* Trade

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford). *See also* Deputy Speaker
James McLaren Company, Limited, 665
Speaker's Chair, presentation, 3688, 3691

Bolshevism, 27, 3451
Pamphlet issued by Labour Department, 4548

Bolton, Mr. Ferris (Lisgar)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 396; Grain trade—drying up of lakes in Prairie Provinces—duration of Parliament, 396

Bombs. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans; Victory Bonds
Canadian Government, qu. 1620, 3289
Comparative return on Dominion and Nova Scotia, 4165
Outstanding War, Victory, tax free and taxable, qu. 2821
Tax-exempt, 3398

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Boot-making. *See* Penitentiaries

Boots and Shoes
Industry, 1222, 3214, 3230, 3386, 3484, 3637
Trade in, 1225

Borax, Manufacture of, 3365

Bordeaux Mixture, 1033

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert L. (King's, N.S.)
Archives, provision for, 2947-53
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Business of the House
Complaint of undue haste, 4452
Prorogation—important business immediately preceding, 4452
Canadian Constitutional Development, 2378
Canadian National Railways, Special Com., reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen), 1777
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2436
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4488
Religious holidays, 4488
Returned soldiers, 4259
Copyright Act Amdt. Bill, 3838-50
De Martigny divorce, 3765-70
Disarmament, views on, 3418
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17c, 2104
Governor General—Address to on retirement, 4435
Interim Supply, 1678
Judges' salaries, 1563

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert L. —*Con.*
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2329
Nauru Island phosphate deposits, 4542
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2626
Privileges and Elections Com., 2373
Speaker's Chair, 3693

Borden, Camp
Air Force, qu. 1820, 3777

Borrowing. *See* Housing; Loans

Boswell, wharf, 3977

Bosworth, Mr., and value of ships, 1706

Boucher, Mr. Aime, ques. 3422, 3423. *See also* Pierrevile; Yamaska

Boucher, Mrs. *See* Pierreville Postmistress

Bounties, 3085. *See also* Natural Resources; Trade and Commerce
Beet Sugar, 3456
Iron and Steel, 874
Linen yarn, 1389
Petroleum, crude, 1385, 1413

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Canadian National Railways, superannuation, qu. 2344
Civil Service
Appointments, qu. 572
Returned soldiers, qu. 3259
Dredge Internationale, qu. 2192, 2506
Motor-bus tax, remission, qu. 603
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, qu. 603
St. Romuald public building, qu. 577, qu. 604

Boxed Goods. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Arthur Young Company and Griffenhagen, payments, qu. 575
Housing, 1146
Immigration to Northern Ontario, 3077
Oleomargarine Act Amendment Bill, 3859
Unemployment and immigration, 1362

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Dairy products grading Bill, 4444
Maple Industry, 887
Natural resources, 887
Road from Cascades Point to Coteau Junction, qu. 576
Tobacco licenses, 2554
War History, qu. 1625

Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Provincial analyst's certificate, 3789
Still—innocent manufacture of part, 3788
Grand Trunk loan, 4148-58

Bradley, Mr., Vice-Admiralty registrar, 1086

Bran, for destructive insects, 1027

Brandram-Henderson, Limited, 1611

"Brant," steamer, 1982

Brantford-Hamilton Highway. *See* Highways.

Bridges. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Public Works; Railways and Canals
Banff, 3986
Bryson-Calumet Island, 3986
Campbellton-Cross Point, qu. 573, 2937
Edmundston, 2810
Grand Etang, 3987
Jacques Cartier County, 3678
Joliette, 4320
Kingston, 3973
Lachine Canal, 3675, 4308
Longueuil, 300
Montreal-South shore, M. (Archambault) 2213
Perrot Island, qu. 576, qu. 603
Quebec highway, 4333
Railway, 1664
St. Annes-Vaudreuil, 3677
Victoria, 300

Briquettes, 1251, 1267, qu. 673, 4499. *See also* Fuel; Lignite

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1288
Cattle embargo, 728
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2464
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 743
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 594
Shipbuilding, 1288

British Board of Trade and Immigration, 3133

British Cattle, 1049. *See also* Cattle Embargo

British Chamber of Shipping, 1716

British Columbia
Buoys and Lighthouse service, 2175
Fisheries, 861, 883
Fruit industry, 9-10
Hog cholera in, 1059
Lumber trade, 1725

British Columbia.—*Con.*
Natural resources, 861
Poultry, 3750
Shipment of ties to Egypt, 1725
Vancouver Island railways, qu. 3422

British Embassy at Washington, 1221. *See also* Canadian Representation.

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1691. *See also* Halifax Graving Dock

British Flag, protection under. *See* Burnham, Dr.

British Foreign Office. *See* French Trade Agreement

British Funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733

British Goods, importation of. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. (Marking of Imported Goods)

British Manufacturers. *See* Trade

British North America Act
Proposed amendments. *See* Address; Ministers
With regard to Judges, 1082

British Precedents. *See* Address; Ministers

British Preference, 3699

British Remount Commission, 4341, qu

British Subjects, foreign-born wives of. *See* Dominion Elections Act

British Traditions. *See* Ministers

Brookfield, Mr., and Halifax Graving Dock, 1699

Brouillard, Mr. J. O. (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Archives, Mr. H. P. Biggar, qu. 2343
Canadian National Railways, Hornepayne division, qu. 1624
George, Mr. A. D., qu. 1233
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., and G. T. Arbitration, qu. 1002
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, qu. 1621
Judge Snider's report, qu. 2028
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001

Brown, Hon. George, 172, 1167-8
Letter to Sir John A. Macdonald, 4002

Brown-Tail Moth, 1027. *See also* Destructive Insects

Brunelle, Sergt. Major N.
M. (Mr. Lemieux) for papers, 1518

Brussells, International Financial Conference, qu. 1237, 3148, 3150, 3157, 3268, 3276, 3452, *See also* Military Expenditure

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Lethbridge)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 475; congratulations to Prime Minister; explanation of personal position; not prepared to support Government; people voted on war not domestic questions; new parties, policies and leaders, 475; redistribution and election; Western Canada entitled to increased representation, 476; tariff; the parting of the ways, 477
Antelope in Western Canada, qu. 1134
Customs revenue by provinces, qu. 1622
Irrigation
Belly river water rights, qu. 2943
Milk river water rights, qu. 2099
Natural resources, 857
Transfer to Western Provinces, 2535
Trade agents in United States, qu. 1001

Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Date of
Announcement of, 2943
Inquiry, 738, 903, 1270, 1555, 2151, 2568, 2818, 2890
Debate on, 3127, 3146, 3209, 3262, 3322, 3343, 3375, 3423, 3476, 3531, 3584
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 3155; neg., 3686-7; resolution agreed to, 3688
Resolutions, 3121
Speech, 3114

Bud Worm, destruction in spruce forests, 1031

Building Conditions. *See* Housing

Building Material, tax on, 3734, 3736. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Building Trades. *See* Labour

Building Trades Conference, 1498, 1556

Bulk Freighters. *See* Fuel Supply

Buoys. *See* Navigation, aids to

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Automobile theft, 3916
Business of the House, 1330, 1340
Definite statement as to, 1025
Estimates—method of voting, 1073
Morning sittings—prorogation, 4339
Previous debate, 3562

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Supply
Procedure, 1024, 1025, 1073, 1217
Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 1217
Canada Temperance Act
Cases pending, 3902
Exemption of, 4376
Proclamation, 4876
Retroactive legislation, 4376
Supreme Court case, 4376
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 645, 647, 767
Canadian National Railway Company, damage to property, 3049
Canadian National Railways
Forest fires—Transcontinental, 4335
Operation of, 1004
Saskatoon, switch engines, qu. 3090, 3903
Cattle embargo, 729
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 3901-4267
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3959-68
Containers, 3956
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3830-7
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900-36
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3798
Fee, 3798
Form of, 3798
Proclamation, 3798
Trade agents, 3798
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite), 261
Dates of proclamation, assent and voting, 303
Names eliminated, 304
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4246-8
Election officers, disqualification, 4246
Nomination paper, 4247
Exchequer Court Act Amdt., 624
Fuel Supply Co. evidence in French, 4251
Harbours, and rivers, estimates, 3973
Vote in Com., 3979
Highway construction in Ontario, 4297
Hudson Bay Railway, motion involving expenditure, 984
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-54
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, Bill, 608
Interior Department
Messenger clerks, 1333
Salaries, 1330
James MacLaren Company, Limited, Bill, 598
Justice Department
Law officers, 1078
Juvenile delinquents—spanking, 3918

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Control Bill, 1176
International Joint Commission, and, 1071
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4171-4226
National Research Institute, 2692
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4012-34
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4575
Patent Act Amendment Bill, 4456-9
Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill, 3739
Railway statistics, qu. 3422
West Durham election, 1324
Wines, sparkling, tax on, 3734

Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, qu. 576
M. (Mr. Lemieux), 1520

Burnham, Mr. J. H., resignation of, 1

Burnham, Lord, 159
Suggested appointment as Governor General, 599

Business Depression, 3213. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade

Business Profits War Tax, 3120, 3253, 3445. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation
Expenditure, 4533

Butter. *See* Dairying Industry; Dairy Products, grading of; Oleomargarine

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Budget, 3524. Attitude of Government supporters on tariff, 3524; comparison with attitude of Opposition, 3525; protection and the fiscal policy, 3525; foreign trade development under protection, 3526; steel trade, 3526; Dominion Coal Company and strike—Mr. E. M. Macdonald, 3528
Cost of operation of ships, 1799
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, theft of automobiles, 3917
Ingonish, Macleod's breakwater, 4087
Interim Supply, 2020
Judges, power to suspend sentence, 1857
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2124
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2066
St. Lawrence coal trade, 1495
Wrecks, removal of, 1990

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons; Representation in Parliament
Bill respecting, 1310
Holding of. *See* Representation in Parliament

Byng, Lord, New Governor General. *See* Governor General

Cabinet
French Canadian Minister, alleged offer of position to, 3638. *See also* Veniot; York-Sunbury
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., M.P., and, qu. 1131
Ministers. *See also* that title
Post Office Dept. and, qu. 1349
Quebec, representation in, 3216

Cabot Strait, 3297

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Air Board, 3777-83
Annapolis public building, 2741
Binder twine fibre, 3756
Bounties, 1386. *See also* under this title; Natural Resources; Oil
Bureau of Statistics, 2142
Business of the House, 1344
Estimates
Announcement of business for to-morrow, 1344
Rule 17C
Right to call dept. when in Com. of Supply, 2889
Thursdays and Fridays, 1215, 2889, 3001
Calumet Island bridge, 3986
Canada Year Book, 1425
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 776
Canadian National Railways
Auditing of accounts, 1189, 1668
Board of Directors, 4314
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1189
Officials, payment of, 1669
Report, qu. 902
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K Maclean), 1615
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1769
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1813
Canadian Northern Railway, Directors, 1664
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378
Census—appointment of enumerators in Pontiac, 828, 1127
Civil Service and patronage, 828
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Cost of production, 4426
Imports from European countries, 2811-19
Proclamation, 4407
"Reasonable profit in the circumstances" 4415
Valuation for duty, 4415

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill—*Con.*
Valuation of currency, 3811-19
Customs Tariff Amdt. Bill, imported goods, marking, 3952
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4245
Dominion Police Force, withdrawal from Mounted Police, qu. 601
Dominion Statistician, 1231
Estimates. *See also* under this title Business of the House
Consideration of, 1666
Objection to, 1074
Flax industry, 1396
Georgian Bay Canal, 688
Gilmour and Hughson, Limited, 1096
Grand Trunk Arbitration, qu. 2030, 2445-79
Grand Trunk Loan, 4145-68, 4314
Motion to reduce, 4151, neg. 4167
Grand Trunk Railway, directors, 3741
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence waterway, 688
Harbours and rivers, 3973-80
Homesteads, 1346
Housing, 1145
Immigration, 2578-84, 3057
Abitibi country, in, 3075
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3826
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4499
Interim Supply Bill, 2103-2116
Interior and Immigration Depts. 1331
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 609
Kapuskasing illustration station, 949
Live cattle industry, 1474
Manufacturers, protection, 1492
Militia, annual drill, 2294
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2268
Mounted Police,
Recruits, qu. 601
Strength, 2798-2800
National Research Institute, 2705
National resources, 849
Oil
Bounties, 1418, 1424
Lands, General Lindsay and, 1342
Leases, 1340
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4028-34
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883-92
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. 2267
Parliament Buildings, 3996-4001
Penitentiaries, 1116
Increase in cost, 1112
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096
Pontiac Census Commissioners, 1127
Printing of Publications, 1438
Purchasing Commission, 1098, 1102, 1114, 2142

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Railway Commission, 3016
Railway Department, record searcher, 1672
Railways
Deputy Minister of, 1665
Parliamentary control, 1603
Return, inquiry for, 2688
Riding Mountain Park, 1343
Rule 17C (Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays) and Interim Supply Bill, 2103-2105. *See also* under this title Business of the House
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2155-7
Shipbuilding, 1935
Contracts, 1902, 1911
Export trade, 1927
Sinking fund, 1885
South Africa steamship service, 1491
Steamship subsidies, 1491
Transcontinental Railway
Colonization along, 3075
Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2511
Transportation of grain, 2982. *See* under this title Georgian Bay Canal; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway
Welland canal construction, 2981-90
West India cable, 1438
West Indies-Canada Trade Agreement, 1467
West Indies Steamship service, 1488, 1490

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Health, Immigration and Colonization; President of the Council)
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 779
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3207, 3827-9. *See also* under this title, Immigration
Civil Service
Retirements, list of, 1817
Superannuation
Increased allowances, 4275
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4461-93, 4281-88
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2486-2503, 4119, 4266-78
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 3903, 4062-8
Debates, Official, distribution of, 2224
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1557
Health
Adulteration of food, 3142
Department, 3127
Report, 1852
Research work, 3135
Drugs, traffic in, 3130 *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Medical officers, 3133
Mental Hygiene Council, 3143

Calder, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Health—*Con.*
Sick mariners, 3135, 4039
Immigration Act Amdt. (Deportation), 1858
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3007, 3822-7
Money qualification, 3825
Persons guilty of sedition, 3826
Senate amendments, 4343
Immigration
British inspectors, 3067
Care of immigrants, 3069
Chinese, 3207, 3827-9, 4131
Department, 3055
Estimates, 2568-2602, 4127, 4131
Postponement of consideration, 3077
Exhibits decorator, 3066
General statement, 2568
Head tax, 3056
Medical officers at ports of departure, 3132
Mental defectives, 3583
Officials, 3057
Policy, 3063
Railways and, 4130
Typhus fever, precautions, 644
Unemployment, and, 1380
United States, 3065
Women, 3061
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 620
Langley, Hon. George, statement by, 456
Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, 4128
Military District No. 12, 2797
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2263-8, 2346, 2897, 3009, 4062
Special Committee, report, 2708
Proportional Representation, 1541
M. for Special Com., 1542
References to, 363, 438, 452
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, strength, 2798
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2343, 2481-6
Sales tax, 3757
Sick and distressed mariners, 3135, 4039
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1499
Tuberculosis, prevention of, 3142

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Abattoirs and cold storage plants, 1125
Agricultural implements, 3496
Budget, 3441. Farmers' party, attitude of, 3441. Protective tariff and duty on fertilizers, 3441; potato crop, 3442; Roumanian loan, 3444; revenue from Victory Bonds, 3444; luxury taxes and business profits tax, 3445; Canadian manufacturers and tariff, 3446; sales tax, 3447

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
By-election, York-Sunbury, 2151
Canadian National Railways, directors, 1672
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2781, 4467-89
Cow-testing, 1037
Customs Tariff Amdt. Bill—imported goods marking, 3950
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4243
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 1497, 2231
Highways—New Brunswick, 4306-8
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 613
Lumber, tax on, 3744
Militia, Douglas, Mr., dismissal, 2277
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Railway Department, sundries, 1667
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2154, qu. 837
Tobique reserve—timber, 4503
Widowed mothers' pensions, 639, 4370
Woodstock exhibition, 1125

Camp Borden. *See* Borden, Camp

Camp Grounds, Farnham, Que., 1132

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways, Commissioner of

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 369; Congratulations to Prime Minister; review of the debate; personal position, 370; tariff, protection not main question before House, 371; adjustment of tariff schedules, necessaries of life; profits; Dominion Textile Company; Sherwin - Williams Paint Co.; duties on agricultural implements; Ford car; mining machinery, 373; Government formed for period of war; redistribution before election, 374; precedents; constituency of Nelson, a concrete proposal; adjournment till fall for redistribution, 375; amendment to the amendment proposed, 376; Amdt. negatived, 561
Aerial patrol, 4495
Budget, 3681. Natural resources of Western Provinces, 3681; tariff revision and protection, 3682; cement industry, 3683
Canadian Forestry Association, 4495
Canadian Wheat Board Bill, 2159
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3915-38
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4233-43
Geological Survey, 2141-7
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 3463
Highways
Manitoba, 4308
Ontario, 4298

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway, 2980
M. 974, 1852
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187-4207
Musk Ox and Reindeer, 4543
National Research Institute, 2699
Natural Resources, 869
Transfer to Western Provinces, M. 2519, 2541-53
Parliament Buildings, 3999
Railway Commission, cases before, 3022
Reference to, 495
Shipbuilding contracts, 1955
Trent Canal, 2606-16, 2953-8
Welland canal, 2966-89
Witness fees, 3937

Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3318-9; 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Canada, Foreign Trade. *See* Trade

Canada Grain Act. *See also* Canadian Wheat Board; Grain; Administration, 1442

Canada Highways Act. *See* Highways

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill (Public Harbours)
1r., 1174; 2r., com., 2228; com., 2555; 3r., 2556

Canada Steamships, Limited, 1914

Canada Steel Company, 3407

Canada Temperance Act, 4533
Importation of liquor into provinces, qu.
Quebec city, petition for suspension, 3584, 4382
Where adopted, repealed and in force, qu. 4253

Canada Temperance Act, Bill. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt; Prohibition Plebiscite
1r., 3901, 4061; 2r., com., 4373; 3r., 4388
Subjects and sections discussed:
Alberta, probibition plebiscite, 4376
Cases pending, 3902, 4373
Costs, 4377-81
Damages, 4387
Defect in form not to invalidate, 3902
Expenses under, 4533
Gold Seal Liquor Co. v. Dominion Express Co. 4375
Omission of date from proclamation, 4379
Pending litigation not to be affected
Amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 4384

Canada Temperance Act Bill—*Con.*
Proclamation, 3901, 4375
Valid, 4373
Prohibition plebiscite, 4375
Retroactive legislation, 4374
Rights other than those of litigants, 4379
Vote, 4379

Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920, 563
Report tabled, 2191. *See also* Trade

Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920, Bill
Res. 1557; 1r., 1557; 2r., com., 2251; 3r., 2263

Canada Year Book, 1231, 1425

Canadian Air Force, qu. 965, 3776. *See also* Air
Camp Borden, qu. 1820, 3777
Regulations tabled, 350

Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, 3142

Canadian Bar Association, 1094. *See also* Private Bills Discussed

Canadian "Beaver," qu. 1673. For names of Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels, *see* Vessels

Canadian Citizens, War Claims, qu. 1820. *See also* Germany, Reparation

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Progressive Party
Platform, 338, 489, 3356, 3358, 3569

Canadian Council of Women's Immigration, 3058-61. *See also* Immigration

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 1426

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Disability pensions, qu. 1235
Farmers and farm labourers in, qu. 1349
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051

Canadian Forestry Association. *See* Forestry

Canadian Goods, sale of. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 6, 314, 557, qu. 3089. *See also* Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.; Canadian National Railways, Special Committee; Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding; Vessels

Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Assets, 1277
Liabilities, and, for 1920, 1701
Auditing of accounts, 1694
Balance sheet for 1920, 1696
Bosworth, Mr., statement of, 3249
Business brokers, 1713
Coal for, 1861
Competition with other steamers, 1714
Construction costs, 1274
Contracts, proposed cancellation, 1727
Control of, 1908
Crews, 1275
Complaint of treatment, 1891
Depreciation, 1701
Directors, names of, 1934
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710, 1723
Export trade, 1732
Fair wages, 4545
Financial operations, qu. 902
First annual report, 1692
General statement by Minister, 1272; shipbuilding, 1272, 1279; shipping rates, decline in, 1273; cost of construction, 1274; officers and crew, 1274-5; operating costs, 1275; routes and sailings, 1275; West Indies service, 1275-6; export trade expansion, 1276; results from operation, 1277; assets, 1277; liabilities, 1278;
Government shipbuilding programme, 2076. *See also* Shipbuilding
Great Lakes, ships on, 1913
Hall Engineering Co., Montreal, qu. 695
Information, 1164, 1440
Availability of, 1279, 1290, 1292
Special Committee. *See* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee
Inland navigation, and, qu. 2192
Insurance, 1278, 1703, 4359
Liabilities, 1278
Manager, 1934
Marcil, Mr. Louis T., compensation for injuries, qu. 2942
Marwick, Mitchell & Co., auditors, 1724. *See also* that title
Montreal, Bank of, opinion, 1895
Operating account, for 1921, 1969
Estimated, 1717
Operating costs, 1275; and wages, 1933
Operating losses, 1579
Operating profit, 1866
Operation, result of, 1277
Operation of boats, 1579
Press comment, 1705, 1707, 1709, 1718, 1808
Prime Minister, statement of, 1708

Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Quebec port, discrimination against, 1271, 1965
Reported sale of ships, qu. 570
Royal Bank, and, 1719
Sailing routes, 1275, 1732
Sick mariners, and, 3136. *See also* Health
State-owned fleets sold in other countries, 1718
Steamers, repairs to, 1979
Steamship services. *See also* that title
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Canada-West Indies, 1275, 1489, 2259
Newfoundland, 1487
Vessels. *See also* that title
Cost of, 1799
In service, qu. 568
Liquor cargoes in, 1713, 1715
Names of, qu. 1499
Canadian "Beaver," qu. 1673, 1862
Canadian "Conqueror," qu. 1381
Canadian "Explorer," 1714
Canadian "Inventor," 1890
Canadian "Mariner," 1713, 1715
Canadian "Otter," qu. 1382
Canadian "Pioneer," qu. 1382, 1689, 1722, 1894
Canadian "Planter," qu. 2942
Canadian "Rancher," 1716
Canadian "Recruit," qu. 575, qu. 1381, 1382, 1703, 1868
Canadian "Runner," 1715
Canadian "Sapper," qu. 734
Canadian "Squatter," 1894
Canadian "Voyageur," qu. 1381, 1382, 1716, 1894
Registration of, 1720
Size of, 1732
Wages, 1921

Canadian Government Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 2164

Canadian Law Library, 1090

Canadian Locomotive Company, Limited, 1610-11
Works, 3407

Canadian Manufacturers. *See* Trade and Commerce

Canadian Manufacturers Association and Tariff, 3445, 3645. *See also* Address; Budget; Manufacturers

Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 3143

Canadian National Express Company
Expenditure on Eastern lines, 3037

Canadian National Railways, 89, 163, 245, 269, 330, 344, 381, 387, 390, 4561. *See also* Grand Trunk; National Railways and Shipping; Railways; Reid, Hon. J. D.
Administration of. *See under this head* Management
Amqui station, 382, 1176, 1233
Annual statement by Minister, 1004
Auditing of accounts, 1669, 1792
Auditor
Independent, qu. 1133
Baie St. Paul—St. Urbain branch line, 4328
Betterments, 1015, 3037, 4316
Bonds
Flotation of in New York, 3288, 3298
Bridge between Montreal and South Shore, 2213
Canadian Government Railways. *See under this head* Intercolonial, Transcontinental
Branch railways, purchase of, 4338
Vote of $7,000,000 to meet working expenditure, 4335
Canadian National Express Company, 3037
Canadian National Railway Magazine, 4332
Canadian Northern Railway, 245, 3287
Bonds, issue and sale of, qu. 837
Borrowing, 3287
Certificates, issue and sale of, qu. 605
Cost of equipment, 1023
Deficits, 1189
Eastern lines, 1018
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Loan of $50,000,000, 3037
Quebec-Loretteville, electrification, 4328
Salaried officials, qu. 2942
Vessels, qu. 1348
Western lands, 2583
Western lines, 1017
Cape Breton Coal and Steel, 3295
Car shortage, 512, 549, 3541, 4322
Caraquet-Gulf Shore extension, 4338
Carvell, Hon. F. B., speech of, 1202. *See also* that title
Cedar posts, tenders for, qu. 1130
Charlevoix county—station platforms, 4329
Claims against, 1657
Claims between Ste. Rosalie and Bagot, qu. 571
Disposition of unoccupied land between, qu. 572
Coal purchases, 1772
Committee proposed, 1201
Company, 3049
Conductors, qu. 569
French-speaking, lack of, 1782, 4329
Correspondence, production of, inquiry, 1003

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Deficit, 996, 1005, 1178, 1185, 1189, 1203-4, 1205, 1597, 1600, 4165, 4319
Payne, Mr. J. Lambert, 3017
Directors, 1664, 3407, 4314
Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501
Deputy Minister of Railways, 1666
Interested in other companies, 1609
Names, 1609
Private business interests, 1609, 3610
Responsibility, 1594
Salaries, 4315
Divisional points, qu. 574
Earnings, 1006
Eastern lines, Improvements, 1017
Electrification, 4327
Employees, 1011
Conductors and brakemen discharged, qu. 1622
Fraud and malpractice by, 1669
Reduction in, 1851
Remuneration, qu. 1673, 1737
Supplementary answer, 1755, 1815
Equipment, 1007, 1013
Expenditure, 1662
Betterments, on, 3037
Western lines, 3037
Explanation of increase, 1011
Fair wages, 4545
Family compact, 1610
Fences, 4569
Fire claims—Shelburne County, 4569
Fish, transportation of, 877, 883, 890, 962, 1038
Fixed charges, 1006, 1008
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314. *See also* that title
Foremen of engines, qu. 1673
Freight
Cars, qu. 568
Nova Scotia points, qu. 1620
Rates, 4562
Tonnage, 1007, 1012
French language in Quebec and New Brunswick, 4328
Gaspé Railway service, 962, qu. 2623
Government business, 4130
Grading and track-laying, 1021
Grading in Western Provinces, qu. 570
Grand Trunk loan, 4131
Halifax and South Western
Extension to Lockeport, 4323
Station accommodation, 4327
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 4315. *See also* that title
Hornepayne division, qu. 1624
Ice supply at Mulgrave, qu. 963
Immigration, 4129
Improvements and new structures, 1017

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Independent auditor, qu. 1133
Information for Parliament. *See under this head,* Management; Special Committee
Insurance, 1772
Intercolonial Railways, 3041, 4561
Amqui, piling lumber in railway yard, 382
Auditing of accounts, 1189
Charny and St. Foy, work, qu. 1501
Deficit on, 1800
Expropriation of land at Lévis
M. (Mr. Fielding) for papers, 1846, 1851
Lévis station, 2957
Management, 1189
Maritime Provinces, improved transportation, 4561
Mileage, 1005
Ocean limited, 1976
Pensions, old employees, 387
Railway Board, and, 1655
Section men, dismissal, qu. 2028
Superannuation of employees, qu. 575
Train service, qu. 3903
Joliette bridge, 4320
Kelley, Mr. Howard D., 4315
Lake Superior Branch, 3050
Liabilities, 3300
Liquor, theft of, qu. 1132
Loans
$26,000,000, 4169, 4288, 4334
$89,687,633.39, 4131
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Locomotives, etc., 1007, 1203, 1611
Damage to at Parent, qu. 963
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503, 2890
McAdoo award, 4325
Maintenance, 1005, 1006
Management, qu. 1132, 1654, 1659, 1668. *See under this head* Special Committee
Information laid before Parliament, M. (Mr. King), 1178
Neg. on division, 1214-5
Manitoba Government, correspondence, 2777
Maritime Provinces, improved facilities, 4516, 4561
Mileage, 1005, 1012
Ministerial statement by Hon. Mr. Reid, 1004; operation, loss in, 1005; mileage, 1005; earnings and operating expenses, 1006; general railway situation, 1007; Grand Trunk Railway, 1008; summary of operating results, 1010; Grand Trunk Pacific, 1014; new structures and improvements, 1017
Monastery, station at, 4324
Moncton shops, 1851
Montmagny—shed accommodation, 4570
Montreal Locomotive Company, qu. 696
Natural resources, development, 871

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
National Transcontinental. *See* under this title, Transcontinental
New lines, 1023
Operation, 1005, 3300
Cancellation of trains, 1004
Operating deficits, 1013, 1189
Operating divisions
Eastern lines, qu. 1131
Western lines, qu. 1131
Operating expenses, 1006
Operating results, 1010, 4316-18
Parlor car receipts—French language, 4330
Passenger traffic, 1012
Payroll, comparison of, 1011
Political control, freedom from, 2828
Politics, participation in, 4502
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4565
Private cars, 4563
Private ownership, and, 1498
Provincial liabilities, qu. 2942
Publicity, 4332
Purchasing agent at Chicago, 1793
Quebec and Saguenay station agents, qu. 696, qu. 963
Quebec bridge—highway, 4333
Quebec, Oriental & Atlantic and Western Railways, qu. 573
Quebec—Shawinigan service, qu. 573
Questions on order paper, 1763, 1782, 1783, 1798
Rails
Price of, 1852
Transfer to France, 4569
Railway ties, 1772
Rate increases, 1007, 1191
Report, qu. 902
Rolling stock, 1007
St. Alexis station, qu. 2375; qu. 3582
St. Augustine, qu. 695
St. Foy round house, 767
Correspondence, 1502
Res. (Mr. Parent), 840, 967
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 837
See also that title
St. Hyacinthe shops, qu. 2821
St. Simon telegraph operator, qu. 3208
Saskatoon, shunting, qu. 3090, 3903
Section men, 1439
Special Committee, proposed reference to M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean), 1573; Amdt. 1582-83
Special Committee on National Railways and Shipping
M. (Mr. Meighen)
Agreed to as amended, 1814
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1761, neg. 1810
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) accepted, 1812-14
Notice of, 1618

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Special Committee on National Railways and Shipping—*Con.*
Special Committee appointed, 1845
Reference to, 1817
Report of, 2095
Staff, 4562
Statements and summaries, 1010, 1024
Statistics, qu. 3422
Steamship services, 558
Subsidiary companies, 1907
Sully, Que., 1134
Summaries of operating results and trade statistics, 1009
Superannuated employees
Increase of allowance, qu. 575, qu. 2344
Toronto train connections, 4569
Tourist traffic in Gaspesian peninsula, qu. 2622
Train agents, qu. 1349
Transcontinental Railway, 280, 746, 1949, 3043
Expropriation of land, 1656
Forest protection, 4335
Freight rates on pulpwood and sawlogs, 2511
Management, 1189
Mileage, 1005
Montreal, and, qu. 574
Montreal-Winnipeg passenger traffic, qu. 2376
Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2509
Transportation of grain, 2984
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Vancouver Island, qu. 3422
Western lines, 1017, 3039
Winnipeg-Quebec and East, qu. 569, 2509
Work done, 1019

Canadian National Railway Company, existence of, 3049

Canadian National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* Research

Canadian National Telegraphs, 1019

Canadian Nationals Definition Bill
1r., 397; 2r., 585, 644, 767; com., 767; 2031; 3r., 2151
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Canadian Nationals, 767
Declaration of alienage, 2031
Naturalization, 781
Renunication of nationality, 781

Canadian Navy. *See also* Naval Service
Adams, Capt. Henry C., 901, qu. 1237
Ex-members of, qu. 3422
Sale of "Niobe" and "Rainbow." *See* "Niobe"
Status of members of, 3686

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian North Prairie Lands Company, 1611

Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1789. *See also references* in Canadian National Railways debates
Canadian notes refused in United States, qu. 599
Comparison with Government railways, 1780
Competition with Government railways, 1181, 1190, 1200
Patents to lands, qu. 2821
Shares, decline in price, 1195-6
Steamers, 1688, 1730, 1936
Stock, depreciation in, 1882

Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349

Canadian Press Limited, 4533. *See also* Press
Comment on Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1704

Canadian Reconstruction Association, 3312

Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2436. *See also* Ambassador at Washington; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Prime Ministers' Conference; Trade
Correspondence, 2406, 2428
Press comments, 2408
Statement regarding, 2406

Canadian Trade Commission
Roumania and Greece, purchases, qu. 1236

Canadian Vickers, 1884. *See also* Shipbuilding

Canadian War Mission in the United States, 2388, 2400

Canadian Wheat Board, 240, 277, 343, 368, 379, 390, 487, 1452-63, 3566. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat
Agrarian party and, 1455
Correspondence, qu. 1348
Discontinuance of, 513
Participation certificates, 340-1
Report, 150

Canadian Wheat Board Bill
Res. 2116; 1r., 2117; 2r., com., 2158-59; 3r., 2159

Canadians, Foreign decorations to, qu. 1132

Canal Boats. *See* Fuel Supply Problem

Canals, 2025, 2602, 2953, 2960, 2966-98
Carillon and Grenville, 2603

Canals—*Con.*
Chambly, 2602
Georgian Bay, 688, 745, qu. 2625
M. (Mr. Devlin) 679. *See also* that title
Lachine, 2603
St. Anne's lock; St. Ours lock, 2606
Tunnel, 302
Navigation by coal barges. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Perrot Island bridges, qu. 576
Soulanges, 2604
Road from Cascades Point to Couteau landing, qu. 576
Tolls, 2962, 2972
Trent, 3374, 3415
Construction, 2025, 2966
Improvements, 2606, 2953
Nassau dam, 2954
Peterborough dam, 266
Wharf at Lindsay, 2616
Welland, 1968, 3374
Construction, 2025, 2493
Contracts, 2966-98
Cost plus system, 2966-98
Improvements, 2960
Retirement of superintendent, 2493
Sand contract, qu. 600

Cancellation of Trains. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canned Foods. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Canners. *See* Dominion Canners

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 531; Speech of the Minister of Militia; the new Prime Minister, 531; partizans and ultra Imperialists; big interests and protection; Government's mandate; struggle for constitutional and responsibile government, 532; election of 1911; controversial legislation following extension of 1916; the appeal in 1917; measures following the war; railway policy; Imperial Conference, 533; new Government leader and programme—the "Rump Parliament"—by-elections, 534; situation in Quebec—Mr. Gauthier—the Postmaster General—the Minister of Labour, 536—Quebec and the balance of power, 537
Annapolis public building, 2750
Arctic Expedition, 4113
Auditor General's report, 1388, 1396
Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, 2915-40
Judges under, 1085
Bounties, principle of, 1425

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 1218
Canada Year Book, 1231
Canadian Nationals, 769
Canadian National Railways
Management and expenditure, 1662
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1197
Canal tolls, 2962
Chief Justice, salary, 1569
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4489-90
Religious holidays, 4489-90
Civil Service Commission, 1336
Outside service, 1653
Civil Service, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) political patronage in; vicious principle; patronage rampant; judicial appointments, 811; census commissioners; Halifax platform, 813
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3921-29
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 305
Dominion lands and parks, 1334, 1343
Donner, Mr. W. A., ques. 1624
Estimates
Detail of item, 1226
French, in, 1386
Rule 17C, Thursday and Fridays, 1218
Post Office, date of submission, 4531
Statutory payments, 1414
Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill, 625
Expenditure
Necessity for reduction, 1336
Without consent of Parliament, 1415
Experimental farm in Dorchester county, 946
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142
Government Railways, claims against, 1657
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grand Trunk loan, 4132-69
Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, 4036
Highways, expenditure on, 3024, 3026, 3036
Houses, tax on, 3958
Imperial Oil Company, 1386-8, 1414
Intercolonial Railway, station at Lévis, 2757
Interim Supply. *See also under this head* Estimates
Discussion out of order, 1680
Notice, 1676
Interior Department Publications in French, 1333
Judges, conduct of, 1571
Live stock, distribution of pure-bred animals, 923
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1165
Montreal-Quebec pilots, superannuation, 1501

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Motion pictures, artist, 1225
Parliamentary restaurant, 4536
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2716-36
Petroleum bounties, 1386, 1413, 1420
Point of order
Information, 1229
Statement of Member to be accepted, 2765
Railway Commission, 3020
Cases before, 3021
Chairman, 3017
Railway Congress, 3023
Railway Department
Deputy Minister's salary, 1666
Outside legal counsel, 1656
Solicitors and counsel, 1654
Work of, 1661
Railways. *See also* under this head Canadian National Railways
Lack of information, 1336
Minister, duties of, 1663
Railway employees, Civil Service Commission, 1653
Responsible Government, 1335
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2799
Ste. Rose de Watford mail contract, qu. 3209
Secretaries to executives, 1671
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill, 653
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Consideration of, 3956
Statutory expenditure, 1419
Trade with Russia, 1224
Trent canal, 2960
Unemployment and immigration, 1375

Canso
Harbour, 3983-9
Wharf, and, 3983-9
Marine hospital, 3138
Mulgrave steamship service, 1496

Canteen. *See* War

Canteen Funds, Expeditionary Force, qu. 1133

Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501, 1609-10, 3407, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Cape Tormentine, dredging, 1017

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Government shipyard at Sorel, qu. 568, 2028, 2618
Indian Commissioner at Regina, qu. 964
St. Lawrence river
Deepening, qu. 2028
Dredges and tugs, qu. 568

Cards. *See* Criminal Code Amendments; Three Card Monte

Carillon and Grenville Canals. *See* Canals

Carroll's Landing, wharf, 3977

Car shortage. *See* Railways

Cartier, Dr. A. P., St. Hyacinthe, 3821, qu. 3904

Cartier Square, Ottawa, storeshed, qu. 3208

Cartwright, Sir Richard, 3645

Carvell, Hon. F. B., Chairman of the Railway Commission, 451, 1202, 1690, 1725, 3017

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
- Baie Ste. Catherine-Tadoussac
  - Mail service, 4530
  - Steamship service, qu. 734
- Business profits tax, qu. 576
- Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1907
- Canadian National Railways
  - Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain branch line, 4328
  - Canadian National Railway magazine, 4332
  - Charlevoix station platforms, 4329
  - Directors' salaries, 4315
  - French language, 4329
  - Liquor
    - Seizure at Baie St. Paul, qu. 696
    - Theft at Baie St. Paul, qu. 1132
  - Montmorency county as tourist resort, 4332
  - Quebec and Saguenay station agents, qu. 696
  - Subsidiary companies, 1907
- Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2032
- Canadian Northern Railway, 1909
- Canadian Pacific Railway
  - Canadian notes refused in United States, qu. 599
- Champlain steamer, 1980, 1983
- Charlevoix County
  - Station platforms, 4329
  - Wharves, 1929, 4536
- Civil Service Commission, proposed abolition, qu. 1381
- Dredging—Baie St. Paul district, 1992
- Embargo on Canadian cattle, qu. 566
- Experimental station—Charlevoix-Montmorency, 943-5
- Foodstuffs, hoarding of, qu. 1347
- Gauthier, Mr. L. J., M.P., qu. 1131
- Grand Trunk loan, 4152-66
- Grand Trunk Railway, reported application for assistance, 1498

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
- Highways, 3032
  - Grants under Act, qu. 567
  - Quebec-St. Joachim-St. Simeon, 3026, 4313
- Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3824
- Isle aux Coudres telephone line, 4540
- Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
- Montreal Post Office Mutual Benefit Association, qu. 567
- Murray Bay-Tadoussac steamship service, 1528, 1822, 1828
- Natural resources
  - M. to adjourn debate neg., 894
- Payments to Postmaster General, qu. 567
- Post Office
  - Mail Superintendents and postal inspectors, qu. 841
  - Religious holidays, 2626
  - Superintendents and inspectors, qu. 965
- Public Works at Murray Bay, etc., qu. 604
- Quebec and Saguenay Railway, qu. 963
- Quebec (city) immigration officers, qu. 1131
- Quebec riots, 1507
- Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
- Railway securities, provincial guarantees, 2619
- Roumania, interest on advances to, qu. 566
- St. Antoine, Montreal, representation, qu. 577
- St. Catherines Bay-Tadoussac mail service, 4530
- St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, warden, qu. 575
- Scott Act, suspension of, 3584
- Shipbuilding, 1895, 1929
- Tapley, W. H., case of, res. 970, neg. 974
- Three Card Monte, 1439
- Trent Canal, 2607-17, 2972
- War indemnity, Canada's share, 3583

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
- Budget, 3195. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3195; general election, 3196; tariff a political issue, 3196; protection, 3196; milk products, 3197; free trade arguments, 2197; tariff protection increased in foreign countries, 3198; group system of Government, 3199; Farmers' party, 3200; price-fixing, 3200; conscription, 3200
- Experimental stations in Dundas, 954, 956

Catellier, Mr. Ludger J., 1465

Catholic Electorate. *See* York-Sunbury

Catholic Labour Unions. *See* Labour

Cattle. *See also* Agriculture; Health of Animals
Blood Indian Reserve, qu. 1818-19; *see also* Indians
Feeding, 344
Feeds, exemption of, 3746
Industry, 335
Live, export to Great Britain, 1474
Prize. *See* Agricultural shows
Shipping, 1039
Slaughtered, compensation for, 1061. *See also* Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo, 757, 3532. *See also* Health of Animals; Live Stock; Prime Ministers' Conference
Commission, inquiry, 1072
Promise of removal, qu. 566
Res. (Mr. Smith) 702
Amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) 725
Sub-Amdt. (Mr. Steele) 758, agreed to, 766
Res. (Mr. Lemieux) dropped, 766

Causapscal illustration station, 947

Cedar Posts for Canadian National Railways, qu. 1130

Cement Industry, 3683

Census. *See also* Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes)
Commissioners and enumerators, qu. 696, 800-12, 1209, 1226, 2098, qu. 3260
Appointment of, qu. 735, 2779, 2843, 2874-82, 3807. *See also* Civil Service Commission
Missisquoi, qu. 1132, 4113
Moncton, 3972
Officials, appointment of, 527, 597, 813, 827, 828, 830, 832
Pontiac, qu. 1127, 1231
Returned soldiers, as, qu. 2097
Industrial, 3490

Cent Coin, 2161

Central Railway Company of Canada, 3716. *See also* Private Bills Discussed

Chabot, Mr. J. L. (Ottawa)
Civil Service, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) patronage in, 796; Civil Service Commission; ill-founded assertions; importance and variety of duties; organization attitude of Civil Service, 797

Chair. *See* Speaker's Chair

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker; Mr. Steele

Challies, Mr. J. B., 1346

Chambers of Commerce. *See* Trade

Chambly Canal. *See* Canals

"Champlain" steamer, 1980, 1983, 1995

Charlevoix County
Station platforms, 4329
Wharves, 1929, 4536

Charny, work at, qu. 1501

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks; Finance

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Budget, 3410. Comment on Speech of Mr. W. C. Kennedy, 3410; Rural depopulation, 3411; production per man in agriculture, 3412; tariff and free agricultural implements, 3413; sales tax, 3413; outside capital, 3414

Chaudiere Junction, 1017

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemicals for Fertilizers, 3441-2

Cheticamp Fishing station, 1991

Chicago Drainage Canal, 185, 1851, 2225

Chicoutimi
Customs collections, qu. 698
Labour Convention. *See* Labour
Pier, qu. 967
Wharves, 1921

Chief Electoral Officer, 4534. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Reports, qu. 577
To be printed, 731

Chief Justice. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Chief Whip. *See* Ames

Child Prisoners, 3011

Child Welfare, 3130

China, Importation of Eggs from, qu. 568

Chinese Immigration, 4131. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3207-3208; 2r., com., 3827; 3r., 3830
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Identity to be established, 3827
Power to arrest, 3829
Prohibited persons, 3839

Chippewa Power Canal, 2444

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Alcohol for medical purposes, 3729
Bernasconi, Mr., 4088

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W.—*Con.*
Canadian "Spinner," "Leader," etc., qu. 1382
Census commissioners—returned soldiers, qu. 2097
Chartered banks, taxes paid by, ques. 2192
Cheticamp station, 1991
Dredging, 3983
Fraser, Mr., Collector of Customs, 3082
Grand Etang
Bridge, 3987
Light, 1997, 3987
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3975
Highways inspectors, 3023
Illicit liquors, 3082
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 622
Inspectors under Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1043
Inverness
Fishery overseer, 2178
Harbour, 3985
Public building, 2817
Lobster hatcheries, 4037
Marine hospitals, 3138
Port Hood, wharf, 4104
Port Margaree wharf, 2174
Public Works—Engineering Branch, 4088
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Roy Building, Halifax, qu. 3089
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation, 4503
Trent canal, 2958

Chlorine Gas, 1027

Churchill, Right Hon. Winston and Shipbuilding, 1288. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Cigars and Cigarettes, duty on, 3698. *See also* Tobacco

Citizens' Liberty League, 304

Civil Aviation, 3776. *See also* Air

Civil Service. *See also* Arthur Young & Company; Griffenhagen; Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Civil Service Political Patronage; Supply
For individual departments *see* their titles
Appointments
As result of notices sent Members in Quebec, qu. 572
Competitive principle, on, 798
Distribution of, 1045
Dominion Lands Act, under, 4062
Dorchester penitentiary, Warden, 1092, 4467
Fruit inspectors in Nova Scotia, 1042
Gas and Gas Meters Act, Inspectors, 618, 619
Health of Animals, Inspectors, 1057, 1067

Civil Service—*Con.*
Appointments—*Con.*
Justice Department—lawyers, 1077
Member's recommendation, on, 2851-60-79
Militia appointments and dismissals, 2234
Order in Council, by, 1114
Purchasing Commission, 1100
Toronto post office, qu. 734
Trade Commissioners, 1464. *See also* Trade; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Veterinary inspectors, 925. *See also* under this head Health of Animals
Woman Supervisor of Immigration, 3058-62
Bonus, qu. 901, qu. 967, 1176, qu. 1350, 1463, qu. 1623, 1948, qu. 2029, 2108-2115, 2236, qu. 3089, 3531, 4120, 4534
Health of Animals, Inspectors to, 1057, 1067
Lightkeepers, qu. 1622
Statement by Prime Minister, 1233
Classification, 817, 1660, 2236, 2842-8, 4465, 4475. *See also* under this title, Reorganization. For classification of the several departments, see their titles
Arthur Young Company, 551, 793, 799, 802, 816, 833, 2781
Board of Hearing, 823, qu. 2820
Bonus and, 1463
Civil Service Executive, 1671
Employment of foreigners, 825
Griffenhagen and Associates, payments to, qu. 575, 793, 833, qu. 4251. *See also* that title
Increase in salaries, 4541
Justice Department, in, 1076
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Public Works, engineers, 2682
Record searcher, 1672
Commission, 825, 829, 835, 836. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt.; Res. (Sir Sam Hughes); Retirement
Abolition, proposed, qu. 1381
Administration of Retirement Act, 2486-2503
Appointments by, 814, 822, 824. *See also* under this title, Appointments
Bland, Mr. C. H., 2861
Buffer, used as, 830
Certificate of competency, 2832
Cost, 794
Curtailment of jurisdiction, 815. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Establishment of, 798
Fraser, Mr. Roy, 2860-8
Good work of, 817
Information from, 1336
Nelson, Mr. Christian, 2880

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Organization and duties, 797
Outside Service, and, 794, 815
Promotions, and, 827, 2833-9, 2847-50, 2867-2878, 2885, 4125
Removal of power to make certain appointments, 2778
Report tabled, 4449
Secretary, 2860-9, 2875-81
Competitive examinations, 817
Disabled soldiers, preference, 4049
Dismissals, 2234, 2884
Economy in, 3194, 3439
Efficiency and discipline, 2865
Employees, number, name and classification, 4255
Employment of women, 2286
Examinations, 2178
Competitive, 798, 817
Federal Union No. 66, 795
Fishery overseers, Lunenburg county, 2179
Grain inspectors, 1444
Griffenhagen and Associates. *See under this title* Classification; Reorganization
Halifax platform, 2844
Holidays, religious, 1384, qu. 1499, 2626, 2775, 4484. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Interim Supply and. *See* Interim Supply
Labour employment bureau, 2852
List, qu. 1349
Manual labourers, 2830-9, 2841-69, 2877-84, 4278-4460
Meetings in Government buildings, qu. 3421
Naval veterans, and, 3686
Organizations, 797, 2850
Outside Service, qu. 2820, 2876-80
Cost of placing under Commission, 794
Railway Department, 1653
Should be taken from Commission, 815
Political partisanship, 828
Political patronage, 2778-81, 2824-40, 2843-6, 2855-83, 3248. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Speeches on Res. (Sir Sam Hughes)
Census appointments, 800, 806, 808, 809
Committee to investigate, 790
Declaration against, 822
Opposed to, 797
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 789; withdrawn, 836
Preference to disabled soldiers, 4049
Prevailing rates of pay, qu. 3089
Printing Bureau, qu. 1234, 2827. *See also* that title
Professional, scientific and technical officers, 2830-43; 2866-84

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 2844-71
Religious holidays, 1384, qu. 1499, 2626, 2775, 4484. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Reorganization, 1335, 4465, 4541, 4555. *See also* under this title Classification
American firm, employment, 517
Griffenhagen and Associates, 551, 799, 802, 813, 816, 2242, 2623, 2781, 2827, 4117
Officers detailed to assist, 600
Post Office Department, 4514. *See also* that title
Retirement, 2826, 4266. *See also* Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
Barsalou, Mr., 2490
Customs and Inland Revenue Dept., 4117
Postmaster at Montreal, qu. 566
Provincial service, 2487-98
Report of Commission on, 1817
Survey staff, 2143
Returned Soldiers and, qu. 963, 2828, qu. 3259, qu. 3531, 4257, 4482. *See also* that title
Rural postmasters, 2829, 2833-41, 2866-84. *See also* Post Office
Superannuation, qu. 734, qu. 967, 2489, 2820. *See also* debates under Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill; Retirement Fund, taxation of, qu. 1237
Increased allowances to meet cost of living, 2112, 2491, qu. 3903, 4275, 4541
Application for, qu. 2099
Permanent Superannuation Act, 4277
Postmaster at Toronto, 566
Transfers, 2847-85
Unrest in, 795
Federal Union No. 66, 795
Whitley Councils, qu. 2820
Women in, employment, 2286

Civil Service Act, 1918, Amendment Bill
1r., 2865; m. for 2r., 2778, 2823; amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 2835; neg. 2887, 2r., 2887; com., 4278-80; 4460; 3r., 4493
Special Committee
Appointed, 2776
Discussed, 2778
First report, 2940
Concurred in, 3005
Second report, 3088
Third and final report, 3901
Discussed, 4278-80
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Air Force, preference, 4483
Annual report, 4473-81; Amdt. 4482
Commission, jurisdiction of, 4460-82
Commission may make regulations, 4461
Customs officials, 4268

Civil Service Act, 1918, Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Dorchester penitentiary, appointment at, 4467
Employees on railways and ships, Act not to apply, 4278-83
Evidence before Special Committee, 4469-80
Exclusion of certain positions from operation of Act, 4281
Foran, Mr. William, 4286
Health Department—Research, 4464-78
Holidays, religious, Amdt. (Mr. Trahan) 4484; neg. 4492
Manual labourers, 4278-4460
Method of procedure, 4257-9
Naval Service, preference, 4482
"Nor in the public interest" Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 4283; 4460-81
Political patronage, 4280
Postmasters, 4278-4460
Professional, scientific and technical officers, 4279-4460
Provisions recommended by Pensions Committee, Res. 4257
Returned soldiers, preference, 4577
Amdt. (Mr. Cronyn) 4482; agreed to, 4484
Roche, Dr., 4287
Section 38, 4460
Senate amendments, 4577
Stayner, postmaster, 4470

Civil Service Association of Canada, 797. *See also* Civil Service

Civil Service Federation of Canada, 797. *See also* Civil Service

Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 2486; 1r., 2503; 2r., com., 4275; 3r., 4278
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Commission to report, 4266, 4277
Continuous employment, Res. 4266
Customs officials, 4268-72
Employees in post offices, 4268
Militia and Defence Dept., 4267-70
Notification of retirement, 4275
Officer, 4277
Officers of House of Commons, 4274
Officials
Permanent Superannuation Act, 4277
Receiving daily wage, 4267-70
Senate amendments, 4544
Sessional employees, 4268-71-74
Special circumstances, 4277
Working part time, 4267

Civil Service Retirement Act, qu. 734

Clapp, Miss S., 1332

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4485
Holidays, religious, point of order, 4485
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4350
Payments to Justices Riddell and Latchford, qu. 1500

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 397; sympathy with and congratulations to Mr. Bolton; the home market argument, 397; congratulations to Prime Minister—protection, narrow, sectional and local; "National Policy" a misnomer, 398; condition of the country—request for Grain Commission, 399; League of Nations—relations with United States—finance, trade, tariff, "luxury" taxes; production, markets; daylight saving; Board of Commerce; direct taxation; free wheat; Prime Minister's speech on Budget, 1920, 401; taxes difficult to collect, 402; rural depopulation, 403; fiscal policy of Great Britain; excess imports not necessarily adverse balance of trade; excessive borrowings, 405; labour conditions in Great Britain and United States; industries of Ireland; emigration from British Isles; iron and steel, 408; fiscal policy of United States; statement by Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, 409; antiquity of protection; Solomon a free trader; Britain has blazed the trail, 410; amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell); the amendment want of confidence in Government; redistribution; proportional representation, 411; the tariff issue, 412; sinking ship, 413; election; Progressive platform; the question before the country, 414
Agricultural publications, 1074-5
Bounties, principle of, 1424
Budget, 3218. Raises a clear issue; Canadian strawberries and grapes, 3218; fiscal condition of Britain; adverse balance of trade, 3219; National policy, debts, and deficits; tariff revision, 3220; taxes upon consumable commodities; three main principles of taxation, 3221; Mr. Fielding's amendment; Protection and Toryism, 3222; needs of the country; trade, increase in necessary, 3223; British trade increased, 3225; cost of living, 3226; building up of in-

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
dustries, 3227; taxation of land values, 3229; income tax, 3229; direct taxation, 3230; boots and shoes, 3230; tariff burdens, 3231
Business of the House
Complaint of undue haste, 4451
Duration of sittings, 1330
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1830
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2253-9
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1283
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information, M. (Mr. King) 1191, 1806
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1769, 1801
Canadian representation in the United States, 2396-2436
Cattle embargo, 704, 728
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Holidays, religious, 4492
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268-73
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill
Crime and sin, distinction between, 3910
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Expense, 4395-4400
Fee, who pays? 3806
German reparation, 4429
Imports and exports, 4397
Increase in tariff, 4398
Invoice certificate, fee, 4397
Officials, appointment of more, 4398
Prohibitive legislation, 4420
Prohibitive tariff, 4429
Reparation Act in Great Britain, 4429
Restriction of trade, 4398
Roumania, 4429
Trade agents, 3805
Trade of other countries, 4430
Trade with United States, 4397-4400
Valuation for duty, 4419
Valuation of currency, 4429
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3724, 3939-51
District Engineer's Office, Edmonton, 4543
Estimates, Committee on, 2201
French Trade Agreement, 2131
Highways, 3029, 3032
Construction in Ontario, 4294, 4305
Immigration, 2579-93, 3056-66
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-54
Latitude in debate, 1451
League of Nations, contribution to, 2370

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2315, 4437
Naval holiday, 4020
Naval Service, 4016-19
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale—point of order, 4031
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3853-88
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2902
Polish battalion for service in Frency army, 4059
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2639-58
Privilege—report in Ottawa Citizen, 448
Protected industries and export, 3631
Protective policy, 1288
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2045
Reparations—difficulties between Allied Powers and Germany, 599
Representation in Parliament, 1314
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships), 655
Shipbuilding, 1283, 1683, 1866, 1874, 1880, 1917, 1924
Closure, 1931
Newspaper comment, 1934
Progress in discussion, 1938
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4059
Taxation, incomes of $200,000 or over, qu. 838
Wheat Board, 1453, 1458

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Criminal Code Amdt.—docking animals, 3923

Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817

Classification. *See that title* under Civil Service

Clay. *See also* Natural Resources
Crockery for, 3384-5
Deposits in Saskatchewan, 846

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Fisheries of British Columbia, 890
Halibut industry, 891
Natural resources, 890

Closure, Rule 17B. 1844. *See also* Interim Supply; Shipbuilding
Government Shipbuilding Programme, 1979-2094
Interim Supply, 2025
Formal motion, 2026; agreed to, 2076
2 a.m. rule, 2094

Clover and Grass Seed, 1109

Coal. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem; Lignite; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources

Coal—*Con.*
American competition with Nova Scotia, 3295
Canadian-owned railway mines in United States, 4316
Carriage of. *See* Fuel Supply; Railways; Transportation
Consumption in Canada, 1249
Deposits, Alberta penitentiary, 1092
Development, 842, 848
Maritime Provinces in, 1281, 3295
Prices at mine, 1251
Production and value, 3515
Railway rates on, 390. *See also* Railways, Freight rates
Railways, duty on, 1184, 1187
Reserve, 1247-8
Resources in Alberta, 857
St. Lawrence route, by, 1731. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Scarcity of. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Trade, 1936. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Wales, from, 1716
Wasting of. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Water carriage, 2963. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Coastal Trade, 1494. *See also* Shipping

Coats, Mr. R. H., 801, 1231. *See also* Census; Dominion Statistician

Cocaine Imports, 3130, 3170. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 91; tribute to new Prime Minister, 91; speech of Mr. Gauthier, a "family fight"; stability and self-respect of Quebec, 92; price of agricultural implements, 93; Opposition—amendment—the Government's mandate, 94; census, redistribution and appeal to country, 95; Agrarian party; expenditure of Ontario Government, 96; tariff and exchange situation—League of Nations, 97; disarmament, reparations, indemnities—taxation, 98; relations between Canada and the Mother Country—Judicial Committee of Privy Council—Governor General; agitation and unrest, 99; modern fads, 100
Binder twine, 3746, 3493
Brantford Customs office, 3086
Budget, 3488. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3488; taxation severe, 3488; Leader of Agrarian party and manufacturers, 3489; co-operation between

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
farmers and manufacturers, 3489; industrial census, 3490; agricultural implements and Western Grain Growers, 3492; Binder twine and free trade, 3493; home market, 3494; free trade with Britain, 3494; agricultural implement industry, 3496
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (A. K. Maclean), 1612
Canadian representation in the United States, 2402-11
Cattle embargo, 718
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Express parcels, 4403
Fee—who pays? 3802, 4402
Invoice certificate, 3802, 4401
Toronto Board of Trade, 4402
Trade
Agents and commissioners, 3802, 4402
Extension, 4403
Director of exporting company, 3564
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 308
Dr. Graham Bell's secretary, 2377
Housing, 1150
Income Tax Act Amdt Bill, 4350-3
League of Nations, contribution to, 2360-7
North American Trust Co., 1128
Parliament buildings, 3999
Pensions, widowed mothers, 637
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2724
Proportional representation, 1546
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2058
References to, 451, 491
Senate and House of Commons (Ministers and directorships) Act Amdt. Bill, 660
Shipbuilding, 1878, 1881

Cocoa
Cocoa paste and chocolate, 3703
Duties on, 3170

Coffee Adulteration, 3141

Coinage. *See also* Currency Act Amdt. Bill
Cent coin, 2161
Gold, melting down, 2160, 2269
Gold, standard, 2269
Nickel, five cent coin, 2160, 2269
Redemption of, 2160

Cold Storage. *See also* Dairying Industry; Health of Animals
Foodstuffs in, qu. 1347
Fruit, 1041
Meat of, 1125
Plants. *See* Live Stock
Warehouses, 1038

Collingwood breakwater, 3973

Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, 1884, 1890, 1902. *See also* Shipbuilding

Colonial Conferences, 3432. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Combines, 3293-5, 3382

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 3606

Commercial Exhibits, director of, 1225

Commercial Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Stock feed

Commercial Intelligence, Director of, 1219

Commercial Museum, 1227

Commercial Relations. *See* Address; Budget; Canadian Representation; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade

Commercial Treaties, 2378. *See also* Canada-West Indies; French Trade Agreement; Reciprocity

Commission of Conservation. *See* Conservation Commission

Commissioner of Patents, 623
Report, 107

Commissioners, Judges as. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Commissions of Inquiry. *See* Printing Bureau; Grain Trade

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committee on Imperial Defence, 2637-49. *See also* Imperial Defence; Prime Ministers' Conference

Committee on Railways and Shipping. *See* Canadian National Railways

Committees, Standing. *See* House of Commons

Commodities, Taxes on, 3221. *See also* Special War Revenue Act

Compensation for Slaughtered Animals. *See* Health of Animals

Condensed Milk, tax, 3737, 3956

Confederation. *See* Ministers

Conference on International Finance, report tabled, 962

Confidence Games. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Confidential Documents. *See* Canadian National Railways

Confidential Information. *See* Canadian National Railways—Management

Confidential Messengers, 1079-80

Conscription, 3200, 3517, 3528. *See also* Military Service Act; Quebec riots

Consent of the House. *See* House of Commons; Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Consequential Amendments. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections

Conservation Act Repeal Bill
1r., 3739; 2r., 3958; com., 3970; 3r., 3971

Conservation Commission
Abolition of, 2, 875, 3146, 3739, 3958, 3970-1
Illustration farms, 949-954

Consolidated Revenue Fund, surplus from Grain Board, 1447

Constituent and Subsidiary Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Canadian Representation; Ministers; Prime Ministers' Conference

Consular Agents. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade

Consular Certificates. *See* Trade, Agents and Commissioners

Consuls. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Serbian, at Montreal, qu. 605
United States, in Canada, 2405

Contracts. *See* Purchasing Commission; Shipbuilding

Controverted Elections Act. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections

Convicts. *See* Penitentiaries

Cook, Mr. Fred, 4541, 4557-60. *See also* Printing Bureau

Cooper, Col. John A., qu. 697, 1713

Cooper, Mr. Hugh L., of New York. *See* Chippewa Power Canal

Cooper, Mr. R. C. (Vancouver South)
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, report, 4055-60

Co-operative Marketing. *See* Live Stock

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 445; Minister of Militia; his

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
position from 1911 to 1917; an exponent of free trade in natural products; speeches of mover and seconder, 446; the amendment—constitutional position of Government; the written and unwritten laws—Bourinot; moral obligation to appeal to people; Ministers in disagreement—public opinion demands election; the precedent of 1911, 449; War election of 1917—formation of Union Government—retirements, 451; responsibility implies public confidence; Mr. Calder; Mr. Spinney; Postmaster General; Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, 452; St. John Standard, 453; political conditions 1891 to 1896, 454; returned soldiers calling for election; Great War Veterans Association, 455; strength of the Liberal party, 456
Agricultural estimates, increases in, 951
Air Board, 3783
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Canadian National Railways, 4561, 4338
Employees, reduction in number, 1851
Freight rates, 4562
Maritime Provinces, 4561
Private cars, 4563
Staff, 4562
Census enumerators in Moncton county, 3972
Census officials, 830
Civil Service, political patronage, 830
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2489-90
Customs
Belyea, Mr., retirement of, 3082
Offices, amalgamation of, 3083
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, 3820
Inland Revenue Act—administration, 3820
Customs Tariff Act Amdt., marking of imported goods, 3949
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4068
Dorchester penitentiary
Purchases for, 1108
Salaries, 1096
Warden, 1092
Dredging, 3982
Forts Cumberland and Moncton, care of, 4540
Fredericton experimental farm, qu. 1131
Grand Trunk loan, 4136-67
Harbours and rivers, 3973

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Highways, 3023, 3034, 4290, 4303
Immigration, salaries, 3059
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill
Intercolonial Railway, 4561
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2119-20, 2151
Justice Department, private secretaries, 1079
"Laurentian," Government steamer, qu. 1348
Marine signal service, 1998
Moncton, examining warehouse, 2815
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4031-2
Parliament Buildings, 4070
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2810
Pilotage, 1999, 2001
Railway Department
Purchasing agent, 1670
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2153, 4564
St. John Rolling Mills. *See* "Niobe" and "Rainbow"
Sackville public building, 2816
Shediac and Cape Tormentine Railway, 4564
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation of, 4505
Shipbuilding, 1905, 1931, 1935
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1837
Welland canal, construction, 2996

Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2, 649
1r., 350; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 2909; com., 3830. 3r., 3850; Senate Amdts. concurred in, 4256
Special Com. appointed, 2941
Report, 3761
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Acts of United Kingdom, 3833-46
Berne Convention, 3833
License to print, 3831-7
Phonographic discs, 3832
Publication in serial form, 3844
Royalty, 3831
Second or succeeding editions, 3840
Suppression of works, 3838

Corn Borer, 1025, 1027, 1031

Corning, W. H., cattle purchases, qu. 1624

Cornmeal, 3546

Correspondence. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Availability to Parliament, 1290-1

Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act
Bill withdrawn, 1126

Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill
1r., 1126-7; 2r., 2036; com., 2036; 3r., 2151
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Avoidance of election, 2037
Exoneration of candidate from consequence of illegal practices, 2037
Exoneration of any person from consequences, etc., 2037
Illegal practices, 2036
Judge's report published, 2037
Presenting petition, 2037
Punishment of corrupt or illegal practices, 2037

Cory, Mr. W. W., and Immigration Department, 3056

Cost of Living, 3169, 3226, 3256, 3548, 3606, 4551. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Superannuation, Increased allowances

Cote, Hon. Mr., Provincial Secretary, Alberta, 1266

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, 1890

County Fairs. *See* Agricultural Shows; Live Stock

Courtenay Bay, improvements, 4097. *See also* St. John Harbour

Cowan, Mr. G. H., K.C., legal expenses, 2187

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 165; Canada at Assembly of League of Nations—election—agitation and unrest, 165; abnormal business conditions—visit of leader of Opposition to western provinces; the tariff, 166; newspaper comment; opinions of business men and returned soldiers, 167; omission of tariff from amendment; unfair to hold election before redistribution, 168; duty on fruit; express rates; Scientific and Industrial research, 164
Agrarian party and Wheat Board, 1455
Briquetting plant at Bienfait, qu. 673
Budget, 3375. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3375; attitude of Opposition and Agrarian party, 3376; Agrarian party and free trade, 3376; loan to Belgium, 3377; agricultural machinery and the tariff; 3379; Customs duties and manufacturers, 3380; free trade and combines, 3382; price-fixing ring in Great Britain, 3383; protective tariff and Western Canada, 3384; agricultural implements, duty on, 3386-7

Cowan, Mr. Walter D.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, Craven line, 3053
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340, 341, 1452, 1455
Flax-growing, 1396
Fuel Supply Problem, 1266
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 685
Natural resources, 845
Saskatchewan militia organization, 2795-6
Trade commissioners, 1392

Cow-Testing Associations, 1036

Creamer, Dr. J. P., qu. 1236

Creameries. *See* Dairying Industry

Cream Separators, 3328, 3364, 3495, 3481, 3508. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Credits. *See* Finance; Housing; Loans

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Marquette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 262; congratulations to Prime Minister; to mover and seconder; the Speech a meagre bill of fare—freedom from unrest; Speeches of the Prime Minister; fishing in Quebec; unemployment insurance and old age pensions; tariff revision, 263; protection to agriculture; revenue, 264; finances; necessity for economy; expenditures, 265; naval and militia votes; trade and exchange; Great Britain, Australia, and United States, 266; need for extended markets; reciprocity, 267; commercial agents, 268; national railways; deficit; special committee suggested; reorganization of board of directors; immigration, 269; Prime Ministers' Conference; Imperial defence; the amendment; Government has lost confidence of country; by-elections; reorganization of Government, 271; redistribution; serious problems, 272
Archives, provision for, 2951
Budget, 3476. Reference to previous speakers in debate; national debt and Finance Minister's surplus, 3476; revenues and expenditures, 3477; maturing loans, provision for, 3478; Agrarian party—"servile tools and minions"—3479; York-Sunbury election. Government platform, 3480; Binder twine industry, 3481; cream separators, 3481; tariff revision, 3482; adverse exchange and protection, 3482; export trade, 3483; boot and shoe industry, 3484; Sherwin-Williams Paint Company, 3484; sales tax, 3485; income taxes in

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Canada and Great Britain, 3486; land taxation, 3486; agricultural products; restricted market and decline in value, 3487; rigid economy in expenditure necessary, 3487
Business of the House
Audibility of debates, 1625
Saturday sittings, 2818
By-elections
Medicine Hat, 2151
York-Sunbury, 3480, 3628
Canada Temperance Act, 4379
Canadian National Railways
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1187
Special Committee
M. (Mr. Maclean) 1184
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1776, 1804
Amdt. 1812, 1813
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2412-17
Canal tolls, 2964
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2835-66
Deceased members, tribute to, 153
Destruction of documents, 2951
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4239-41
Additional courts, 3111
Alien wives of British subjects, 3106
Certificate of naturalization qualification, 4240
Forms, 4240
Government terminal elevators—overages, 3634
Governor General, address to on retirement, 4434
Grain Growers Grain Company, 3180
Grain inquiry
Proposed commissioners, 1674
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2449-59
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 689
Highway construction in Ontario, 4294-6
Hudson Bay Railway, 998
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345
Judge Snider's report, 4436
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2351-2
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4184-4224
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891
Natural resources—transfer to western provinces, 2529-46
Navigation, season of, 1994
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 259
Post Office Department, 4519

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 1545, 1546
Railway Commission, vacancy, 3021
References to, 367, 372, 390, 395, 438, 450, 515. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget
Resignation of, letter, Sir Robert Borden, 516
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 662
Senate Committee, leave to attend, 3207, 3259
Shipbuilding, attitude on, 1978, 2082
Speaker's Chair, presentation of, 3694
Trent canal, 2971-8
Welland canal, 2974
Wheat Board, position with regard to, 1452
York-Sunbury election, 3480
Debates, official report of, changes in, 3628
Reference to by Mr. Stevens, 3627-8

Criminal Cases
Appeals, 3006
Procedure, 3006

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Aliens and Firearms (Mr. Currie) 1r., 2373; Bills withdrawn, 2560; (See Bill No. 7)
2. Excessive or Inadequate Punishments (Mr. Tweedie) 1r., 695; M. for 2r. stands, 1856, 1857, 2228
3. Defamatory Libel. (Mr. Archambault) 1r., 2149, 3933
4. Probation of Offenders. (Mr. Mowat) 1r., 2097. (See No. 7)
5. Three Card Monte (Mr. Lafortune) 1r., 1439; 2r., 1857; com., 1857-58; 2555; (See No. 7)
6. Warrant of Commitment (Mr. Mewburn) 1r., 2686
7. Age of Consent; Firearms; Motor Car Theft; Recorder's Court Jurisdiction; Seduction; etc. (Mr. Doherty) 1r., 3005-7; 2r., 3830; com., 3830-96; 3906; 3r., 3938; Senate Amdts, concurred in, 4342

Subjects and Sections discussed:
Animals, docking, 3922-36, 4343
Carnally knowing, 3912, 4342
Chattels, $25 in value, fraudulently burning, 3922, 4343
Clerk or Deputy Clerk of Peace, 3936
Commencement of Act, 3932
Concealed weapons, pistols, ammunition, etc., 3900-33
Disorderly house, 3925
Dogs—docking, 3936
Driving motor vehicles while intoxicated, 3911

Criminal Code Amendment Bills—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Falsely registering at hotel as man and wife, 3909
Feeble-minded, 3896-3932
Forms, 3932
Horses, docking, 3923
Illicit connection with Indian woman 3907
Indecent assault—age raised from 14 to 16, 3911, 4342
Location of land, 4343
Marks made on public stores, 3921
Metal tokens used as money, 3923
Offender under suspended sentence may be placed on probation, 3931
Officials stealing fares, 3925
Penalty for injuring oil wells, etc., extended to gas wells, 3922
Publication of Judicial Proceedings—Defamatory libel, 3933
Rape—whipping added to punishment, 3912
Reading depositions on preliminary inquiry, 3924
Recorder's Court, 3899
Revising of sentences, 4343
Seduction and carnal knowledge, 3899, 4342
Spanking—persons under 21 and guilty of theft, liable to, 3918
Stealing automobiles, minimum sentence for, 3913
Three Card Monte, 3921
Whipping for robbery and assault with intent to rob, 3922
Witness fees, 3937

Cromwell's Navigation Act, 1872

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2922
Civil Service Act. Amdt. Bill
Air Force, preference, 4483
Returned Soldiers, preference, Amdt. 4482, 4493, 4577
Housing, 1146
National Research Institute, 886, 2695
Natural resources, 885
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4366-73
Pensions, widowed mothers, 633, 4369
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4055
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4356
Returned Soldiers
Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment

Cronyn, Mr. Hume—*Con.*
Returned Soldiers—*Con.*
Motion for adoption of report, 4041-55.
See also Returned Soldiers, Special Committee Civil Service
Quorum, 901

Crop Reports, 1116

Crops, Loss of through insect pests, 1028

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269

Crown, taxation of the, 3742

Cruelty to Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Currant Boxes. *See* Berry Boxes

Currency Act Amendment Bill
Res. 2160; 1r., 2162; 2r., com., 2269; 3r., 2270

Currie, Mr. J. A. (North Simcoe)
Adams, Capt. Henry C., qu. 1237
Armistice Day Bill, 3776
Australian and New Zealand trade, 1223
Automobile theft, 3914
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925
Berry Boxes, 4115
Business of the House, 1831
Supply, procedure,
Discussion not in order, 1217
Hypothetical questions, 1217
Canadian Manufacturers and American markets, 1223
Canadian National Railways
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1194
Cattle embargo, qu. 714
Chief Justice, income tax and, 1566
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2825-48-83, 4283, 4466-93
Annual report, 4473
Holidays, religious, point of order, 4485
Returned soldiers—preference, 4493
Stayner postmaster, 4471
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3835-41
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900-34
Firearms, 2373, 2560
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commercial agencies, 4408
Consular certificate, 4408
"Dick Turpin"—point of order, 4421
Dumping of goods, 4412
Invoice certificate, fee, 4391

Currie, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill—*Con.*
Trade, extension, 4408
Valuation for duty, 4412
De Martigny divorce, 3764-9
Destruction of documents, 2950-3
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. 309
Dredging, 3982
Foreign trade commissioners, 1223
French Trade Agreement, 1175
Gaspé Peninsula, railway facilities, 2509
Geodetic survey, 2806
Geological survey, 2145-7
Grain
Grain Growers Grain Company, 1462
Open market in, 1452
Harbours and rivers, 3979
Highland regiments, 2307
Highway construction in Ontario, 4296
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4353-5
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2355
League of Nations, contribution to, 2365-73
Letter rate, 4517
Linen trade, 1391
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2558, 2890
Militia
Command pay, 2292
Purchasing Commission, 2239
Topographic Survey, 2806
National Expenditures Committee, 1835
National Transcontinental Railway—Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2516
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale,—point of order, 4030
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2899-2905
Parliament buildings, 4076
Letter of Hon. George Brown, 4001
Post Office, Col. Verret, 4525
Potato growing and diseases, 1033
Press—publication of court proceedings, 3933
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2669
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4059
Spruce forests, bud worm, 1031
Trade agents, 1478
Trade with Fiji Islands, 1465
United States, exports to, 1222
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1831
Welland canal, construction—point of order, 2989
Wheat Board, loss under, 1457-9
Wheat, purchase by Great Britain, 1449

Customs. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill; Tariff

Customs—*Con.*
Brokers'
Licenses, 3786
Payments to by departments, 1090
Drawbacks, qu. 2375
On fish from United States, qu. 600
Entry, 3786
Foreign monetary standards, qu. 1133
Importations
Foreign goods, 3119
From Germany, qu. 696
Marking of, 3120
Reported increase in, 597
Revenue by provinces, qu. 1622
Value for duty, 3786-3819
Valuation of currency, 3786-3818

Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Res. 3785; 1r., 3822; 2r., com., 4388; 3r., 4453
Subjects and sections discussed:
Certificate, form of, 3788
Certificate of trade or consular agent, 4389
Commission, 4388
Consular agents, 3791
Cost of production in foreign country, 4411
Customs house brokers, 4432
Department constituted, 4388
Entry, 4389
Exchange—tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
Express parcels, 4400
Fee for invoice certificate, 4389
Who pays?—3792-9, 4391-5, 4400-9
German competition, 4423
German mark, depreciation, 3810-19
Invoice certificate, 3786-3809, 4391-5, 4400-9
Minister's duties, powers and functions, 4389
Molasses wash, for hog feed, 3787-3820
New or unused goods, 3813
Proclamation of Act, 3798, 4391-4
Provincial analyst, certificate, 3786
"Reasonable profit under the circumstances," 4415
Restriction of trade, 4398
Letter of Gillies Bros., Limited, 4418
Revenue, expenditure, 4397-9, 4403
Still—innocent manufacture of part or possession, 3788-3820
Third reading, complaint of haste, 4449
Trade agents, 3786-3809
Trade, extension of, 4389
United States Customs regulations, 4417
Valuation for duty at not less than wholesale price, 4411
Valuation of currency, 4420

Customs and Inland Revenue
Department
Board of Customs, 4126
Consolidation of offices, 3083
Estimates, 2889, 3077, 4117
Inspectors, 4126
Officials
Merchandise, branding of. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. Bill
Overtime, 4123-5
Reorganization, 804
Retirement, 2490-7, 2502, 4268-72
Salaries and contingent expenses, 2889, 3081, 4117
Staff, reduction, 4117
Toronto, 1351
Revenue cruisers and preventive service, 4127
Minister, private business connections, 3077, 3172

Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Res. 3121, 3698; 1r., 3725; 2r., com., 3938; 3r., 3955
Subjects and sections discussed:
Anodynes, elixirs, etc., 3709
Imported goods to be marked, branded or labelled, 3711-19, 3938
Spirituous liquors, 3708-8
Sugar, 3699
West Indian importations, preference, 3698
Wines
Medicinal, 3709
Other than sparkling, 3710
Sparkling, 3711

Dairy Cattle. *See* Health of Animals; Live Stock

Dairy Herds, testing of, 1118

Dairying Industry, 1036, 3118. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Produce, Grading; Oleomargarine
Butter
Material for substitutes, 3745
Price of, 3190, 3256
Production, 3118
Butter and Cheese
Exports and imports, 1037, 1470, 1471, 3747-50, 3852-88, 4438
Cheese factories, 1472
National Dairy Council, 1126

Dairy Produce, Grading Bill
Res., 1r., 3760; 2r., com., 4439; 3r., 4448
Subjects and sections discussed:
Butter and cheese, export, 4437
Complaint of undue haste, 4449
Definitions, 4437

Dairy Produce Grading Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Demand for legislation, 4437
Regulations, 4448

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 137; right of Mr. Mackenzie King to lead Liberal party—overtures of Government to Province of Quebec; the French language, 138; Government without authority to carry on administration; Prime Minister the author of iniquitous laws, 139
Agricultural shows, 1240
Debates, translation of French speeches, 700
Experimental station in Rimouski, 954
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Military expenditure, 2801
Shipbuilding, 1924

Dark Lantern Brigade, 1187, 1192, 1209, 1282

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Annapolis public building, 2743
Apple-growing counties of Nova Scotia, 1046
British preference and free trade, 3666
Canada Temperance Act—relevancy, point of order, 4383
Canadian Wheat Board, participation certificates, 341
Guernsey cattle at Nappan, qu. 2686
Highways expenditure, 2555
Proportional representation, Special Com., 2027
Reference to Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King in speech, 2443

Davie Shipbuilding Company, qu. 1348, 1846, 1972

Davis, Mr. F. L. (Neepawa)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 483; congratulations to Prime Minister; "no man's land"; formation and composition of Government; out of touch with electorate, 483; Progressive platform; Liberal party; tariff "opportunism"; transportation; Committee on Estimates; Imperial relations; excess profits tax; demand by western provinces for natural resources, 484; redistribution and election, 485
American immigration, 3064
Budget, 3262. Business and financial depression, 3262; business profits and income tax, 3262; heavy freight rates, 3263; adverse balance of trade, 3264; exchange variation, 3264; debts and

Davis, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
obligations, 3265; United States, borrowings from, 3266
Canadian National Railways
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1193
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1793
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4283
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Cost of production, 4413
English bankers on trade restriction, 4412
Exchange, 4413
Foreign goods, cost of production, 3814
German goods via Holland, England and the United States, 4427
Money—purchasing power and exchange value, 4427
New and unused goods, 3815
Valuation for duty, 4412
Valuation of currency, 3816, 4427
Wages, 4428
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill, imported goods, marking, 3940
Estimates, Committee on, 484, 2197
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2458-70
Grand Trunk loan, 4146
Hudson Bay Railway, 994, 2969
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4220
Militia—reduction of staff, 2241
Natural resources—transfer to western provinces, 2537
Proportional representation, 1542
Welland canal construction, 2967-8
Wheat Board, unified buying, 1459

Dawson, Judge at, 1088

Daylight Saving, 401, qu. 1817
Ottawa, in, qu. 2687, 2776

Dease and Stikine Rivers, qu. 1133

Debates, Official, Report of. *See* House of Commons

Decayed Pilots, 2000. *See also* Pilots

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Agricultural Gazette, 1076
Agricultural shows, 1243
Board of Trade forms in French, 2819, 3320
Budget, 3466. Government system of taxation; war profits tax and large companies; income tax, 3467; Yamaska election, 3467; railway administration, 3469; fire insurance in foreign firms, 3469

Dechene, Mr. A. M.—*Con.*
Butter
Exports, 1037
Price of, 3256
Butter and cheese exports, 1471
Civil Service
Bonus, 4535
Classification, 4541
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4446
Government shipbuilding programme, 2094
Immigration, salaries, 3057
Militia employees, 2241
Montmagny—railway shed accommodation, 4570
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3860
Post Office, Isles aux Grues-Montmagny service, 4529
Potato diseases, 1032
Public Works—Nova Scotia, 2754
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Missals and prayer books, 3756
Prayer beads and crucifixes, 3756
Sales tax, 3757
Supply—point of order, 2759

Decorations, foreign, to Canadians, qu. 1132

Defamatory Libel. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bills

Delinquent Children, 3012. *See also* Juvenile Delinquents

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Cabinet Ministers and Post Office Dept., qu. 1349
Canadian National Railways
Conductors and brakemen discharged, qu. 1622
Post Office Department—reorganization, 3772

De Martigny Divorce. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 232; congratulations to mover and seconder; general election, inevitable, 232; circumstances under which Government was formed; manipulation of soldier votes in 1917; no relief until constitutional government restored; Prime Minister's attitude towards Quebec, 233; all classes anxious for general election; necessity for rigid economy, 234
Budget, 3437. Financial and economic condition of country, 3437; railway deficit,

Demers, Mr. M. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
3438; shipbuilding, 3438; military expenditure, 3440; economy in public affairs, 3440
Deposits outside Canada in Canadian banks, qu. 1623
Fort Lennox, Isle-aux-Noix, sundial, qu. 2097
Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 736, qu. 1817; qu. 2027
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2718-22
St. Jean Post office, receipts, qu. 576

Demobilization, 2285, 3523. *See also* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment.
Canadian claims against Germany, 4534. *See also* Germany
Enemy debts, 4534
Public Works, 3989

Democratic Government. *See* Ministers

Demography, Chief of, 1232

Denis, Mr. J. J. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 539; French language; speech of Prime Minister a document without fragrance, flavour or taste, 540; the new Government and the old; Prime Minister's tour; general election; position of Government precarious and humiliating, 541; province of Quebec, 542; League of Nations; French speaking representatives; International Labour Conference, 544; financial position of Canada, 545; amendments, 546; ten years without an election; the one issue of 1917; fiscal policy, 547
Alcohol, tax on, 3732
Budget, 3575. Approved by industrial interests, 3575; sales tax bears heavily on working classes, 3576; tax on spirits, 3576; railway situation, 3577; immigration policy, 3580; military expenditures, 3580
Business of the House
Duration of sittings, 3733
Private Bills, 3971
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2257-8
Canadian National Railways
Joliette bridge, 3038, 4320
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2419-21
Census commissioners in province of Quebec, 832

Denis, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2865
Civil Service, political patronage, 831
Criminal Code Amendment Bill, 3830
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Valuation of currency, 3818
Dairy Produce, grading Bill, 3760
Debates, official, distribution of, 2221
De Martigny divorce, 4002-6
Estimates in French, 1385
Grand Trunk loan, 4159-62
Highways, Quebec, 4308
Immigration, 2598, 3088
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3825
Income Tax Act Consolidation, 2819, 3905
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3877, Amdt. to 2r., 3879, neg. 3886
Privilege—Immigration, remarks on, 3088
Proportional representation, 1543
Quarantine stations, 2811
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Amendments, 3755
Lumber, tax on, 3756-7
Sales tax, 3755

Departmental Expenditures. *See also* Supply, Depts.
Detailed information, 1186-7

Departments
Purchasing Commission, 1099
Supply, right of discussion, 1215. *See also* Supply

Deportation of Undesirables. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill

Depot Harbour, wharf, 3973

Deputy Governor General, 1559

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and Statements of. *See also* House of Commons; Speaker
Amendment
Changing destination of vote, 4169, 4289
Mover may not speak second time without consent, 727
Sent across floor, 764
To Public or Government Bill, 4485
Announcement by Minister in Committee, of Governor General's assent, 4169
Bills
Amendments
Involving or increasing charge on public revenue, 4359, 4485-91
Negativing principle, 3895
Which do not alter principle, 4355
Committee
Discussion of principle in, 779
Notice of amdt. to public or government Bill not required, 4485

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Principle having been adopted discussion must be relevant to clause 4466
Question put and declared carried, 4488
Title cannot be changed in, 2033
Two questions cannot be considered at same time, 4229
Consideration of clauses en bloc, 3956
Introduction of
No debate allowed, 3007
Motion to strike out section not in order, 3952
Permissible to move consideration clause by clause, 3956
Private
Com. must first report progress and motion to refer back will be in order, 1130
Precedence only for first hour on Friday night, 4010
Recommendation for change of title, 1096
Right
To hear evidence, 3768
To refer back, 1130, 3768
To review action, 4004
Senate amendments, non-concurrence in, reasons, 3010
2r.,
Analysis of clauses on, 2832
Objection to Bill not being printed in both languages must be raised before, 1095
Order for, stands, 1857
Questions and comments not in order, 2834
3r.,
Amendment, notice of, 3421
Change of title, 1096
Chair
Cannot oblige Minister to give answer unless he so desires, 1908
Rulings of subject to judgment of House, 3562
To be addressed by Members, 1066, 1896, 3468, 3530
Closure. *See that title*
Minister's right to speak exhausted, 2080
2 a.m. rule, 2094
Committee
Discussion must be strictly relevant, 1570, 1995

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Evidence taken in Court not to be used as argument, 3769
Forms adopted can only be reconsidered by unanimous consent, 4229-49
Having agreed to report, member's opportunity to speak has passed, 4275
Item declared carried after question put, 1091
No item before Com., debate not in order, 1090
Principle of Bill may not be discussed, in, 779
Vote in, 2756
Correspondence reflecting on members, 2176
Debate
Confined to specific items in Com. of Supply, 944
Details of railway administration, 747-8
Interjection of remarks during, 914
Limitation on Appropriation Bill, 2103
Motion for adjournment negatived, mover precluded from continuing, 894
Motion to adjourn by member closing discussion, 999
Debates, Official report of
Statement not read, insertion of, 472, 3270
Decorum—conversation, 272, 528, 3619, 3832, 3982, 4145
Interruptions—members should ask permission, 3215
Language
"Flippant" and "disrespectful", 2746
"Gentlemanly", 3553
"Misstatement", 2321
Letter already read may not be read again, 3080
Member
Attack or reflection on, 4297
Exhausting right to speak, 1650
Has no right to consent to irregularity in debate, 914
Lecturing another, 4078
May comment on letter but not read it again, 3080
May not question ruling, 3003
May speak to point of order, 1217
Minister having floor, member may not ask questions, 1867
Misstatement or untruth, 3615
Must accept statement of Minister, 3080

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Must not entirely forget subject under discussion, 996
Must rise to ask questions, 3216, 3553
Putting question without giving opportunity for reply, 4471
Right to close debate, 1528
Right to state point of order, 2322
Should speak to question, 1898
Sitting not entitled to answer question until member speaking yields floor, 4402
Two members cannot occupy floor at same time, 4467
Message from Governor General, 4169, 4289
Ministers
Comparison between, 3944
Official conduct of, 3079
Motions
Amended
Purchasing Commission, 2020
In absence of notice require unanimous consent, 3088, 3259, 3582
Mover to close debate, 2206, 2210
Negative, not in order, 2920, 3952, 4411
Non-debatable
Adjournment, for, 2148
That Committee rise, 2230, 2774, 4203
That further consideration be postponed, 1389, 2025, 3716
To refer back, 1130
Non-debatable subjects
Already debated, 2406
Notice of Motion
Action on does not imply acceptance of principle, 584
Order—Point of
Attacks or reflections on judiciary, 1570
Denial does not constitute, 2322
Discussion, 1218
Interim Supply, 2011
When raised members must confine remarks to it, 2009
Pairs—none in Committee, 4531
Previous debate, 3533, 3562, 4212, 4401
Questions
Not relevant, may be asked by consent, 2113
Not in order on item, 3065
Relevancy, 1035, 1345, 1571, 1772, 1898, 2113, 2175, 2405, 2747, 2751-59, 2761, 2916, 2966, 2990, 3003, 4158, 4313
Canadian National Railways, directors, 1667

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Relevancy—*Con.*
Discussion of "Niobe" and "Rainbow" on estimate for Royal Canadian Navy, 4031
Highway construction in Ontario, 4293-6
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4354-5
Interrogation of Govt. on estimates to be taken up, 1218
Question not in order on item before Chair, 1669, 3065
Resolutions
Amendments to not reported, 3755
Consideration, item by item, 3026
Ruling may be appealed but not questioned, 779
Speaker's Chair, speech on presentation, 3691
Notice of presentation, 3688
Statement not a question, 4056
Supply
Agreement as to contentious items, 4538
Amendment changing destination of vote, 4169, 4289
Amendments in—discussion must be relevant, 1191, 1583
Announcement of consent of Governor General, 4169, 4289
Discussion confined to specific item, 944, 919, 3066
Government orders may be called in sequence as Government think fit, 962
Individual items, motion to strike out, 3015
Interim
Further consideration of item postponed, 1682
Motion, 1674
Notice not required, 1676
Resolution can only be considered by unanimous consent, 1680
Item by item, 3014, 3132
Item disposed of discussion not in order, 1090
Latitude of discussion, 3014
Liberty to discuss any subject on item allowed to stand, 4033
Minister in order in asking that item be called, 961
Mounted Police not to be discussed on Militia Estimates, 2799-2801
Motion that item be struck out, not in order, 2617
Questions not in order, 1653, 3056

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Supply—*Con.*
Railway items to be considered separately, 3048
Reverting to previous item, 2163
Rule 17C, Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, 959, 961, 962, 1677
Unanimous consent, 1026, 1074-6, 1677, 1680, 3088, 3259, 3582, 3725, 3849, 3936, 4245, 4489-92
Vote in Com., hearing question, 2756
Vote, to be counted, five members should rise, 1068

De Salaberry, Miss, 4070

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Military Service Act—Mr. R. A. Stewart, qu. 2028
Privilege—name omitted from division list, 4255
Rural Mail routes, qu. 605
Stewart, Mr. R. A., qu. 2028, qu. 2343

Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," 1515, 3562

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Bonus to letter carriers, qu. 967
Canadian National Railways, locomotives at Parent, qu. 963
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2554, 2672
Shipbuilding, 1966
Unemployment, suspension of immigration, M, 1351

Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1027, 4512. *See also* Entomology

Destruction of Public Documents. *See* Printing Bureau

Desy, Mr. Justice, 1569

Detroit River, 1996

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel (Wright)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 57; complimentary reference to Minister of Trade and Commerce, 57; official languages, League of Nations; reply to Prime Minister; status of the Government; no precedent for present situation; the tariff, 58; financial, agricultural and industrial conditions consequent on war; Government by Order in Council; voice of the people stifled; agricultural growth of Quebec, 59
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 260
Experimental Station in Wright, 922
Georgian Bay Canal, 679
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 679

Devonshire, Duke of. *See* Governor General

Dick Turpin, 4421

Dillon, Mr. Gerald, Purchasing Agent, 1079

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors. *See* Canadian National Railways

Directorships. *See* Ministers and Directorships

Disarmament, 98, 3150, 3418. *See also* League of Nations

Discrimination in Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Diseased Herds. *See* Health of Animals

Disfranchising Act, 1r., 1126. Bill withdrawn, 1126

Disputed Accounts. *See* Pecuniary Claims Convention

Disraeli, Benjamin, and Proportional Representation, 1552

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorce, 228, 4474. *See also* De Martigny

Dockages, 3633-34. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat

Docking Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Dockyards, 4017-36. *See also* Drydocks

Documentary Evidence. *See* Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill

Documents
Access to, 1286
Production of. *See* Canadian National Railways
Public, destruction of. *See* Printing Bureau

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 188; speech of Mr. Lemieux; Canada's status; a voice in foreign affairs; Mr. Asquith's declaration, 189, 190; development of inter-imperial relations, 190; equality amongst the nations of the British Commonwealth; signature of Peace Treaty, 191; consular service; Ambassador at Washington; the ghost of Imperial centralization; declaration of Prime Minister, 192; general election before Prime Ministers' Conference, 193; Assembly of the League of Nations, 195; alleged violation of constitution by continu-

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ance of Government, 196; authority derived from people and parliament; countries in which elections have been held, 197; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 198; by-elections, 199; requisitioning of ships; cattle embargo; merchant marine; the Gold Coast and Nigeria, 200; "deadly parallels"; reciprocity; election in England after South African War, 201; declaration of Prime Minister at Montreal, 202
Ambassador at Washington, 185. *See also* Canadian Representation
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation of, 1323
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2914-39
Judges under, 1085
Business of the House
Adjournment, 1173
Closure,
Motion under Rule 17B—Govt. shipbuilding programme, 2076
Notice of, 2026
Estimates, Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 3001
Interim supply, 2011
Morning sittings, prorogation, 4338
Order of, 1672
Supply, procedure, 1073
Justice Dept., 1073
By-elections Bill, 1310
Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill, 3318
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill, 4061
Alberta Court of Appeal, decision, 4375
Constitutional question, 4375
Costs, 4378-81
Court cases pending, 4374
Gold Seal Company vs. Dominion Express Co., 4375-8
Pending litigation not to be affected Amdt. (Mr. A. K Maclean) 4384
Prohibition plebiscite, 3901
Public vs. private interests, 4374
Canada Temperance Act
Quebec, petition for suspension of Act, 3584, 4382
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 397, 585, 644, 768
Declaration of alienage, 2031-2033
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1598
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1766
"Champlain" steamer, 1980
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2835-72, 4467-89

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Civil Service, Political patronage in, (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) 809
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3146
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 350, 649, 2908, 3830-50
British Copyright Acts, 3833
Explanation of provisions, 3830
License to print, 3831
Phonographic discs, 3832
Royalty, 3831
Criminal Code Amdt. Bills, 3005, 3830, 3896-3901; 3906-38
Automobile theft, 3913
Defamatory libel, publication of judicial proceedings, 3934
Firearms, 3900-6
Juvenile deliquents, spanking, 3918
Senate amendments, 4256, 4343
Witness fees, 3937
Excessive or inadequate punishments, 1856
Exchequer Court Amdt. Bill, 563, 623
Extradition treaty, 3008, 3319, 3740, 3741
Hearst publications, 4171
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 614
Judges
Exchequer Court, 1083
Judicial district of Quebec, 1081
Resignation of, 1093
Retirement and superannuation of, 1082
Vice-admiralty, 1084
Yukon, 1088
Judges Act, 1920, correspondence, 1851
Judges Act Amendment Bill, 1559, 1561, 3009
Free Conference with Senate, 3972, 4061, 4250
Retiring allowance, 1562
Judge Snider's report, 3905
Judicial districts, division of, 1083
Justice
Administration of
Northwest, 1080
Yukon, 1087
Department
Litigated matters, 1089
Private secretaries, 1079
Purchasing agent, 1079, 1115
Salaries, 1076
Juvenile deliquents Act Amdt. Bill, 3319, 3758. *See also* under this head Criminal Code Amdt. Bill
Law stamps, tax, 1090
League of Nations. *See also* under this title Address
Contribution to, 2362-9
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096. *See also* that title under this head

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Legal expenses, 4497
Madrid Postal Conference, 3001
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2315
Marine estimates, closure notice, 1988
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt., 2892
Militia Dept., sale of surplus supplies, 1098
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1160
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1650
Natural resources, transfer to western provinces, 2551
Nauru Island phosphate deposits, 4255, 4542
"Niobe" and "Rainbow" sale, 4018
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2905-8, 3009
Park St. Charles Company, 4571
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4456-60
Penitentiaries Act Amdt. Bill, 3738, withdrawn, 3973
Penitentiaries. *See also* that title
Alberta, closing of, 1115
Ballot boxes, labour on, 1092
Detailed statement of expenditure, 1105
Dorchester
Purchases for, 1109
Salary and retiring allowances, 1096
Warden, 1092, 4467
Flour purchases, 1107
Increase in crimes, 1091
Maintenance and cost, increase in, 1111
Prisoners, remission of sentences, 1094
Purchasing system, 1108
St. Vincent de Paul, warden, 1078
Salaries and retiring allowances, 1097, 1110
Saskatchewan, 1091
Stony Mountain, release of prisoners, 478
Supplies for, 1104
Pensions, widowed mothers, 638
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2708-36, 2096, 3014
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 1619
Post Office Department
Annuities Branch, 4524
Fiset, Dr. Michel, 4523
Isles aux Grues service, 4529
Letter rate, 4519
Maritime Provinces, 4522
Outside service, 4529
Parcel post rates, 4527
Purchasing agent, 4527
Railway mail service, 4519
Reorganization and administration, 4518
Griffenhagen and Associates, 4519
Rural mail carriers, 4524

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Post Office Department—*Con.*
St. Catherine Bay-Tadoussac mail service, 4530
Verret, Col. Hector, 4525
War tax, 4519
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amdt. Bill, 3011
Privy Council appeals, 1090
Proclamation—enforcement of Acts of Parliament, 3758
Provincial legislation, reports on, 2373
Public Works estimates, 2737
Purchasing Commission, 1080, 2015, 2021
Appointment, date of, 1102
Authority appointing, 1098
Civil Service Commission, and, 1100
Details of contracts, 1104
Reduction, 2024
Staff, 1113
Statutory authority, 1113-1114
Tenders—statute applying, 1106
Quebec riots, 1512
Representation in Parliament, 1321
Scott Act, suspension of, 3584, 4382
Three Card Monte, 1837. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
Vice-Admiralty Courts, registrars, 1086
Winding Up Act Amdt. Bill, 2095
Yorkton judicial district, 1080

Dollar, Mr. Robert and shipbuilding, 1707, 1725

Dominion Alliance, 304
Use of armoury at Windsor, 902

Dominion Arsenal, Lindsay, 2439

Dominion Canners
Greek and Roumanian purchases, qu. 1001, 1072

Dominion Coal Company, 3528

Dominion Controverted Elections Act. Bill withdrawn, 1126

Dominion Elections Act Amendment Bill. (Prohibition Plebiscite in Ontario). *See also* Prohibition Plebiscite. 1r., 150-2; 242; 2r., com., 244; 259; 3r., 313
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Agents, names of eliminated, Amdt. (Mr. Bureau) 304
Lists, preparation of, 307
Proclamation, assent and voting, 303, 311
Residential requirement, Amdt. (Mr. Steele), 306; neg. 311

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2775; m. for 2r., 2994; 2r., 3090; com., 3090-3114; 4227; Amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4249; 3r., 4250

Dominion Election Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and sections discussed:
Administration of oaths, 3091
Advance polls, 3099
Amendment to writ, 3100
Certificate, 3100
Certified copy of list, 3094
Chief Electoral Officer, 4288-48
Consent of person nominated, 4246
Election officers, disqualification of, 4245
Foreign born wives and children of British subjects, 4229
Forms, 4227-40
Hours of polling—Amdt. (Mr. Fraser) 4245
Indexed copies of Act for election officers, 3094
Name added to list, 3092
Naturalization—certificate of qualification. Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 3103, 4249
New forms substituted, 3100
Nomination day, postponement of, 3094
Nomination paper, 4246
Oath of qualification, 4228-39
Oath of secrecy, 3095
"Personally naturalized", 4244
Polling divisions, urban, 3091
Polls, holding of, 3095
Qualifications, 3096
Recount, application for, 3097
Returning officer's report, 3098
Revising officers, 3091, 3101, 4250
Smith, Mr. Alexander, 4228-40
Voting, if disqualified, 3098

Dominion Elections Act
Chief Electoral Officer's reports, qu. 577; 731

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Dominion Franchise Act, 361

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710, 1723
Contract for ship plates, qu. 733, 1233. *See also* Shipbuilding

Dominion Lands, 1334
Aerial exploration and survey, 3778
Oil leases and, 1340. *See also* Oil
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 2506
Reclamation, 4495

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Appointments). 1r., 3903; 2r., com., 4062; 3r., 4113

Dominion Lands and Parks, 1334, 1343, 4494
Antelope for parks, qu. 1134

Dominion Linens, Limited, 1398. *See also* Flax

Dominion Notes
And gold reserve, qu. 1234
Circulation of, qu. 1001
Securities, qu. 1383

Dominion Securities
Assignments of grain and produce, 1443

Dominion Shipbuilding Company, 1884, qu. 3423. *See also* Shipbuilding

Dominion Statistician
Census commissioners and enumerators, 801, 1232. *See also* Census

Dominion Textile Company, profits, 372

Donner, Mr. W. A., qu. 1624

Don Pacifico, case of, 1522

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Douglas, Mr., dismissal of from Militia, 2246, 2277

Douglas, Mr. J. C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Canadian National Railways—rails, 1852
Fuel Supply Problem, 1270

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Oil and Gas rentals, qu. 672
Unemployment and immigration, 1366
As Chairman
Member must show what bearing question has on estimates, 3078

Doukhobors, 1365

Dourine among range horses, 1050

Drainage. *See* Reclamation; Irrigation

Draper, Mr. P. M., and Labour, 1632, 1637

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General's Report, 737
Delay, 911-17
Fourth volume, 1385
British taxation of spirits, 3706
Budget
Date of, 738, 903, 1555, 2151
Speech, 3114. Luxury taxes, 3114; exports and imports (aggregate trade) 3115; trade with Great Britain, 3116; revenue and expenditure, 3116; liabilities, 3117; revenue and expenditure estimated, 1921-22, 3117; Grand Trunk acquisition, 3118; tariff changes, 3119; imports, marking of, 3120; Business profits war tax, 3120; excise taxes, 3120; sales tax, 3120; resolutions, 3121

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Business Profits War Tax, 2100, 3120
Canadian loans in New York, 3289
Canadian National Railways
Directors, responsibility of, 1604
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1602
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1762
Civil Service
Bonus, 2108-10, 4535
Superannuated officials, payments to, 4541
Coal prices, 3295
Combines, 3293
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2160-2, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping clause, 3815
Exchange, 4424
German
Agents of exporters, 4426
Competition, 3811-19, 4424
Labour, cost of, 4425
Mark, 3810, 4423
Policy, 4423
Reparation, 4423
New and unused goods, 3815
Roumanian loan, 3811
Unemployment, 3811
Valuation of currency, 3810, 4423
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill, 3698
Alcohol, 3705, 3725
Cocoa imports, 3704
Date of coming into force, 3724
Imported goods, marking of, 3711, 3714, 3719, 3722, 3938-54
Date of coming into force, 3724
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Medicated wines, 3709
Whiskey, 3706, 3707
Estimates, Committee on, 2202
Grand Trunk loan, 4165-6
Income tax, 2102, 2107
Exemptions, 3466
Forms, 1176
Penalties, 2100
Returns, 2625
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 3905, 4251
Consolidation, 4353
Penalties, 4343
Self-assessment and payment, 4344-50
Provincial Ministers' salaries, and indemnities, 4352
Railwaymen's expenses while absent from home, 4353
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, 3727, 3729, 3732
Distilled spirits, 3726

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Molasses, 3726
Patent medicines, 3728
Spirits, excise duty on, 3726
Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 2625, 4339
Insurance Conference, 3088
Interim Supply, 1675, 1680, 1681, 2095, 2100-10
Former votes, 1681
Necessity for voting, 2002
Notice, 1676
Payments due, 2025
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159, 2268
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2041
Reduction of drink consumption, 3705
Returns, inquiries for, 1176
Roumania, Canadian loan to, 3811
Interest on, 478, 1072
Repayment of, 3811
Russian currency, 1072
Sales tax, 3120, 3372
Senate Committee, attendance of Mr. Crerar, 3259
Special War Revenue Act. Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, tax on, 3957
Amendments, 3742
Binder twine, 3751, 3756
Butter importations, 3749
Containers, 3754, 3956
Farmers, no tax on sales by, 3956
Fishing boats, 3745, 3751
Houses, tax on, 3959
Lumber, tax on, 3743
Farmers exempt, 3744
Missals and prayerbooks, 3756
Mixed grains, 3744
Sales tax, 3735, 3752, 3754
Change in clause, 3957
Tailors, 3955
Sparkling wines, 3734
Spirits, 3742
Sugar, duty on, 3699
Supplementary estimates, 3741
Supply, partial, 2019
Tariff revision, 903
Taxation. *See under this title* Business Profits; Income; Special War Revenue
Tobacco, duty on, 3698
United States tariff and Canadian duties, 4255
Whiskey, importation and taxation, 3706, 3707
Young Emergency Tariff, 3905

Drayton-Acworth report, 3042

Dredges and Dredging, 3982. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Marine; St. Lawrence Channel
Baie St. Paul district, 1992
Cape Tormentine, 1017
"Internationale," qu. 2192, qu. 2506
Inverness harbour, 3985
Maritime provinces, 3982
Ontario and Quebec, 3985
Quebec dredging fleet, 2605
St. Lawrence river, qu. 568. *See also* that title

Druggists. *See also* Customs Tariff; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.
Alcohol tax, and, 3727
Prescriptions, 3725

Drugs. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff; Health; Inland Revenue; Opium and Narcotic Drugs

"Druid" steamer, repairs, 1980, 1984

Drury, Hon. E. C., and Drury Government, 96, 315, 335, 421, 3199, 4172-4221, 4301. *See also* Address; Budget; Highways; Lake of the Woods
Patronage, 2876
Position on tariff, 421

Drydocks, 1690, 3987, 4017-36. *See also* Shipbuilding
Esquimalt, 3149, 3648
Expropriation of, 1698
Halifax, qu. 567
Montreal Dry Docks and Ship repairing, limited, qu. 2191
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Victoria, contract for, qu. 565

Duff, Mr. Justice, 1561

Duff, the late Hon. James, 1033

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Air Board, 3782
Apple-growing in Lunenburg county, 1042
British Chamber of Shipping, 1716
Canadian citizens' war claims, qu. 1820
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1686
Assets and liabilities, 1920, 1701
Balance sheet for 1920, errors in, 1698
Business brokers, 1713
Depreciation in value of vessels, 1701
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1711
Hall Engineering Company, qu. 695
Insurance, 1703
Officers, and seamen, 4357-60
Operating account, 1717

Duff, Mr. William.—*Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Prime Minister and, 1708
Registering of ships at Halifax, 1720
Reported sale of ships, qu. 570
State-owned fleets in other countries, 1718
Vessels, qu. 1499
"Canadian Conqueror," qu. 1381
"Canadian Explorer," 1714
"Canadian Inventor," 1890
"Canadian Mariner," 1715
"Canadian Pioneer," 1689
"Canadian Recruit," qu. 575
Canadian National Railways and Montreal Locomotive Co., qu. 696
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk bonds, qu. 837
Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, distribution of, 1045
Fruit inspectors, 1042
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2496-2502
Cold Storage, 1040
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Consular certificates, 4404
Invoice certificate, 3791, 4407
Fee—who pays? 4399, 4403
Proclamation, 4407
Trade agents, 3791-4, 4404
Drydocks
Halifax, ques. 567
Expropriation of, 1698
Victoria, contract for, qu. 565
"Esperanto," wreck of, 4341
Fish and Fisheries
Canned and pickled, inspection of, 2182
Cold storage for, 1039
Drawback on from United States, qu. 600
Fish breeding establishments, 2188
Lunenburg overseers, 2179
Tax on fishing boats, 3745
French speech by Sir George Foster, translation, 1230
Fruit inspectors, 1041, 1047
Halifax-Newfoundland service, 1713
Highways, 4303
Johnston, Mr. Alexander, re-appointment, 644
Marine hospitals—Lunenburg, 3139
Montreal Drydock and Ship-repairing, Limited, qu. 2191
Natural resources, 881
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," qu. 671
Prince Rupert
Public building, qu. 567
Purchase of land from Mr. V. W. Smith, qu. 963
Railway Department, salaries, 1671

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Railways, auditors, 1661
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355-60
Shipbuilding, 1710, 1867, 1932
Advances at Victoria, qu. 599
Contractors' percentage, 1902
Contracts, 1689
Depreciation, 1886
Dominion Steel Company and Government, 1691
Exchange, 1894
Interest, 1869, 1886
Operating costs and wages, 1933
Opposition to policy by newspapers, 1892
Point of order, 1898
Programme, 2091
Trade routes, opening of, 1888
Sick mariners, 3129, 3139
Steel plates for ships, qu. 1233
Steel ships, contracts for, qu. 565
Trade and Commerce estimates, 1231

Duguid, Mr., naval architect, 1280

Dumping Act. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Du Tremblay, Mr. P. R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2921-7
Budget, 3191. Tariff revision, 3191; congratulations to Minister upon moderate changes, 3192; public debt, 3192; golden era of Liberal party, 3193; get rid of railroads, 3193; merchant marine, 3194; military and naval expenditures, 3194; Civil Service, 3194; war indemnity, 3195
German reparation, Canada's claim, qu. 643
Loan to shipyards, 1883
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4032
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3881
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2266-8, 2903
Tobacco, duty on, 3698

Easter Adjournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

East Elgin, 1293. *See also* Address

Eastern Car Company, Limited, 1611

Ebert, Mr. Justice, report of, qu. 4254

Economic Development Commission, 869

Editorial Committee, 4557. *See also* Printing Bureau
Printing of Civil Service list, qu. 1349
Statement, 4551

Edmonton
Deputy postmaster, 827
District Engineer's office, 4535-43

Edmundston
Bridge, 2810
Post office, qu. 3422

Educational Statistics, 1231

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 126; congratulations to Prime Minister; the tariff on apples, 126; speech of the leader of the Opposition; right of the Government to hold office; resignation of Ministers or defection of supporters no reason for dissolution, 127; Liberal party a thing of shreds and patches, 128; by-elections, 128; leader of the Opposition a usurper; issue of the 1917 election, 129; right of Parliament to deal with tariff; the soldier vote, 130; analysis of civil and soldier vote in Ontario and Quebec, 131; the amendment not specific, 131, 136; record of Liberal party on the tariff, 132; Government defeat would mean accession to power of leader of the Opposition, 133; province of Quebec, 134; record of the Government, finances, debt, expenditure, agricultural and industrial production, loans, savings, 135, 136
Agricultural shows, 1239, 1241
Budget, 3175. Liberals and free trade, 3175; Ministers of the Crown and business enterprises, 3176; German goods, 3177; public debt, 3177; other budgets, 3178; budget of 1919, 3178; tariff reductions on agricultural implements. 3179; Progressive party, attitude of, 3179; Mr. Crerar and Grain Growers Company, 3180; Prime Minister on tariff, 3182; member for Red Deer and free trade, 3182; Liberals and tariff reduction, 3183; fiscal policy of Great Britain, 3185; agriculture in Great Britain, 3185; pig iron industry, 3188; Ontario, progress in, 3188; United States, progress in farming, 3188
Business of the House
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1840
Butter and cheese, imports and exports, 3852, 4438. *See also under this title,* Oleomargarine
Cattle embargo, 715
Chief Justice, salary of, 1562
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2874, 4286
Air Force, preference, 4483
Holidays, religious, 4490
Returned soldiers, preference, 4483
Civil Service (res. Sir Sam Hughes), political patronage in; Judicial appointments; Halifax programme; Lib-

Edwards, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
eral platforms, 1893 and 1919; census enumerators, 813; Civil Service Commission; an illogical and undemocratic system, 814; outside service; inside service, 815
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4274-6
Collins' Bay, wreck, 1989
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4438-46
Debates, translation of French speeches, 700
De Martigny divorce, 4203
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 680
Health of Animals—glanders in Frontenac, 926
Hearst publications, 4170
Highway construction in Ontario, 4290-4303
Interim supply, 2008, 2020
Judges Act Amendment, 1560
Judicial appointments, 813
Kingston, bridges and wharves, 3974
Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, appointment, qu. 2505
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Main Ducks life-saving station, 1991
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 1302, 2247, 2310-2339
Militia
Annual drill, 2295
Military expenditures, 2792
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1171
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3852-88
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2904
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4061
Privilege, Maisonneuve-Gaspé representation, 2247
Proportional representation, 1537
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2048
Representation in Parliament, 1316
Royal Military College, 2803
Shipbuilding, 1953
Soldiers Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment, 4054-61

Eggs, 1122
Chinese, importation of, qu. 568, 3751
Export and marketing of, 1122
Production, 3190, 3473

Egypt, shipment of railroad ties to, 1725

Elections. *See also* By-elections; Canadian Nationals; Controverted Elections; Corrupt Practices; Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation; Representation in Parliament

Elections—*Con.*
Foreign agitators at, qu. 903
General, necessity for. *See* Address; Budget; Representation in Parliament
Officers' fees, 188
Yamaska, arrangements for, 4534. *See also* Yamaska
York-Sunbury. *See that title*

Elective Senate. *See* Ministers

Electoral System. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Power. *See* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes and St. Lawrence; Lake of the Woods, Water Powers

Elevators, 1442. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Grain and Grain Trade; Terminal Elevators

Eleven O'Clock Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Elkin, Mr. S. E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
De Martigny divorce, 3764
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2156
Shipbuilding, 1888
Sick mariners benefit fund, 4039

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Cattle

Empire Cabinet, proposed, 1385. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Empire Insurance Company. *See* North American Insurance

Empire Parliamentary Association. *See also* Speaker's Chair
Address by Sir Herbert Ames, 1311

England. *See also* Great Britain
Linen manufacturers, 1390
Railway situation in, 1008

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Entomology, 1024. *See also* Destructive Insects

Epiphany, 2626. *See also* Civil Service, Religious holidays

Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1556

"Esperanto", wreck of, 4341

Esquimalt
Dockyard, 4017-36
Drydock, 3149, 3648, 3651
Naval College, 4010-16

Essences, tax on, 3709

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply. For departments, *see their titles*

Estimates—*Con.*
Closure. *See that title*
Consent of House necessary, 1073
Consideration after midnight, 2736-75
Current necessities—Redlich, 1675
Discussion of, opportunity for, 1026. *See also* Labour Dept.; Ministers; Post Office Dept
Form of voting objected to, 1674
Holding up of, 1941. *See also* Shipbuilding
Lengthy debate, 1832
Main (1921-22) tabled, 644
Notice of amendment in Com., 4168
Obstruction in. *See* Shipbuilding
One-sixth of amount, 1674 *See also* Interim Supply
Passing of without information, 1616
Procedure in, 1676
Railways, deferring of, 1652
Right of Opposition to attack items, 1678
Scrutiny of by Special Committee, 484, 1503. M. (Mr. Lemieux) 2193
Statutory payments, 1414
Supplementary, tabled, 3901, 4170, 4453
Inquiry as to, 3741, 4070
Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons
Unreliability of figures, 1203-4
Voting en bloc, 2006, 2012
Voting, method of, 4538, 4540

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114-16
Canada Temperance Act, 4383
Central Railway Company of Canada, 3715, 3716
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4277
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4278-85
Classification and reorganization, 4465
Dorchester penitentiary, appointments at, 4467
Exemption of certain classes from jurisdiction of Commission, 4460-83
Returned soldiers, preference, 4358, 4483
Special Committee, evidence, 4461
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 1350
Number of civil servants, names, and classification, 4255
Daylight saving, qu. 1817
De Martigny divorce, 3766-8
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1821
Highways—Montreal—Hull, 4306
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.—Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114-16
Veniot correspondence, 3719

Ethyl Alcohol, 3705. *See also* Inland Revenue

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Air Board, 3777-85
Bounties, principle of granting, 1423
Budget, 3569. Business profits tax and sales tax, 3570; economy in expenditure necessary, 3570; income tax, 3570; methods of raising revenue, 3571; national railways, 3572; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 3573; Prime Minister's remarks on Budget, 3574
Canadian Nationals, 647, 770
Canadian National Railways
Independent auditor, qu. 1133
Canadian Press, Limited, 4533
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4280-5, 4469-82
"Nor in the public interest," amdt., 4283
Returned soldiers, 4258
Civil Service Bonus, 2110-15, 3531
Coal consumption, 1258
Convicts, increase in number, 1091
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3844-6
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking, 3953
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (prohibition plebiscite), 259
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4227-49
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3103, 3113, 4209. *See also* Naturalization
Forms, 4227-46
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4229
Amdt. in Com., 3103, 4227; neg. 4342
Amdt. to 3r., 4249
"Personally naturalized", 4244
Fuel Supply Problem, 1263
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2461-3
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 694
Highways, 3028
House of Commons Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Hudson Bay Railway, 979, 988
Illustration stations in Ontario, 950
Immigration, 2574-92
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344
Income Tax returns, 2567, 2625
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549
Kingston penitentiary, 1097, 1107
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4175
League of Nations—labour, 4547
Linen yarn factories, 1397
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1161
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4025
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3870
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt., 2267
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2483-4
Royal Military College, 2802

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2154
Shipbuilding, assistance to, qu. 603
Smith, Mr. Sydney, qu. 1236
Suggested resignation of Opposition, 223. *See also* Stevens, Mr. H. S.
Surplus war supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Trent canal, 2613-15, 2989
Welland canal, construction, 2988-96; amdt. 2989

European Corn Borer. *See* Corn Borer

European Credits, 3160. *See also* Belgium; Greece; Loans; Roumania

Excessive or Inadequate Punishments. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Exemptions. *See* Taxation

Exchange, rate of, 96, 267, 316, 416, 545, 3087, 3160, 3167, 3264, 3571, 3599. *See also* Customs and Excise; Finance; Loans
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
German mark, 3810-19
Money—purchasing power and exchange value, 4427
Shipbuilding, 1894
Tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
Trade with Russia, 1003
Valuation for duty, qu. 733
Valuation of currency, 3786-3818
Valuation of the pound and dollar, qu. 577

Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 563; m. for 2r., 623; com., 625; 3r., 644
Subjects and sections discussed:
Appeals, 623
Commissioner of Patents, 623
General rules and orders, 258
Judges, 1083

Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Exhibitions, 1123. *See also* Agricultural Shows; County Fairs; Live stock; Trade
Film productions, 1558
Seed fairs, 1126

Exhibition Train, 1557-8

Exhibits Branch, 1466

Expeditionary Force. *See* Canadian Expeditionary Force

Expenditure in Departments. *See* Ministers

Experimental Farms, 922, 928, 931, 932-36, 945, 1949, 4215. *See also* Agriculture: Live Stock
American implements at, qu. 492
Charlevoix-Montmorency, 945
Distribution of, 1076
Dorchester county, 946
Fredericton, qu. 1131
Hours and pay, 932
L'Assomption, 918
Nappan, Gureney cattle, qu. 2686
Ontario, 948
Rimouski, 954
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, 948
Seed inspection, 1125
Wright county, 922

Explosives, 2162

Exports. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Canadian, for last year, 3483
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, by, 1276-7
Freight rates, 1224

Export Trade, Expansion of. *See* Shipbuilding; Trade

Express Companies, 3469

Express Rates, 169

External Affairs
Conservation Commission, 3960
Department, creation of, 2388
Estimates, 2437
Legal adviser, opinion as to correspondence *re* Canadian Representation in the United States, 2406, 2428
Passport office, 2436
Report of Secretary of State for, 397

Extradition Convention with the United States, Bill
1r., 3319; withdrawn, 3741

Extradition Treaty with the United States (Wife desertion.) *See also* Extradition Convention
Copies tabled, 3207
Inquiry, 3008, 3740

Fabian Pamphlets, 1034

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Algernon Rock pier, qu. 1383
Bonus to lightkeepers, qu. 1622
County fairs, 1123
Fruit inspection, 1043
St. John harbour, qu. 1383
Upper Crossing St. Roch light, qu. 1383

Fares, theft of, 3925

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements; Machinery

Farm Labour, 3412. *See also* Labour; Unemployment

Farm Lands, price of, 1034

Farmers
Agricultural publications, and, 1075
Canadian Expeditionary Force, in, qu. 1349. *See also* Military Service Act
Exemption, 3597
Income tax collections, 569, qu. 838
Organizations, 791
Prosperity of, 1035
Protection for, 3748-49

Farmers' Clubs, 1034. *See also* Live Stock

Farmers' Movement and Party. *See* Progressive Party

Farming, competition in, 3188

Farnham, Que., camp grounds, qu. 1132

Fat Stock Shows. *See* Live Stock

Federal Housing Board. *See* Housing

Federal Union No. 66. *See also* Civil Service
Agitation by, 825
Organization of, 795
Policy of, 823

Feeding Stuffs Act
Enforcement, qu. 965
Inspection districts, qu. 1624

Feeds, Mill, 1126
Adulteration of, 3589
Exemption of, 3745
Stock, 289
Mixed grains, 3745
Transportation charges on, qu. 2686

Female Suffrage, 173, 527, 4474. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Ferrer, Execution of, 1523

Ferries. *See* Marine

Ferryman. *See* Post Office

Fertilizer Act, 1909. Administration of, 4513

Fertilizer Act, 1909, Amdt. Bill, 1r., 1497; 2r., 2231; ref. to Com. on Agr., 2234

Fertilizers, duty on, 3441

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Shelburne and Queen's)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 518; political possibilities—Liberal, Farmer or Tory Government—congratulations to Prime Minister; leaders of Liberal and Farmers parties; League of Nations, 518; Canada's participation; independence; expenses of League, 519; difference between British and Canadian representatives, 520; Article X, 521; the Government's mandate; change of leadership, name, party and policy, 522; individual understandings and experiences; conclusion of war ends Government's mandate, 523; Cabinet reorganization; Government's record, 524; Ambassador at Washington, 525; Imperial Conference, Cattle embargo, 526; votes to women; patronage, 527
Alcohol, tax on, 3705, 3727, 3730, 3732
Armouries for public meetings, 901
Auditor General's report, delay, 909
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2919-34
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Budget, inquiry as to date of, 1270
Approximate date, qu. 738
Speech, 3127, 3146; severe depression result of war, 3146; advantage of direct taxation, 3147; income tax returns, 3147; disposition of public funds, 3148; naval and military expenditures, 3149; disarmament, 3150; tariff revision, 3150; protection of industries, 3153; American tariff, 3154; free trade, 3155; Amdt. moved, 3155; neg. 3686-7
Business of the House. *See also* under this head Estimates; Interim Supply; Supply
Adjournment moved by member closing debate, 999
Agriculture Estimates, proceeding with, 1074
Announcement of, for to-morrow, 1026, 1073, 2148
Division after a recess, 1383
Easter, after, 1270
Further discussion, 1068
Meeting at two o'clock, 447
Motion requires longer notice, 1672
Prorogation, 4068
Sittings
Saturday, 2777
Wednesday, 1384
Adjournment at eleven o'clock, 1828
Evening sittings, 1174, 1844
Two o'clock rule, on, 447
Undue haste, 4449
Butter "dumped" into Canada, 3750
Canada Shipping Act. Amdt. Bill (Public Harbours) 2230-1

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill
Cases pending, 3902, 4373-6
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2254-63
Canadian Government bonds, qu. 1620
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 647, 768, 2033
Canadian National Railways
Board of Directors, 1653
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Fire claims—Shelburne County, 4569
Halifax and Southwestern line, 3052
Extension to Lockeport, 3054, 4323
Station accommodation, 4327
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1184
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1606
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1764, 1846
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1794
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2391-2436
Cattle embargo, 713, 729, 762
Chief Justice, income tax, and, 1566
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780, 3901
Religious holidays, 4491
Returned Soldiers, 4259
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2489-90, 4268-78
Civil Service, political patronage, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 807
Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817
Conservation Act Amdt. Bill, 3959-71
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3834-48
Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. Bill, 2161
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Brokers' fee, 4432
Cost of production, 4411-14
Dick Turpin, 4421
Dumping clause, 3816, 4412
Exchange—tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
German trade, 3813
Invoice certificate, 3801
Fee—who pays? 3801-3, 4389
New or unused goods, 3813
Tariff, increase, 3813
Third reading; undue haste, 4449
Trade agents, 3800-13, 4389
Valuation for duty, 4411
Valuation of currency, 3813, 4420
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill, imported goods—marking, 3712, 3714, 3722, 3953
Dairy Products Grading Bill—undue haste, 4449

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 243
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 2944
Revising officers, 3092, 3101
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4063-5
Dredging, 3984
Election petitions, 3934
Entomology Bureau, 1025
Estimates
Expenditures not appearing in, 1423
Statutory, 1417-18
Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C, 1676
Voting of fixed sums, 1417-18
Extradition Treaty, 2687, 3008, 3740, 3741
French Trade Agreement, 1351, 1558, 2127-41, 2152
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2376, 2448-80, 2777
Harbours and Rivers
Estimates, 3976-82
Nova Scotia, 3990
Highways, 1664, 3023
Hudson Bay Railway, M. involving expenditure, 982
Imports, regulations, 3709
Income tax, Chief Justice, and, 1566
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-52
Intercolonial Railway—land at Lévis, 1846
Interim Supply. *See also* under this title, Estimates; Supply
Motion out of order, 2009
Procedure, 1677, 2012
Resolution should have schedule, 2015
Unanimous consent required, 2002
Urgency of, 2003
Judges' Act Amdt, Bill, 2118, 3010
Judges as revising officers, 3092-3101
King's birthday, 4450
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224-6
League of Nations, Assembly, request for papers, 188
Lighthouse signal service, 4040
Lobster season, 2188
Lockeport-Froude's Point service, 1496
Lockeport railway extension, 3054, 4323
Luxury taxes, abolition, 1185
Macallum, Dr., 1432
Manufacturers and protection, 3660
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891, 4496
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1649
National Research Institute, 1432, 2701-07, 2893-6. *See also* Research
National resources—transfer to Western Provinces, 2549

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4011
Nova Scotia harbours and icebreakers, 1994
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3531, 3863-90, 3906
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2903
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt. Bill, 2941
Parliament Buildings, 3992-8
Pensions to pilots, 2000
Pensions, widowed mothers, 638
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4365-73
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2097
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4061
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2637-8
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Protection and, references to former speeches, 3332
Public Accounts Committee, information, 1805
Public Works Engineering Branch, 4083-4
Railway Commission, 3019, 3022
Railway estimates, deferring of, 1652
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, Amdt. to Supply, 2038
Representation in Parliament, 1318
Research Council, 1432. *See also* under this title National Research Institute
Returned Soldiers, 4365
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4261
Right of Dominion to tax provinces, 3742
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2155-6
St. John harbour, 4079
Soldiers pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4061
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, 3705, 3730, 3727, 3732
Fishing boats, 3737, 3745
Patent medicines, 3728
Sales tax, 3754
Spirituous liquors, 3711
Sugar, duty on, 3699
Supply. *See also*, under this title, Estimates, Interim Supply
Amendments, non-confidence, 1184
Comprehensive items, 3015
Motions in, 1683
Tariff revision, 3749
Taxation, right of, 3706, 3742
Trade agents in United States, 1476
Trade with United States, 1468
Unemployment, 4549

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Vacancies, 1324
Victoria Day, 3697
Vote on capital account, 1464
West Indies importations, 3704
West Indies steamship service, 1488
Westport signal service, 1998
Women workers, 4547

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1465
Catellier, Mr. Ludger, 1465

Films, Educational. *See* Trade and Commerce; Exhibitions

Finance. *See also* Address; Banks; Bonds; Brussels International Financial Conference; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; Currency Act Amdt. Bill; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Exchange; Grand Trunk; Housing; Loans; Taxation
Accounts with Great Britain, qu. 2191; qu. 2622
Canadian currency discount, 3115
Canadian dollar, value in United States, 3087
Canadian Government bonds, 3289
Chartered banks, taxes paid by, qu. 2192
Credits, 3160. *See also* Loans
Roumania and Greece, to, qu. 1236. *See also* Roumania
Department
Purchasing Commission, and, 1102
Deposits outside Canada in Canadian banks, qu. 1623
Dominion Notes
Circulation, qu. 1001
Gold reserve, and, ques. 1234
Issues, qu. 2621
Securities, qu. 1383
Expenditure accounts, qu. 2621
Expenditure and debt per capita, 2013
Expenditure, revenue and debt, qu. 2099
Foreign monetary standards and Customs, qu. 1133. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Government bonds, purchase of, qu. 1620
Investments, "other" and "non-active," qu. 2691
Minister
Miscellaneous estimates, passing of, 1116
Public debt—non-active, miscellaneous and banking accounts, qu. 2621
Repayment of, $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Revenue accounts, qu. 2620
Revenue, expenditure and debt, qu. 2099
Victory bonds, 1920
Expenses, qu. 1620

Firearms, possession of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bills

Fire Insurance, 3469

Fiscal Policy of Government. *See* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Tariff

Fiset, Dr. Michel, qu. 963, 4523

Fish and Fisheries
Biological Board, 2189
Breeding establishments, 2185, 4036
Saskatchewan, in, 2185
British Columbia, 882, 890
Conservation Commission, 3965-9
Cowan, Mr. G. H., K.C., legal expenses, 2187
Development of, 856, 861
East Coast Fisheries drawback, qu. 600
Ebert, Mr. Justice, report, qu. 4254
Fish bait, 1038
Fish consumption, 1038
Gulf, Gaspé and Magdalen Islands, 877
Halibut industry in British Columbia, 883
Halifax award, qu. 2191
Inspection, 2182
International Fisheries Commission, Fraser River, 2189
Jurisdiction of Dominion and Provinces, 2104
Lobster hatcheries, 2188, 4036
Net fishing in Missisquoi Bay, qu. 570
Officers and guardians, 2177
Oyster culture, 2177
Patrol service, 2177
Problems, scientific investigation, 2188
Protection service, 4036
Quebec fisheries reference, 4040
Refrigerator cars, 1038
Salmon licenses, 2104, 4341. *See also* Privy Council
Quebec, qu. 1381, qu, 2506
Transportation of fish, 883, 877
Gaspé, 962

Fishing Boats, exemption of material, 3737. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Flax. *See also* Bounties; Linen Yarn
Bounty, 1389
Decline in prices, 1389
Growers, Convention, 1391
Industry, experimental work, 931-2
Patent process of retting, 4455

Fleming, Sir Sanford, 3046

Florence & Son. *See* Printing Bureau, Destruction of Documents

Flour. *See also* Wheat
Moisture in, 1446
Penitentiaries for, 1107
Price of, 1448

Flour Bags, tax on, 3754. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Flynn, Mr. Harry, 217

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 210; congratulations to new Prime Minister, 210; change in name of Unionist party; the tariff; neglect of agriculture; the working classes; consumer finally pays the taxes; the cost of living, 211; Georgian Bay Canal; national debt, expenditure; old age pensions and unemployment; insurance; province of Quebec, 212
Alcohol, tax on, 3725, 3728, 3732
Georgian Bay Canal, 745
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 745
Hull-Wakefield road, 3033
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1646
Patent medicines, 3728
Shipbuilding, 1941

Food Adulteration of. *See* Health
Maple Products, 887. *See also* that title

Foodstuffs, 3589, 3734
Hoarding of, qu. 1347
Tax on, 3546. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Foran, Mr. William. *See* Civil Service

Ford Motor Company, 3409

Fordney Bill. *See* Budget; Tariff; United States

Foreign Agitators and Elections, 903

Foreign-Born Wives and Children of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Foreign Business. *See* Trade

Foreign Currency Inflation. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Foreign Decorations to Canadians, qu. 1132

Foreign Imports, value, 3310

Foreign Loans. *See* Greece; Loans; Roumania

Foreign Manufacture. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff, imported goods—marking

Foreign Monetary Standards and Customs, qu. 1133. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, Valuation of Currency

Foreign Shipments, Invoice Certificate. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Foreign Tariffs Division, 1437

Forest Reserves
Porcupine, 538
Winter grazing, 383

Forestry. *See also* Natural Resources; Research
Aerial patrol and survey, 3776, 4495
Bud worm, 1031
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Conservation Commission, 3960-9
Director of, 1346
National Transcontinental Railway, forest protection, 4335
Protection of forests, 870, 4335, 4494
Spruce forests—bud worn, 1031

Forfeitures and Penalties. *See* Inland Revenue

Forman, Mr. H., 1672

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 169. Amendment — duty of Government to hold election; the Agrarian movement; West Peterborough; attitude of Quebec; National Liberal Conservative Association in no sense national, 170; change of electoral map will not change sentiments of the people; western representation; unconstitutionality, tyranny and despotism, 171
Air Board, 3785
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2912-34
Budget, 3417. Deplorable condition of finances, 3418; military expenditures, 3418; national debt, 3420; tariff revision, 3420
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Canadian Wheat Board, 2116-17
Civil Service bonus, 2112
French, Bill not printed in, 1095
Highways projected in Quebec, 3025, 3029
Judges—reorganization of districts, 1083
National Research Institute, 2897
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3876
Railway Commission, French secretary. 3018

Fortier, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2486
Shipbuilding, 1946

Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, care of, 4540

Fort Frances Post Office site, qu. 1233

Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348

Fort Lennox, Isle-aux-Noix, sundial, qu. 2097

Fort Smith Railway Company. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Fort William
Harbour improvements, 4536
Terminals, 3050

Fortifications of the City of Quebec. *See* Quebec

Fortin, Abbe. *See* Labour, National Catholic Labour Unions

Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, 90, 3509

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 46; the tariff; First Assembly of the League of Nations; work and purpose of League, 47; development of national life; enlarged ideals and sympathies; the problem of world peace, 48; Covenant of League of Nations and Treaty of Versailles; Peace Treaty signed by 47 nations; the United States; duties and obligations of League; its organization; the Council, 49; respective jurisdictions of Assembly and Council, 50; the Secretariat, reduction of armaments and arbitration of differences; registration of Treaties; mandatories, 51; social and economic reforms; technical organizations; meeting of assembly in Geneva, 52; election of permanent president; rules of procedure; official languages, 53; spirit of courtesy; the smaller nations, 54; publicity of proceedings; financing of the League, 55; Article X; Permanent Court of International Justice, 56
Auditor General's Report, delay, 915
Bounties, 1386
Flax and linen yarn, 1389, 1393, 1394
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1519
Budget, 3156. Income tax, 3156. Brussels Conference, 3157; League of Nations, 3157; debt, increase in, 3158; tariff revision, 3159; exchange and credits

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
system, 3160; Young Emergency Bill, 3160; protection, 3161
Business of the House
Announcement of for to-morrow, 1026
Legislation pending, 4068
Progress in, 1230
Butter and cheese exports, 1470
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1442
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2191, 2251-62, 3703. *See also* West Indies steamship service
Canada Year Book, 1231, 1425
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 1426
Canadian National Railways
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1207
Cattle embargo, 711
Census commissioners and enumerators, 597, 696, 735, 806, 1209, 1226, 2098, 3260, 2843, 2874, 3807
Missisquoi, 1132, 4113
Moncton, 3972
Pontiac, 1127, 1231
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2842-74
Civil Service
Bonus, 1463
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555, 4555
Reorganization, 4555-6
Civil Service, Political Patronage, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 802-3
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3791-3809
Fee—who pays? 3792-9, 3804, 4389-95
Form of, 3799
Imports and exports, 4398
Proclamation of Act, 4394; Amdt. 4407
Revenue and expenditure, 4399
Trade agents, 3791-3809
Certificate of, 4389-94
Trade commissioners, 4394
Trade, extension of, 4394-8
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Editorial Committee, 4559
Estimates
Committee on, 2206-8
Procedure, 1385
Statutory payments, 1414
Exhibitions, 1466
Canadian goods, 1227
Flax bounty, 1403. *See also* under this title Bounties
Fox breeding, 1429
French Trade Agreement, 1174, 1573, 1557, 2125-41, 2152

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
French Trade Agreement—*Con.*
Printing, 1380
Fruit, co-operative effort, 1470
Grain Act, administration, 1442
Grain
As security for Dominion notes, 1443
Chemistry—Dr. Birchard, 1228
Elevators, 1442
Grading, 1230
Inquiry, remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* under this title Civil Service.
Hides, inspection, 1437
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345-51
Industry
Encouragement of, 1469
Government aid to, 1397
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 351, 607, 2944
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1437
International Trade Conference, 2151
Judge Snider's Report, 3761, 4062
Labour—Mr. Lapointe, 3584
League of Nations, 47, 2356-73
Macallum, Dr., 1433
Motion picture films and exhibits, 1232, 1466
National Research Institute, 2688, 2708, 2892-7. *See also* Research
Newfoundland railways, 1485
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4453-60
Patents of Invention Act Consolidation Bill, 303, 2890-1
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4368
Petroleum bounties, 1413
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2662
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, 4559
Publications, printing, 1438
Research, industrial and scientific, 1426
Research Council Act Amdt. Bill, 2566; 2688, 2892. *See also* under this title, National Institute
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355
Searls, Mr. George, Chief Grain Inspector, 1444
Shipbuilding, 1938, 1972
Statistical Department, 1231
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3007
Statutory expenditure, 1420
Steamship Services
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 1826
West Indies, 1488, 1491
See also under this title Trade
Terminal elevators, 1463, 1464, 1442
Timber culling, 1426

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Trade
Australia, 1468
Russia, 1003, 1072
South Africa, 1491
United States, 1219, 1468, 1475. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Trade and Commerce
Department
Director of Commercial Exhibits, 1226
Educational films, 1225, 1466, 1558
Patent and Copyright Branch, 1496
Salaries, 1218
Tariffs division, 1226
Weights and Measures, 1485
Trade Commissioners, 1219, 1224, 1391, 1464, 1479. *See also* under this title Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill, 229; 2891
War Indemnity—Canada's share, 3583
West Indies
Cable, 1438
Steamship service, 1488, 1491
Trade agreement. *See* under this title Canada-West Indies
York-Sunbury, French-Canadian Minister, 3638

Foundation Company of Montreal, payment to, qu. 4541

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 203; speech from the Throne a "negligible document"; Government incapable of dealing with pressing issues; unemployment and soup kitchens; 203; League of Nations an ideal distant and unattainable; disarmament, 204; Administration's arguments for retaining office; inconsistency of Minister of Immigration; issue not the tariff but vindication of constitutional rights, 205; no general election held on last redistribution; crime of the junkers, fire-eaters and reactionaries; assault on national unity, 206
Agricultural expenditures, 1029
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2910
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1799
Civil Service, Political Patronage, 836
Highways in Quebec, 3030
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2266
Parliament buildings, expenditure, qu. 4341
St. Michel wharf, Res. 967, 3991
Weekly bulletins, 1231

Fox Bay, squatters, 1514

Fox-Breeding, grant for, 1428

France
Amount of credit to, qu. 2622
Ministers, appointment of, 1154
Senate in, 1165
State-owned fleet sold by, 1718
Treaty with. *See* French Trade Agreement

Franchise. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill; Naturalization; Proportional Representation

Franco-Canadian Commercial Agreement. *See* French Trade Agreement

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Hours of polling in municipalities near international boundary, amdt. 4245
Returned Soldiers, employment on Welland Canal, 3001

Fraser, Mr. Roy, 2860-8

Fraser River
International Commission, 2189
Snag boat, 3978

Fredericton Experimental Farm, qu. 1131

Free Trade, 4419. *See* Address; Budget

Freight Rates, 214, 484, 3474. *See also* Railways; Transportation; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Discrimination in, 1232
Increase in, 341, 389, 538, 3263
Ocean, 1734, 1946
Pulpwood and saw logs, 2511

Freight Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding

French Canadians, 3594
Appointments to office, 355, 510
League of Nations, representation on, 552
United States in, 1483, 3675

French Language, 3824, 3972, 4543
Address not moved or seconded in, 138, 223, 280, 385, 539.
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, French Version. *See* that title
Bill not printed in, 649, 1095
Board of Trade reports, forms, 2819, 3320-75
Canadian National Railways
Conductors,, waiters, printing, 1782, 4329-33
In Quebec and New Brunswick, 4328

French Language—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of, translation of French speeches M. (Mr. Archambault) 698; agreed to, 702
Election proclamation, 553
Estimates, printing and discussion in, 1386
Fuel Supply, Special Committee, evidence, 4251
Income tax instructions, 2626
Interior Dept. publications, 1333
Parliament buildings
Inscriptions
Central column, qu. 568
Tower, 3995-8, 4543
Pensions, application forms, qu. 965
Questions to immigrants, 779, 3824
Use of in debate, 539

French Parliament. *See* Ministers

French Purchasing Commission, 3172
Letter of Minister of Customs to, 3079

French Trade Agreement
Copy of
M. for, 578, 607, 766, 2193
Tabled, 1271
Inquiry as to date of, 1174
Printed copies, 1351, 1380
Terms and signature, 1185

French Trade Agreement Bill
Res. 1557; 1r., 1573; 2r., com., 2125; 3r., 2152

French Version, 3144. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Canada Highways Act, qu. 1237
Cartier square, Ottawa, stores shed, qu. 3208
Civil Service
Political patronage in, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 792; Civil Service Act; patronage not abolished, 792; classification, Arthur Young & Company; Griffenhagen; Printing Bureau; Mr. Wolffe; destruction of documents; patronage exercised by irresponsible persons, 793; outside service; cost; efficiency not increased, 794; unrest; Federal Union No. 66; reorganization by deputy ministers, 795
Reorganization, qu. 600
Superannuation, application for increased allowances, qu. 2099
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4481
Daylight saving in Ottawa, qu. 2687
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 4004
Gilmour and Hughson Bill, 1096
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4010-15
Right of House to review action of Private Bills Com., 4004

Frontenac Breweries, Limited, 1611

Fruit. *See also* Apples
Berry boxes, 4106, 4114
Cold Storage, 1041
Duty on, 126, 164-8
Growing, 1469, 3354
In British Columbia, 9-10
Inspectors, 1041, 1042-3, 1045
Preserved, 3703

Fruit Marks and Sale Act, 1041

Fuel Control, 2944. *See also* Coal

Fuel Supply Problem. *See also* Coal; Lignite; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources
Special Committee, M. (Mr. Steele) 1247; appointed, 1439; withdrawn, 1857; Mr. Chisholm substituted for Mr. Lemieux, 2148; Evidence, printing and distribution, 2027, 4250

Fulton, Mr. F. J. (Cariboo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 206; issues proposed by Opposition, 206; congratulations to mover and seconder; reasons for opposing amendment; no demand for immediate election; assertion that Government has usurped powers, 207; war not only issue of 1917 election; problems arising out of war; changes in personnel of Government; constitutional right of Government to carry on; British and other precedents, 208; conduct of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1911; the reciprocity question, 209

Fumigation of Nursery Plants, 1028, 1031

Fur-bearing Animals, Conservation Commission, 3965

Furness-Withy Company, 1712

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Game
Conservation Commission, 3965. *See also* Migratory Birds; National Parks

Gaols. *See* Prisons

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera; Health of Animals

Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of. *See* Inspection

Gaspé
Railway facilities, 2507
Railway from Amqui to Gaspé Basin, 876, 881
Service, qu. 962
Timber and mineral resources, 875

Gaspé and Bonaventure
Fishing communities, 1038

Gaspé and Maisonneuve. *See* Maisonneuve

Gauthier, Mr. L. J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 74; comment on remarks of Mr. McMaster; demand for election in advance of redistribution; free trade, protection and the tariff, 74; fiscal policy of the Liberal Government; the late Hon. M. Tarte, 75; the Government's mandate ; increase of indemnity; precedents for retaining office; Liberals members occupying dual positions; member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé; "traitors and renegades"; Agrarianism a class movement, 79; Labour element, 80; isolation of Quebec; alliances of Laurier and Cartier, 81; Ontario natural ally of Quebec, 81; accusations answered; La Société des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 82; a "solid bloc" no longer possible; Quebec must have representation in public affairs, 86; the hour of Quebec has struck; Lafontaine, Cartier, Laurier; the Baptist preaching the coming of the Saviour, 87; gospel of toleration and self-respect, 88
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information — M. (Mr. King) 1196
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1583
Highways; Quebec-Montreal-Sherbrooke, 4305
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2338
References to, 421, 446, 514, 535, 559, 3215

Gauthier, Mr. L. J., and Montreal Progressive Club, qu. 1131

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Temiscouata)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 385; address not moved or seconded in French; Government has not confidence of country; voice of the people; the Press and by-elections, 385; unpopularity of Government; usurpation of power; Prime Minister's attitude towards Quebec, 386; Canadian National Railways deficit; treatment of old employees; clamour for general election, 387
Business of the House
Monday, Government business, 2148

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Intercolonial
Section men, qu. 2028
Superannuation of employees, qu. 575
Section men, 1439
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2033
Census officials, 597
Civil Service Retirement Act, qu. 374
Civil Service Superannuation, qu. 734, qu. 967
Customs officer, Riviere du Loup, 3083
Farmers' sawlogs, 3743-4
Indians at Temiscouata, 2168
Macdonald, Hon. Senator, appointment of, qu. 577
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2121
Sully station, 1822

Geodetic Survey, 2806
Report, 4340

Geological Survey, 2141-62. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Below normal strength, 870
Survey of Northern Canada, 856

George, Mr. A. D., qu. 1233

Georgetown wharf, 4564

Georgian Bay Canal, 212, 298, 679, 688, 745, 751, 755, qu. 2625, 3678. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Company, 229, 598, 1270

Germany
Commodity prices, 4431
Competition from, 3177, 4424
Cost of labour in, 4425
Enemy debts, 4534
Exports to Canada, 4426
Imports from, qu. 696, 838
Holdback, qu. 1350
Marking of. *See* Customs Tariff, Imported Goods
Labour conditions, 4425, 4428
Mark, 3810-19, 4421, 4431. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Reparation, 98, 599, 4423-9
Canadian claims, 643, 3583, 4534
Trade with. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Gervais, Mr. Theodore (Berthier)
Berthierville telephone, qu. 1233
Tobacco
Excise taxes on, qu. 1236
Growing, qu. 1500

Gilmour and Hughson, Limited. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Gladstone, Mr., and Thrift, 1169, 3640

Gladu, the late Mr. Joseph E. O., tribute to, 3, 153, 292, 430

Glanders. *See* Health of Animals

Glass, Mr. S. F. (East Middlesex)
Experimental farms, 938
Flax industry, 931, 1399, 1408, 4455-8
Imports, per capita, 3415
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4349-52
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3868-95
Patent Act Amdt. Bill
Flax, process of retting, 4455-8
Nolan Act, 4454
Right to continue to manufacture, 4454
Right to revive patent, 4454
Treaty of Versailles, 4453
Poultry industry, 939

Glass Industry, 3484

Gold
Melting down, 2160, 2269
Reserve, Dominion notes and, qu. 1234
Standard, 2269. *See also* Currency

Gold Seal Liquor Company, 4375. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Good Roads Convention, 4300. *See also* Highways

Goods, new and unused. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Gordon, Mr. G. N. (West Peterborough)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2915-22
Budget, 3543. Will affect milling industry, 3543; packing business in cereals, 3544; sales tax and package business, 3545; Minister of Immigration and Liberal party, 3547; Mr. W. F. O'Connor, 3548; Peterborough strike, 3549; unrest and wages, 3549; inconsistency of taxation, 3550
Civil Service Bonus, 2111
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3910-20
Juvenile deliquents, spanking, 3920
Military and civilian caretakers, qu. 4340
Militia Department
Employment of women, 2286
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4024
Oatmeal and package foods, 3543, 3736
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2727
Shipbuilding, 1968
Trent Canal, 2953-9, 2976
Unemployment relief to returned soldiers, qu. 4253

Gouin, Sir Lomer, 1825

Gould, Mr. Oliver R. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 335; speech of Mr. Scott; quotation from speech of Mr. Clark (Red Deer); Premier of Ontario; dissolution, 335; speech of Mr. Crerar; congratulations to Prime Minister; members elevated to Cabinet rank, 336; Mr. Stacey; Tariff Commission, 337; the amendment; "want of confidence" argument; faith with the people broken; suggested fusion of Liberals and Progressives; platform of Canadian Council of Agriculture; Liberal platform of 1919, 338; agreements and differences, 339; Canadian Wheat Board; decline in price of wheat; participation certificates, 340; freight rates; Advisory Council of Scientific 3666; manufacturers and United Farmers, 3667
Budget, 3662. United Grain Growers, 3662; Mr. Steven's remarks on York-Sunbury election, 3662; new methods of taxation, 3663; taxation and large banking institutions, 3664; land taxation, 3664; agricultural losses from insect pests, 3665; Tariff Commission, 3666; manufacturers and Grain Growers' Association, 3667
Export liquor licenses in Saskatchewan, qu. 838
Farmers in Canadian Expeditionary Force, qu. 1349
Grasshopper plague, qu. 838, 1028, 3665
Horse clubs, 1120
Income tax, 2107
Insect pests, 930, 3665
Military district No. 12, 2379
Military expenditures, 2792
Military preparations, 2298
Natural Resources, transfer to western provinces, 1339
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2072
References to election, 368, 391, 438
Saskatchewan Militia organization, 2792
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1498
Wheat Board and Progressive party, 1455

Governor General
Acknowledgment of address in reply to Speech, 3830
Address to on retirement, 4433, 4493
Cars, 3037
Lord Burnham, suggested appointment of, qu. 599

Governor-General—*Con.*
Lord Byng—reported appointment, 4435
Announcement of appointment, 4541
Message from, 4169, 4289
Prorogation, 4577
Speaker's Chair, speech on presentation, 3696
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; relative prosperity of country; revenue maintained; taxes remitted; measures to relieve unemployment; unemployment insurance and old age pensions; British West Indies; Assembly of League of Nations; Tariff revision; Commission of Conservation; Dominion Elections Act; Canada Temperance Act; Copyright; Income War Tax Act; Scientific Research, 2

Governor in Council, specific power to pass Orders in Council, 1098

Government
Attitude of in regard to information, 1739
Borrowing from. *See* Housing; Loans
Buildings, Civil Service, meetings in, qu. 3421
Control of steamships, qu. 3530
Policy with regard to Estimates, 1026
Railways and ships, 1895. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Responsibility to Parliament, 1197, 1098, 1192, 1213, 1186
Shipbuilding programme, 1858. *See also* Shipbuilding
Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Grade Cattle. *See* Health of Animals

Graham, wharf, 3978

Graham, Mr. A. M., 2618

Grain Act. *See* Canada Grain Act

Grain and Grain Trade, 316, 335, 390, 395, 396, 399. *See also* Agriculture; Address; Budget; Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; United Grain Growers
Assignments of grain and produce as note securities, 1443
Car shortage, 512, 549. *See also* Railways; Transportation
Carriage on Great Lakes, 1915, 3371. *See also* Great Lakes
Certificates, 1451
Commission to investigate, 342, 493, 510, 513, 539, 549, 2247. *See also* Grain Inquiry Commission
Crushed grain, 3745
Dockages, 3633-34
Elevators, 277, 278
Country, 278

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Overages, 3634
Quebec, 282, 1443
Saskatchewan So-operative Elevator Co., 391
Terminal, 278, 1442
Weed seeds in, 289
Exchange, 277. *See also* Winnipeg Grain Exchange
Export, 3045
Freight rates, 999, 3392
Lake, 1915, 2963, 3371. *See also* Canals; Canadian National Railways; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Hudson Bay Railway
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 288, 391, 3180, 3357, 3587, 3662, 3667. *See also* Address; Budget; Progressive Party; United Grain Growers
Agricultural implements and, 418, 491, 3372, 3492
Grain Growers' Guide, 391, 420, 3360, 3393
Inspection. *See* Canada Grain Act
Marketing, 346, 377, 383, 438
Moisture in grain, 1445
Montreal, handling at, 3371
Northwest Grain Dealers' Association, 277, 297, 379
Overages, 316, 1463, 3181, 3634
Screenings, 3182
Seed Grain Advances, 4498, 4506
Shipments
By American ports, 1975
Freight cars for, 3541
Staples, Mr. W. D., 3260
Supervisors, 439
Surplus fund, 1446
Tests, 1228
Transportation, 999, 2962, 2963, 2984, 3370. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Hudson Bay Railway
United Grain Growers' Company. *See under* this title Grain Growers
Winnipeg laboratory, 1228

Grain Inquiry Commission, 278, 279, 441, 493, 1447, 1674, 2116, 2295, 3417
Counsel, Secretary, cost of, qu. 2625
Remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
Staples, Mr. W. D., qu. 3260
Winnipeg laboratory, 1228
See also Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Etang
Bridge, 3987
Light, 1997

Grand Trunk Arbitration
Board, salary of, qu. 1130

Grand Trunk Arbitration—*Con.*
Correspondence, 1619
Exchequer Court, Chief Justice, 1084
Expenses, 4335
Extension of time, 1498
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., qu. 1002
Obligations under agreement, 2030
Pensions, qu. 964
Progress of, 3321
Revival, 4436
Subsequent correspondence tabled, 3738
Taft, Hon. W. H., 4158
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001
White, Sir Thomas, 464, 1294

Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill
1r., 2247; M. for 2r., 2346; 2r., 2445; com., 2450, 2560; 3r., 2566; Senate amdts. 2977, 2821
Agreement to revive and continue Arbitration to be made before May 16, 1921, 2474
Extension of time, 2450
Immediate possession and control, 2248
Letter of Messrs. Kelley and Phippen, 2454
Power to continue arbitration, 2248
Powers and duties of arbitrators to continue if Governor in Council extend time, 2476
Preamble, 2450
Request for delay, 2376

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Betterments, 1015
Borrowing, 3291
Cost of, 1614
Deficit, 1005
Equipment, details of, 1015
Improvements, 1018
Loan of $89,687,633.39, 4331
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Loan of $26,000,000, 4169, 4288, 4334
Mileage, 1005
Operating results, 1014

Grand Trunk Railway
Acquisition of, 3118
Alleged request for assistance, 1498
Amount due by United States Government, 4135
Board of Directors, 4142, 3741
Bonds, issue and sale, qu. 837
Building of, 1584
Coal mines in United States, 4316
Control, qu. 697
Details of expenditure of $25,000,000 advance, 4143
Employees
Pensions, qu. 964

Grand Trunk Railway—*Con.*
Equipment trust certificates, qu. 604
Estimated cash requirements, 4140
Estimates for, 1864
Guaranteed advances to, 4139
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Interest, alleged default, 1498
Lines in the United States, 4326
Central Vermont, 4327
Loan of $89,687,633.39, 4131, 4334
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Details of, 4144
McAdoo award, 4143
Management and details, 1008
Operating charges, qu. 1132
Operating results, 4319
Portland terminus, 1384, 4316-27
Running rights Richmond to Quebec, qu 964
Shareholders
List of, 3320, 3560, 3740
Voluminous return, 3697

Grasshopper Plague, qu. 838, 930, 1027, 3665. Insect Pests. *See also* Destructive Insect and Pest Act

Graving Dock Company. *See* Halifax

Grazing
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817-19, qu. 2098, 2618, 2374. *See also* Indians
Leases, 335
Forest reserves, 383

Great Britain. *See also* Shipping; Trade
American wheat, sale to, 1449
Apple exports to, qu. 1051, qu. 1714
Butter and cheese exports, 1471
Cattle, live, export to, 1474. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Decline of agriculture in, 3185
Tonnage, disposal of, 1718
Trade agreement with Russia, 1003

Great Lakes
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and, 1913, 2192, 2969

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Waterway
Chicago Drainage Canal diversion, 186, 2225
Motion (Mr. Keefer) for Special Com., 674-95, 738
Withdrawn, 757

Great Northern and Lake St. John Railways, 281

Great War Veterans Association, 105, 214
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855-81. *See also* that title
Dominion Housing scheme, 4049. *See also* Housing
Early General election, 455

Greece and Roumania. *See also* Roumania
Dominion Canners, purchasers from, qu. 1001
Loans to, qu. 1236

Grenville Canal. *See* Canals

Griesbach, Mr. W. A. (Edmonton West)
Alberta Supreme Court, qu. 576
Canadian National Railways
Provincial liabilities, qu. 2942
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4284-7
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) political patronage; present system preferable; Civil Service Commission; Federal Union No. 66, 825
Disability pensions, qu. 1235
Immigration, 3070
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891
Military preparations, 2299
Militia staff, 2793
Oil and Gas leases
Bounties, 1387, 1413
Delay in issuing, 2029
Payments under, qu. 734, qu. 673
Surface rights, 579
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2639
Ross Rifle, 2784
Royal Military College, 2805
Y.M.C.A., qu. 1625

Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555, 2781, 2827, 4277, 4465, 4514, 4555. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Civil Service, Reorganization, Post Office, Printing Bureau
Employment of, 517, 551, qu. 1821
Officials detailed to assist, qu. 600
Payments to, qu. 4251
Penitentiaries, 1111

Griffin-Boscawen, Sir Arthur, 1156

Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, 1981

Gutelius, Mr., Intercolonial Railway, 1847

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Minister of Militia and Defence and Acting Solicitor General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 415; divergence between reasons advanced by leader of the Opposition and Mr. Clark (Red Deer) in support of amendment; the fiscal question, 415; trade policy of Great Britain; adverse balance of trade; exchange situation, 416; purchasing from United States; United Grain Growers; tariff, policy of Farmers' party; South York speech; Mr. Rice Jones; statement

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
compared with evidence before Tariff Commission; United Grain Growers machinery almost all from the United States, 418; farmers demand for free implements; millions going out of country; why not buy in Canada; 419; did not say Farmers party a "menace"; tariff; position of Farmers' party, 420; Mr. Drury; the official Opposition; Mr. Gauthier; balance of trade; Canada's indebtedness largely to her own people, 421; Liberal Convention of 1919; tariff plank; Liberal Government was protectionist, 423; the amendment; British and Canadian precedents for Government's continuance in office, 424; who is clamouring for election? 426; by-elections; leader of Opposition represents only remnant of Liberal party, 427; amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell) 428; redistribution; rural and urban representation, 429
Air Board, 3776-85
Armistice Day Bill, 3773-5
Armouries for public meetings, 902
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2618, 2909-40, 3143, 4170
French version, 2557
Budget, 3267. Congratulations to Minister on financial showing; former surpluses did not reduce national debt, 3268; Brussels Conference; military expenditure, 3269; comparison of military expenditure by countries, 3271; returned soldiers and military training, 3279
Chief Electoral Officer, reports, 731
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780
Civil Service classification and bonus, 2237
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4270
Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, 1126, 2036
De Martigny divorce, 3771, 4203
Demobilization, 2286
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition Plebiscite) 244, 259, 303
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill 2775, 2944, 3091, 4228-48
Advance polls, 3099
Amendments to writs, 3100
Certificate to women voters, 3111
Disqualified voters, 3099
Election officers, disqualification, 4245
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3109, 4233

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—certificate of qualification
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 4233
New forms, 3100
Nomination and polling day, 3096
Nomination paper, 4246
"Personally naturalized," 4244
Polls, hours of, 3095
Qualified voters, 3096
Recount, 3097
Returning officers' report, 3098
Revising officers, 3091, 3101
Voters, identification of, 3093
Franchise Act—foreign agitators and elections, 903
Judges' Act Amdt. Bill, 2118
Military expenditure, 2301, 3269, 3551
Military Service Act, claim for services, 2807
Militia
Annual drill, 2294
Cadet services, 2296
Command pay, 2290
Employees, increase in number of, 2014
Employment of women, 2286
Estimates, 2234-46, 2275-2310, 2781
Permanent Force, 2239, 2788
Purchasing Commission, 2239
Record Office, 2280
Sale of supplies, 2244-5
Staff, 2787-95
North American Trust Company, 1094, 1129
Pensions
Deduction from pay of Permanent Force, 2236, 2275
South African, 2278
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4052
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-25
Quebec citadel, 1442
Fortifications, 968
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4261
Ross rifle, 2783
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, strength, 2800
Royal Military College, 2802
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4052
Tapley, W. H., case of, 972
Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill, 2158

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 500; criticisms of Farmers' party; Colchester and East Elgin; election demanded by people; by-elections, 501; redistribution; great

Halbert, Mr. Robert H.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
issues at stake; farmers' part in national development; unity and agreement as to national ideals, 502; equal rights to all; protection and class privilege, 503
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2485

Half Island Cove, breakwater, 3981

Halifax
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, registration of vessels, 1720
Dockyards, 4017-36
Explosion, 1699
Fisheries award, qu. 2191
Graving Dock Company, qu. 567, 1690, 1698, 1861. *See also* Drydocks; Shipbuilding
Harbour, government ships at, 1940
Naval College, 4010
Newspapers and merchant marine, 1705, 1706, 1928
Ocean terminals, 1017
Quarantine station, 2754
Roy Building, qu. 3089
Shipbuilding at, 1689, 1921. *See also* Shipbuilding
Shipyards. *See* Shipbuilding

Hall Engineering Company, qu. 695

Halladay, Mr. H. H. (Bow River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 334; congratulations to Prime Minister; the amendment; mandate of the Government; election; the ins and outs; redistribution; Grain Commission, 334; price of wheat; the cattle industry; grazing leases, 335
Canadian Northern Railway, Hanna-Calgary line, 3048
Destruction of documents, qu. 604
Immigration, 2590

Halladay, Mr., Canada Cycle and Motor Company, address, 1227

Hamilton-Brantford Highway. *See* Highways

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 381, 1191, 1609, 1658, 1774, 1801, 1852, 3051, 3406, 3499, 4315, 4328. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. R. B., and York-Sunbury election, 3639. *See also* York-Sunbury

Harbours. *See* Canada Shipping Act. For Individual harbours, *see their titles*

Harbours and Rivers, 3973-82, 4097, 4536
Estimates, amdt (Mr. Pardee) 3979
Manitoba, 3975
Nova Scotia, 3979
Ontario, 3973
Prince Edward Island, 3990
Quebec, 3991

Harding, Mr. R. T., payments to Judges, qu. 1500

Harling, Mr. Thomas, 1981

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Binder twine fibre, 3746, 3756, 3505
Budget, 3500. Canada's financial position; manufacturing industries, 3501; tariff problems, protection and free trade, 3502; manufacturers' profits, 3503; tax upon profits, 3504; customs tariff, binder twine, 3505
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Express parcels, 4400
Impediment to business, 4400
Invoice certificate, fee, 4399
Trade agents, 4399
Proportional representation, 1544
Sales tax, 3754

Harrison, Mr. Charles R. (Nipissing)
Address in reply to Governor General's speech, 230; Grand Trunk strike in 1910, 230; the tariff; effect of Opposition policy on wage-earner; United States industries in Canada; unemployment, insurance and old age pensions, 231; what Government has done for labour; the Mathers Commission, 232
Canadian Northern Railway
Salaried officials, qu. 2942
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill
Railwaymen's expenses while absent from home, 4352

Harrow Tobacco Station, 1076

Hawkins, Dr. Charles, and immigration, 3068

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 393; congratulations to Prime Minister; no great demand for election; side-stepping of Opposition, 393; tariff; office seekers and usurpers; the home market, 394; the grain trade; commission of inquiry; old age pensions and unemployment insurance; Prime Minister should carry on, 396
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4242
Disfranchising, 3112

Hay, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—certificate of qualification
Amdt. 4242; agreed to, 4245
Hog cholera, compensation, 1065
Hudson Bay Railway, Amdt. 994
Imaginary letters, point of order, 3173
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883

Hay and Straw Inspection. *See* Inspection and Sale Act

Hayter, Mr., auditor, 1668

Head Tax. *See* Chinese Immigration

Health. *See also* Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drugs; Quarantine
Adulteration of food, 3129
Estimates, 2940-3127
Minister's statement, 3127
Medical inspection of immigrants, qu. 573 3128
Opium and Drug Act Amdt, convictions under, 3134
Quarantine stations, 3128
Report of, 1852
Research, 4464-78
Salaries, etc., 3127
Sick mariners, 3129, 3155
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1498, 1556
Typhus in Europe, 643, 4534

Health of Animals, 926, 1048, 4506-13. *See also* Agriculture; Cattle Embargo; Live Stock
Accredited herd, 4506-13
Alderson, Mr. G. B., claim of. *See that title*
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 1061
Glanders outbreak in Frontenac, 926
Hog cholera, 1050-9. *See also* Alderson
Increase in amount of item, 1064
Indemnity for diseased herds, 1048
Motions (Mr. Sutherland)
To reduce item, 1068
To strike out item, 4513
Tuberculosis, 4506-13
Veterinary system, 1058, 4508-13. *See also* Alderson

Hearst Publications, 4170

Heating. *See* House of Commons, Chamber

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 272; protection of agriculture; tariff changes in the United States; the tariff, 273; the Government's mandate, issues of the election of 1917, 274; record of the Government; important measures passed, 275; the "want

Henders, Mr. Richard C.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
of confidence" cry; no popular demand for an election; no charges of maladministration or corruption; progressive legislation, 276; Canadian Wheat Board; Grain Exchange; Northwest Grain Dealers' Association, 277; uniform price quotations; elevators; profits; overages, screenings; enquiry suggested, 279
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 669; Amdt. 670
Binder twine, 3748
Butter and oleomargarine, 3748
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2868-83
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4232
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187
Wheat Board, 1454

Hepburn, Mr. W. B. R. (Prince Edward)
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4441

Hewitt, Dr. Gordon, the late, 1030

Hickman, Mr., alleged deportation of, qu. 575

Hides
Inspection, 1437
Prices of, 3317, 3370, 3491, 3667. *See also* Budget Speeches

High Commissioner in London, 2437

High Cost of Living. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Retirement; Customs and Excise
Superannuated civil servants, 2491, 4275.

Highland Regiments. *See* Militia

Highways
Alberta, grants to, qu. 1821
Canada Highways Act, administration of, 4289
Approval of projects in Ontario, qu. 1237
Grants, qu. 567, qu. 2098
Commissioner, Mr. A. W. Campbell, 3023-4289
Expenditure, 2555
Good Roads Convention, 4300
Manitoba, proposed, 4308
Metapedia valley, qu. 2505
New Brunswick, approved, 4306
Nova Scotia
Approved and applied for, 4307
Highways Board, 4304
Ontario
Approved, 4295
Biggs, Hon. F. C., 4290, 4448
"Charge of the Road Brigade," 4300
Dundas Street, qu. 4252, 4299

Highways—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Dundas-Waterloo, 4298
Expenditure, 4289
Extravagance, charges of, 4304
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 3582, 3904, 4252-3, 4290
Hamilton-Dundas, 4290
Hamilton-Kitchener, 4292
Hogarth, Mr., 4298
London-St. Thomas, 4307
London-Stratford-Sarnia, 4307
Maclean, Mr., 4298
Peel and Halton, qu. 4252
Price paid for expropriated land, 4291
Purchase of trucks, 4292
Relevancy of discussion, 4293-6
"The Roads that Biggs Built," 4302
Toronto-Guelph-Sarnia, etc., qu. 4252
Toronto-Kingston, 4306
Town of Dundas, 4298
Wages, 4291
Warren Paving Company, qu. 4252; 4291
Ottawa-Point Fortune, 4306
Overhead charges, qu. 4252
Prince Edward Island, aid to, qu. 2345
Projected roads, 3025
Quebec
Approval of, qu. 2098
Federal aid to, qu. 2344, 2375
Hull-Montreal highway, 3029, 4306
Hull-Wakefield highway, 3033-34
Lachine bridge, 4308
La Salle, repairing road in, 4313, 4333
Montreal-Sherbrooke, 4305
Quebec-St. Joachim-St. Simeon, 4313
Rougemont-St. Hyacinthe, 4305
St. Hyacinthe-Richmond, 4305
Saskatchewan, approved, 4307
Grants to, qu. 1820
Statement of highways under agreement or consideration, 4309
Width of, 4306

Hillsboro river dredging, 3984

Historical Publications, Board of, 2947

Hobson, Mr. Robert, 1609-10, 3407, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Chief Justice, salary of, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2859-66
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3844-50
De Martigny divorce, 4006-8
Fraser, Mr. Roy, and Civil Service Commission, 2860-8
Fuel Supply Problem, 1261

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Housing, 1134, 1136, 1857
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 1565
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4209-18
Parliament Buildings, book on, inquiry, 1175
Printing Bureau employees, qu. 1234
Quebec riots, 1510
Toronto post office, promotions, qu. 1673
Unemployment and immigration, 1378
Wednesday evening adjournments, 1838

Hog Cholera. *See* Health of Animals; Alderson

Holt, Sir Herbert, and shipbuilding, 1900

Home Brewing, 3788

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1539. *See also* Proportional Representation

Horses. *See also* Live Stock
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817-19
Diseased. *See* Health of Animals
Docking of, 3922
Purchase of by British Remount Commission, qu. 4341

Hospitals
Alcohol, use of by, 3726. *See also* Inland Revenue
Marine. *See* Health

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Adjournment to discuss matter of public importance, 4106
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2688, 2941, 2998-3000
Easter, 1002
Victoria Day, 3531, 3698, 3738
Audibility of debates, 1625, 2252, 2269, 2385, 2892, 2941, 2989, 3998-4000, 4307, 4381, 4489
Bills
Introduction by consent, 2247
Private
Extension of time, 1625
Placed on order paper same day as reported, 3971
Procedure, 1128
Suspension of rule, 3582, 3715
Reported by Standing Com., 3761
Second reading by consent, 2889
Senate, delay in 1r., 1619
Business of the House
Alleged desire to hasten prorogation, 4068
British Practice to announce, 1026

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Closure. *See* that title
Complaint of undue haste, 4068, 4449
Definite statement necessary, 1025
Division after a recess, 1383
For to-morrow, definite statement, 1025
Government, 1318, 1384, 2148
Legislation pending 2150, 2818-9, 4068
Mondays and Fridays, 1830, 1845
Government business, 2148
Order of, return incomplete, 2250, 2270
Progress of, 1842
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Restriction of discussion, 1318
Rule 17C—Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays. *See* under this title Estimates
Saturday, on, 2777
Suspension of Rule, 103, 3582
To-morrow, for, 1025, 2148
By-elections, 217. *See also* under this title Vacancies
Dates, 903
East Elgin, 1293
Medicine Hat, 1174, 1293, 2151
Peterborough, 504
Yamaska, 4534, 4572-6. *See also* that title
York-Sunbury, 2151. *See also* that title
Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Closure. *See* that title
Committees, Select Standing, 3, 107, 303, 2776. For proceedings and reports, *see* titles of the several Committees
Liberty to sit during sessions of the House, 4338-40
Powers of, 110
Correspondence, unsigned, 2175
Debate, motion to adjourn by member closing discussion, 999
Debates, Official Report of,
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, errors in, 1697-8
Changes and corrections in 3716
Crerar, Hon. Mr., 3628
Documents not read, insertion of, 4308. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Distribution of, M. (Mr. Prevost) 2220
French speeches, translation of, M. (Mr. Archambault) 698; agreed to, 702
Motion in different form from Votes and Proceedings, 1130
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor, 258, 430
Speaker's Chair, address to be printed in, 3696
Staff—strain of long sittings, 2887
Decorum, conversation, 528. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions
Address, Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) non-confidence, neg. 561
Budget, Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) neg. 3686-7
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information—M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 1215
Special Com., reference to M. (Mr. Meighen); Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 1810; Main motion agreed to as amended, 1814
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax)—six months' hoist, neg. 2886
De Martigny Divorce Bill
M. (Mr. Stein) agreed to, 4107
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Guthrie)
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Euler) neg. 4249
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Pardee)—six months' hoist, neg. 4226
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Denis) 3886—six months' hoist, neg. 3886
Prime Ministers' Conference
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 2679
Reciprocity—Amdt. to Supply (Mr. Fielding) neg. 2075
Representation in Parliament Amdt. (Mr. King) neg. 1329
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. McMaster) 665
Estimates. *See aslo* that title
Method of voting, 4033, 4117, 4569
Post Office, late date of submission, 4531
Rule 17C—Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 1004, 1073, 1215, 1217, 1385, 1682, 2103-4, 2887, 3001, 4544
Effect of passage of Interim Supply Bill, 2103, 2105
Right to call department when in Com. of Supply, 2888
Supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Imaginary letters, 3172. *See also* that title
Indemnity of Members, 4450-52
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Members
Attendance of, 1829, 1832, 1838
Deceased, tributes to
Gladu, the late Mr. Joseph E. O. (Yamaska) 3, 153, 292, 430
McLeod, the late Col. H. F. (York-Sunbury) 4, 153
Sifton, the late Right Hon. Arthur (Medicine Hat) 3, 153

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Wallace, the late Mr. Thomas G. (West York) 152
Money resolutions, and, 1135
New
Election and introduction
Gordon, Mr., 258
MacKelvie, Mr., 1
McCurdy, Hon. Mr., 1
McDermand, Mr., 1
Wigmore, Hon. Mr., 1
Non-attendance on Mondays and Fridays, 1832-8
Resignation of. *See also* Representation in Parliament
Ames, Sir Herbert, 1001. *See also* that title
Maharg, Mr., 4340
Rowell, Hon. Mr., 4340
White, Sir Thomas, 1619. *See also* that title
Ministers to sit in either Chamber. *See* Ministers
Motions
For returns in general terms, 1555
Notices of sent in Advance, 1307
Pairs, correction of list, 563. *See also* under this title Divisions
Parliamentary Restaurant. *See* that title
Privilege
Archambault—Société des Artisans, 230
Clark, Mr., (Red Deer)—Address, incorrect report in Ottawa Citizen, 448
Denis, Mr.,—Immigration, misinterpretation of speech by Quebec newspapers, 3088
Desaulniers, Mr.
Correction, Montreal Gazette, 644
Name omitted from division list, 4255
Edwards, Mr.,—representation of Maisonneuve-Gaspé, 2247, 2310
Kay, Mr.,—Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, vote on, 3971
Lapointe, Mr.
Alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Correction of report in Ottawa Journal, 477
Explanation of remarks on Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4543
National Catholic Unions, 3584
Meighen, Right Hon.,—York-Sunbury election, Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3716
Pedlow, Mr.,—Amendment incorrectly printed in Votes and Proceedings, 737

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Power, Mr.,—Withdrawal from Special Committee, Returned Soldiers, 789
Robb, Mr.,—Quebec bloc, 3261
Turgeon, Mr.,—Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3740
Wilson, Mr., (Wentworth)—Challenge to Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4448
Questions
Inquiry as to, 2943
Not answered, 1621, 1502
Returns
Alleged disobedience or neglect of order, 3320
Alleged imperfect, 2250-70
Inquiry for, 1176, 1499, 1502, 2688, 2775, 2777, 3008, 3320, 4255
Motions for in general terms, 1555
Reason for delay, 1555
Rules
Suspension of, 3582, 3715
Bills, first reading, 3716
17C. *See under this title* Estimates
Sergeant-at-Arms; Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Sittings
Attendance at, 1844. *See also* under this title Wednesday evening
Duration of, 1330, 1828, 2438, 2736, 2750, 2772, 2887, 2998, 3000, 3900, 4169, 4420, 4449, 4531
All night
Government shipbuilding programme, 1858-2026
Saturday, 2777, 2818, 2941, 4338-40
Two o'clock, 2941, 3737
Wednesday
Two o'clock, 447
Evening, 1002, 1174, 1384
M. (Mr. Fielding) 1828; withdrawn, 1845
Staff
Law Branch, changes, 2685
Long sittings, 2887
Organization and compensation, 2441, 2685
Retirement Act, 4266-78. *See* Civil Service Retirement Act
Women workers, 4547
Supply. *See also* that title
Interim—Redlich, authority on, 1675
Procedure, 1215
Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C
See under this title, Estimates
Vacancies. *See also* under this title By-elections
Filling of, 1293. *See* Representation in Parliament

House of Commons—*Con.*
Vacancies—*Con.*
Leeds, 1293, 1619. *See also* White, Sir Thomas
Medicine Hat, 478, 1174, 1293
St. Antoine, 1001, 1069, 1293. *See also* Ames
Yale, 1
Yamaska, 478, 643, 1293. *See aslo* that title
York-Sunbury, 478,643, 1293
York, West, 478, 643, 1293
Writs, 643

House of Lords. *See* Ministers

Housing, 4362-8. *See aslo* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Dominion Housing scheme, 4049
Loan to provincial governments, 4552
Proposed establishment of a Federal Housing Board
M. (Mr. Hocken) 1134, 1152
M. as amended withdrawn, 1857

Howard, Mr. *See* Purchasing Commission

Hudson Bay Railway, 330, 538, 1578, 1961, 1966, 2969-80. *See also* Canals
Early resumption and completion, M. (Mr. Campbell) 974
Amdt. (Mr. Hay) 994; agreed to, 999
M. (Mr. Campbell) as amended, withdrawn, 1852-6
Expenditure actual and estimated, qu. 2623
Fort Churchill, 1966
Port Nelson, 1966
Selection of lands, qu. 672

Hudson, Hon. A. B., 4184-4213

Hughes, Hon. Sir Sam (Victoria)
Civil Service—Res.—Political Patronage in; fads and freaks, 789; uplifters; Outside Service; Civil Service Commission; Inside Service; Committee to investigate, 790; trust and mistrust; autocracy, 791

Hungry Bay road, 1661

Hunter, Dr. Andrew, fox-breeding, 1428

Hydro-Electric Power. *See* Fuel Supply Problem; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Hyndman, Judge, and Grain Inquiry Commission, 1674

Icebreakers, 1979
"Lake Champlain", 2174
"Montcalm", 1985
New, 1994
Thunder Bay, at, 2174

Ice-cream, tax, 3737, 3956

Iles aux Grues-Montmagny mail service 4529

Illegal Practices. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill

Illicit Still, innocent manufacture of part, 3788-3820

Imaginary Letters
Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, 3174-3209
Mr. McMaster, 3173
Speaker's ruling, 3260

Immaculate Conception, 2626. *See also* Civil Service, Religious Holidays

Immigration, 269, 3580. *See also* Canadian Nationals Definition Act; Chinese Immigration; Health; Unemployment
British, Inspector of, 3067
Central European, 2575-85
Chinese, 4131. *See also* Chinese Immigration
Continuous passage, 2580-6
Co-operation of railways, 4129
Emigration to the United States, 3068
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, arrest for sedition, 1556
Exhibitions, 3067, 4129-31
Expenditure, qu. 2943
German and Austrian, 3206
Halifax Quarantine Station, 2754
"Hand picking" of immigrants, 3203
Head tax, 3056
Hickman, alleged deportation of, qu. 574
Immigrants rejected, qu. 1624
Infection, danger of, qu. 272
Inspectors, 3067
Land settlement policy, 2581, 2588-9
Liberal administration, under, 3245
Loss of in Western Canada, 3373-4
Medical inspection of immigrants, 3128
Medical offices at ports of departure, 3132
Mental defectives, of, 3055, 3583
Money qualification, 2579-85
Nationality of, 3071
Oriental, 2584-94, 2595. *See also* Chinese Immigration
Partridge Island Quarantine station, 2808-15
Policy, 850, 861, 872, 879, 3205, 3249, 3256, 3580
Polish immigrants rejected, qu. 964
Restriction of, 507, 1127, 2568-77, 2585
Statistics, 3071-3073
Suspension of. *See* Unemployment
Typhus fever, precautions, 643, 4534
Western Canada Colonization Association, 2583

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3007; 2r., com., 3822; 3r., 3955; Senate amdts. 4343

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Bill of health, 3824
Costs of appeal, 3823
Deportation after five years—cost, 3827
Hearing of cases, 3823
Investigation of complaints—deportation—cost, 3826
Landing of passengers, 3824
Medical examination, 3824
Non-immigrant classes, 3822
Possessing prescribed amount of money, 3825
Powers of Board exercised by officers in charge, 3823

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill (Deportation of Undesirables)
1r., 1497; order for 2r., stands, 1858. *See above* Bill

Immigration and Colonization
Department
Contingencies and general expenses, 4127
Deputy Minister, 3057
Estimates, 2568
Contingencies, 4131
Postponement of consideration, 3077
Quebec, officers at, qu. 1131
Salaries, 2568-2602, 3055, 3068

Imperial Bureau of Entomology, 1025

Imperial Conference, 526, qu. 564, 1073. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial Defence, 228, 270. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference
Committee on, 2637-49

Imperial Federation, 159, 2423. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial Institute, 4499

Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2164, 4498

Imperial Munitions Board, 1284. *See* Research
Shipbuilding, and, 1730, 1859, 1875

Imperial Oil Company, 3206. *See also* Oil; Petroleum Bounties

Imperial Relations, 247, 484, 519. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial War Conference, 1917, 2389
Res. 2626-36-48. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Implement Manufacturers, 91. *See also* Agricultural implements

Imported Goods, Marking of, 3120, 3938. *See also* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt Bill

Imports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Foreign, value of, 3310
For home consumption, 1920, qu. 602
From Germany, qu. 838
From United States, 3409
German goods, holdback, qu. 1350
Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Marking. *See* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill

Income Tax, 98, 402, 3229, qu. 3260, 3422. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Ways and Means
Canada and Great Britain, in, 3486
Chief Justice and. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Corporations, on, 3262
Exemptions, 1567
Forms, inquiry, 1176
Regulations, 1272
Returns, difficulty of making up, 3147

Income Tax Act Consolidation Bill, 3905
1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4343; 3r., 4355
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Administration, 4533
Direct taxation, 4344
Members' travelling expenses, 4349
Method of self-assessment and payment, 4345
Notice of assessment, 4353
Penalty for failure to file returns, 4343
Penalty for short payment, 4344
Railway men, expenses when absent from home, 4352
Salaries and indemnities of provincial ministers, 4351
Tax upon tax, 4349
Victory bonds, taxation of, 4353

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

Independence of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Independence of Parliament. *See* Representation in Parliament

Indian Affairs

Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2171, 4501

Indian Ford, 1055

Indians
Blood Reserve
Grazing leases, qu. 1817, 1818, 1819, 2098

Indians—*Con.*
Blood Reserve—*Con.*
Live stock, starvation of, qu. 2618
Sale of cattle, qu. 2374-5
Commissioner at Regina, qu. 964
Muscowegan reserve, 2171
New Brunswick, 4501
Prince Edward Island, 4505
Riding Mountain reserve, 2172
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 2618, 4501-5
"Shows" for distinguished visitors, 2169
Tobique reserve—timber cut, 4503
Women, 3907

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Industrial Production. *See* Fuel Supply Problem

Industrial Property, International Convention for protection of, 230

Industrial Research Commission, Alberta, 1267

Ingonish-MacLeod's Breakwater, 4087

Inland and Coastwise Shipping Rates, 1497, qu. 2192, 2969. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Inland Navigation, qu. 2192. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept.; Customs Tariff

Inland Revenue Department. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept.; Customs Tariff
Excise taxes on tobacco, qu. 1236
Montreal officers, qu. 1820
St. Hyacinthe—Dr. Cartier, 3821, qu. 3904

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. (Forfeitures and Penalties—Mr. Archambault)
1r., 2247

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3726; 1r., 3733; 2r., com., 3r., 3955
Subjects and Sections discussed.
Beer containers—marking, 3786
Illicit stills, 3786-3820
Increased jurisdiction in proceeding in summary convictions, 3786
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Tobacco and cigars—unlawful sale, 3786

Inquiry for Returns, House of Commons. *See* Returns

Insecticides, 1027

Insect Pests, 930, 1024, 3665. *See also* Destructive Insect and Pest Act; Entomology; Grasshoppers

Inspection and Sale Act
Administration, 1437

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bills
Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114
Hay and Straw. 1r., 3319-20; 2r., com., 3r., 3759
Root vegetables, 4343

Inspection of Animals. *See* Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals

Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill
1r., 351; 2r., 607; 3r., 2944

"Insular" Tribunal of England, 1090

Insurance. *See also* Fire Insurance; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Canadian, in foreign firms, 3469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1278
Officers and seamen, 4359
Canadian National Railways, 1772
Fire, 3469
Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 82
Marine, 1703. *See also* Shipbuilding
Registered mail matter, 2120-24
Registered parcels. *See* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
Returned Soldiers, 4041. *See* that title; also Pensions
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4260, 4355. *See also* that title
Sickness, 2554
Taxation of Mutual Companies, qu. 605
Unemployment. *See that title*

Insurance Act
Proposed amendments, inquiry, 2625
M. for res. 4339; withdrawn, 4453

Insurance Conference, 3088

Intercolonial Railway. *See that title* under Canadian National Railways

Interim Supply. *See also* Supply
Closure. *See that title*
Debate postponed, 1682
Former votes, of, 1681
Motion withdrawn, 1683
Point of Order—Res. to be preceded by notice, 1676

Interim Supply Bill. *See also* Appropriation Acts
Res. 1674; objected to, 1674; notice, Rule 17B, unanimous consent, 1676-82; withdrawn, 1683; Res. 2001; Amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 2018-20; closure, notice of under Rule 17B, 2025-6
1r., 2095; 2r., com., 2100; 3r., 2116

Interior Department
Draughtsmen, 1334
Minister, necessity for presence in Commons, 1155
Salaries, 1330
Surveys Branch, 1332
Surveyor General, 1342

International Association of Railways Congress, 3023

International Boundary Commission, 1342, 4494
Joint report, 4340

International Commission, Fraser River, 2189

International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, adherence to, 230

International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1437

International Financial Conference. *See* Brussels

International Harvester Company, 3394. *See also* Agricultural machinery

International Institute of Agriculture, 1116

International Joint Commission, 164, 2388, 2421, 2435. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Lake of the Woods
Appointment of Sir William Hearst, 510
Lake of the Woods Control, 1071, 1176, 1233, 4172
St. Lawrence waterway, 691, 3960-70

International Justice. *See* Permanent Court

International Labour Conference, 544. *See also* Labour

International Labour Union. *See* Labour, National Catholic Unions

International Trade Conference, qu. 2029. *See* Trade

"Internationale," dredge, qu. 2192, qu. 2506

Inventors. *See* Patent Act Amdt. Bill

Inverness
Fishery overseers, 2178
Harbour, 3985
Public building, 2817

Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Ioco, wharf, 3979

Ireland, Parliament for South of, qu. 603

Iron and Steel Industry
Development of, 873-4. *See also* Natural Resources; Steel

Irrigation. *See also* Natural Resources
Belly river water rights, qu. 2943
Milk river water rights, qu. 2099
Southern Alberta and Saskatchewan, 858

Isaac, Mr. *See* French Trade Agreement

Italy
Cargoes of wine from, 1715
Lira, exchange value of, 3816-4227
Trade with. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 503; congratulations to Prime Minister; by-election in Peterborough, 504; National Liberal and Conservative party; Mr. Bourassa, 505; Mr. R. B. Bennett; Government saturated with war spirit, 506; shipbuilding; immigration; restrictive loans and regulations, 507; railways and public ownership; Department of Trade and Commerce, 508; Departments not directly represented in House; military expenditures, 509; Royal Commission to investigate grain trade; conciliatory overtures to Quebec; appointments that violate the traditions, 510
Agriculture Dept.—Salary of Deputy Minister, 950
Air Board, 3780-3
Alpine Club, 4494
American immigration, 3065
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1327
Animal Contagious Diseases, 1048
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Jacobs)—French Version, 1069, 2256
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Guthrie) 2910-39, 3144
Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1085
British Remount Commission, qu. 4341
Canada Temperance Act
Damages, 4387
Invasion of the province of the courts, 4379
Proceedings pending, 4378
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, Special Com., reference M. (Mr. Meighen) 1785
Cattle embargo, 1072
Chief Justice, salary of, 1568
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3896-8, 3906-30, 4342
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commissioner, 4388
Reflections on legal profession, 4406
Trade commissioners, 4406
De Martigny divorce, 3763
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Foreign-born wives of British subjects, 3105
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1556
Foundation Company of Montreal, payments to, qu. 4341
Fox-farming, 1433
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grand Trunk Arbitration expenses, 4335
Grand Trunk loan, 4158
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 749
Immigration, 2574-92, 3055
Exhibit decorator, 3066
Officials, 3057
Juvenile delinquents—spanking, 3918
League of Nations, contribution to, 2357-69
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 1325, 2333
Medicinal preparations, 3709
Militia, cadet services, 2297
National Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2513
Natural Research Institute, 2894
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4018-31
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3880-2
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2905
Amdt. to amdt., 2903
Parliament buildings, 4075
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4456
Penitentiaries, 1092
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2709-35
Permanent Force, 2278
Private Bills—extension of time, 1625
Quarantine, typhus, 4170
Representation in Parliament, 1327
Roumanian loan, interest, 1441, 2030
Supreme Court and Privy Council appeals, 1089-1090
Tariff revision, qu. 903, 2346
Trade commissioners, 1219, 1465
Trent canal, 2607
Unemployment and immigration, 1358
Wines—British colonies, 3710

James MacLaren Company, Limited. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Jameson, Mr. Clarence, 799. *See also* Civil Service

Japan
Foreign credit, balance of, 1227-8

Johnston, Mr. Alex., 1280
Reappointment, 644

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred. (Last Mountain)
Address, 437. Congratulations to Prime Minister, 437; Canadian Wheat Board; statement of Minister of Immigration at Regina; attitude of Progressives, 438; definite stand taken on "enabling legislation", the farmers and wheat control; report of grain supervisors, 439; objections to Wheat Board, 440; scarcity of cars; increase in freight rates; commission to investigate grain trade; Board of Commerce, 441; Mr. G. M. Murray and the press, 442; the West anxious for an election, 444
Agricultural shows, 1245
Budget, 3550. Military expenditures; shifting of taxation, 3551; tariff revision, 3552; Government policy of moderate protection, 3553; agriculture, area and revenue, 3553; Soldier Settlement Board, operations, 3554; natural resources of prairie provinces, 3555; Ambassador to Washington, 3556; Farmers' party, 3556
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4469-72
Cow-testing, 1037
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4241
Naturalization—Certificate of qualification, 4241
Grain Commission, 1449
Grand Trunk Railway, operating charges, qu. 1132
Immigration, restriction of, 1127
Indian Commissioner at Regina, 2167-9
Live stock breeding, 1117
Muscowegan reserve, 2171
Oil development in Mackenzie district, 2162
Post Office, outside service, 4528
Public Works, expenditures in Saskatchewan, 2818
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2070
Stayner postmaster, 4470
Wheat Board, 1454

Joliette Bridge, 3038

Jones. *See* Rice Jones

Judge Snider. *See* Printing Bureau

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, Revising Officers

Judges—*Con.*
Appointment of, 801, 811, 813
Chandler, Judge, Moncton, 2119
Chief Justice, Supreme Court, exemption of salary, 2188
Exchequer Court, 1083-4
Latchford, Judge, payment to, qu. 1500
Macleod Judicial district, qu. 2344
Number of, 1081
Riddell, Judge, payments to, qu. 1500
Salaries, 3680
Saskatchewan King's Bench, additional Judge, 1559
Travelling expenses, 1559, 2118
Vice-Admiralty, 1084
Wilson, Judge, qu. 1622
Yukon Territory, salaries and living allowance, 1087-8

Judges Act, 1920
Correspondence, M. (Mr. Lemieux) 1851

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 1559; Amdt. (Mr. Lanctot) neg. 1572; 1r., 1573; 2r., com., 2117; 3r., 2151; Senate amdts. 3009; Free Conference with Senate, 3972; 4040-61; 4250

Judicial Committee. *See* Privy Council

Judicial Districts, Quebec, 1081-3

June Bugs, 1030

Justice
Administration of, Yukon Territory, 1087
Department
Counsel employed in, 1077, 3523
Legal cases referred to, 1655
Litigated matters, expenses, 1089
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., qu. 1002
Purchasing agent, 1079, 1115, 2017
Salaries, 1076
Taxation forms, revision by, qu. 1237
Law stamps, tax, 1090
Penitentiaries, estimates, 1091, 1096. *See also* Penitentiaries
Privy Council appeals, 1089. *See also* that title

Juvenile Courts. *See* Juvenile Delinquents

Juvenile Delinquents, 3013
Spanking, 3918

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3319; 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Kamouraska, plum-growing, 1048

Kamouraska and Temiscouata Telephone Co., 2175

Kapuskasing Illustration station, 949

Kay, Mr. W. Fred. (Missisquoi)
Camp Grounds, Farnham, Que., qu. 1132
Canada Temperance Act, qu. 4253

Kay, Mr. W. Fred.—*Con.*
Census enumerators, qu. 735, qu. 1132, 4113
Income tax forms, 1176
Missisquoi
Census enumerators, qu. 735, qu. 1132, 4113
Net fishing in Missisquoi Bay, qu. 570
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3854
Privilege—vote on Oleomargarine Bill, 3971
Special War Revenue Act—condensed milk and ice-cream, 3956
Victoria Day, 3531

Keefer, Mr. Francis H. (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Africa, trade with, 1965
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925
Canada-West Indies Trade agreement, 2259
Canadian representation in the United States, 2424-6
Canal tolls, 2963
Cattle embargo, 730
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2487-8
Fuel Supply Problem, 1257
Grain transportation rates, 2982
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2479
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, Res. 674, 753
Kingston, wharves and bridges, 3973
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2346-54
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4184-98
Parliament buildings, 3999
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2483-4
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 593

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward (East Toronto)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 590

Kenora
Board of Trade, 4184-6
Dam, 4172

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Cattle, embargo, 720
Cattle feeds, 3744
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
New and unused goods, 3814
Grading of cheese, 1037
Hudson Bay Company, selection of land, qu. 672
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3866
Unemployment and immigration, 1372

Kennedy, Mr. W. C. (North Essex)
Budget, 3404; deficit and annual debt; militia expenditures; mercantile marine, 3405; railway situation, 3406; Canadian National Railways, directors, 3407; manufacturers and home and foreign markets, 3408; importations from United States, 3409; amdt. of Mr. Fielding, 3410
Canadian National Railways, Board of Management, qu. 1132
Civil Service bonus, 2111-13
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 684

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 10; congratulations to Prime Minister; usurpation of authority by Government; changes in Ministry; elected as a war administration—has it a mandate?—comparison with former administrations, 12; retirement of ministers principally responsible for Government's war record, 13; aims of present and former administrations different, 15; the tariff, 17; issue excluded in formation of Union Government, 19; no right to legislate without consulting the people; grounds for continuance of Government examined; limitation of parliamentary term, 20; supremacy of Parliament, 22; no pledge given in 1917, 23; withdrawal of Ministers who believed administration had fulfilled its mandate, 24; desire of Leader of Opposition for an election; significance of by-elections, 25; Canada alone in denying to people right of general election, 26; violation of fundamental principles of free government, 28; non-confidence amendment, 28
Air Board, 3782
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 478, 1069, 1295
Archives, provision for, 2949
Arctic expedition, 4106
Armistice Day, 3775
Auditor General's Report, 737, 903, 915
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2909
Budget, 3596. Tariff revision and the Government; tariff inquiry, 3598; Republican party in the United States—barriers to trade between two countries; exchange rate, 3599; comparison of Budget speech and policy and principles of National Liberal and Conservative party, 3600; inter-Imperial

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade, 3601; association between interests and Government during war period, 3602; political power united with plutocracy of self-interest, 3603; Board of Commerce—Mr. Murdock, 3604; lack of constructive legislation, 3607; protection of the interests, 3607; expenditure on National Railways and Merchant Marine, 3608; directors of National Railways and business interests, 3609; loans to foreign countries, 3611; Members of Parliament and sales to foreign countries, 3611; Minister of Crown soliciting business from foreign government, 3612; Prime Minister and misrepresentation of attitude of Opposition, 3612; free trade and protective tariffs, 3613; methods of taxation, 3614; downward revision of tariff, 3616; election necessary, 3618
Budget, date of, inquiry, 1555, 2151
Business of the House
Estimates—alleged agreement, 4569
For to-morrow, 2145
Interruption of debate on Address, 151
Legislation
Pending, 2150, 2819, 3972
Undue haste, 313
Lengthy discussions, 1230
Monday—Government business, 2148
Order of, 1619
Prorogation, 4069
Sittings
Duration of, 897, 900, 1330, 2887
Saturday, 2818
Wednesday evening, 1002
Supply, procedure, 1216
Victoria Day, 3689
By-elections, dates, 903. *See also* under this title Representation in Parliament
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1292
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, Bill, 585, 648
Canadian National Railways
Government-owned railways, correspondence, 1004
Information—attitude of the Government, 1759
Management, 1440
M. that information be laid before Parliament, 1178
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1188, 1594; M. (Mr. Meighen) 1758; Amdt. (Mr. King) 1761; Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1813

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2429
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2486
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2844; M. for 2r., 2778
Commission
Annual report, 4477
Jurisdiction of, 4286-8
Returned soldiers, 4258-9
Special Com.
Quorum, 2940
Reference to, 2776
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 2908, 3843-50
Cost of Living, 4551
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3830
Date of summoning Parliament, 311
Daylight saving in Ottawa, 2776
Deceased members, tributes to, 4, 153
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition Plebiscite) 151, 309
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Bill not printed, 2944
Certificate of qualification, 3090, 3107-10, 4238-9
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3090
Forms, 3100
Voters' lists, registration, 3092
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Estimates. *See also* under this head Business of the House, Interim Supply
Committee on, 2207-9
Time of taking up, 1330
French Trade Agreement, 2125
Governor General—address to on retirement, 4434
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill
Agreement of March 8, 1920, 2377
Committee of five, 2479
Legal consequences, 2451
Liquidation, 2451
Position of Opposition on taking over Grand Trunk, 2560
Ratification of new agreement, 2450
Request for delay, 2346
Senate amendments, 2777, 2823
Submission of agreement to Parliament, 2476
House of Commons staff, 2887
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4343
Interim Supply, 1679, 2115
Attitude of Opposition, 2004
Objected to, 1674
Obligations for payment, 2025

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Judge Snider's report, 3697, 3761, 3905
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2117-18
Kamloops, speech at, 3623
Labour Department
Alleged combines, 4551
Bolshevism—pamphlet, 4548
Fair wages, 4545
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4552
Minister—letter of in Gazette, 1643
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 3903, 4211-17
League of Nations, contribution towards, 2356
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1163
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159
National Research Institute, 2894. *See also* Research
Natural resources
Adjournment of debate, 894
Transfer of to western provinces, 2546-52
Nauru Island, phosphate deposits, 4255, 4541
Newsprint, alleged combine, qu. 2099
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2907
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 258
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment, 4573
Peterborough speech, 134
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Press Gallery, 2887
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2631
Amdt. to Supply, 2634-58
Prisons and reformatories, 3011
Privilege—alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Proportional representation, 1552
Public money, accounting for, 1292
Purchasing Commission, 1099
Statutes
Limiting power, 1101
Providing for tenders, 1105
Representation in Parliament
Vacancies (Amdt. to Supply), 1293, 1300, neg. 1309
By-elections, 1306
Rockefeller Foundation, 2443
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2481, 2801
Shipbuilding, 1292

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Speaker's Chair, 3693
Supplementary Estimates, inquiry for, 3741
Tariff inquiry, 3055
Tariff revision, 3622-3
Unemployment, 4549
Vacancies, 478. *See also* under this head Representation
War Times Election Act, 4238
White, Sir Thomas, qu. 477

King's Bench. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Judges, 1081

King's Birthday, 4450

King's County, fruit inspectors, 1041

Kingston
Fortifications, 969
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Wharves and bridges, 3973

Kino Hill, silver discovery, 856

Kirkwood Steamship Company, qu. 564

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 537; congratulations to Prime Minister; the amendment; Soldiers' Settlement Board; Porcupine Forest Reserve; lack of transportation facilities—freight rates—Hudson Bay Railway, 538; investigation of grain trade; farmers' movement
Budget, 3414. Government has reverted to indirect taxation, 3414; militia expenditures, 3415; expenditures on canals; northern Saskatchewan transportation facilities, 3416; protection and the farmers; grain inquiry, 3417
Canadian National Railways, passenger traffic, Montreal-Winnipeg, qu. 2376
Chinese immigration, 3056
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855
Cordwood for fuel, 3748
Credits to Roumania and Greece, qu. 1236
Hudson Bay Railways, 538, 982
Immigration, 2589-90
Income tax payers—farmers, qu. 838
Saskatchewan railway lines, 3054
Senate representation—Saskatchewan, 2567
Trent canal, 2608-9, 2958

Kuskanook, wharf, 3979

Labour. *See also* Building Trades Conference; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Shipbuilding; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Alleged combines, 4551

Labour—*Con.*
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, wages, 1921
Civil Service, prevailing rates, qu. 3089
Conditions in Great Britain and United States, 408
Discontent and unrest, 3439
Department
Emergency relief, 4535
Employment offices, 2852, 4363
Estimates, 4170, 4535
Draper, Mr. P. M., 1632, 1637
Fair wage clause, 1910, 2955, 4545
Germany, cost in, 4425, 4428
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549-52
International Conference at Washington, 544
Status of Canada, 2629
Unemployment insurance, 4547
Washington and Geneva, conventions and recommendations, 4041
Women workers, 4547
League of Nations, 4547
Manual labourers. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Mathers Commission, 232
Minister in Senate, criticism of, 1154-5, 1162, 1169, 4544
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1627, 1632, 1636
National Advisory Council, 4363
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1625, 3584
Chicoutimi Convention, 1626
Letter of Minister in Gazette, 1642
Minister of Labour and, 1625
Platform of, 1627
Wright, Mr. A. A., letter of, 1647
National Industrial Conference, 2101, 4549
Railways, and, 1179, 1190, 1587. *See also* that title
Shipbuilding, Government, 1273, 1727, 1889, 1897, 1902, 1909, 1974
Strikes
Cape Breton in, 3528
Grand Trunk, 230
Number of, qu. 569
Peterborough, 3549
Winnipeg, 3359, 3360, 3560
Trades and Labour Congress, platform of, 1634
Unemployment relief, 4535. *See also* Unemployment
Wages and prosperity, 3514
Women workers—overtime, 4547

Labour Gazette, 1155

Lachine Canal. *See* Canals

Ladysmith, wharf, 3980

Lafleche, Col. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques-Cartier)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 292; tribute to late Mr. Gladu; the debate reviewed, 292; Mr. Gauthier, 293; the amendment; Government's mandate executed; Prime Ministers' Conference, 294; Government in danger when it turns to Opposition for help; new name of Government party, 294; change of Government in 1896; issues of the election; promises made and kept; Manitoba school question; St. Lawrence river channel; revising barristers; contracts, men's wages; deficits; Sir Wilfred Laurier; the tariff, 296; reciprocity, 297; things the Liberals will do when returned; Georgian Bay canal; bridge between Vaudreuil and Ste. Anne, 298; will demand accounting; Quebec not isolated but badly represented, 299; widening of Victoria bridge; bridge at Longueuil; tobacco growers, 300; sugar beet industry, 301;
Automobile theft, 3915
Budget, 3669; historical and political review, 3669-70; Mr. Bourassa, 3671; Laurier administration; prosperity of manufacturers and agricultural interests under Liberal Government, 3673; Post Office Department—deficit, 3674; Lachine canal bridge, 3675; immigration of French Canadians to United States, 3675; protection of tobacco growers, 3676; Ville Emard tunnel, 3677; bridge at Ste. Anne's-Vaudreuil, 3677; bridges in Jacques Cartier county; Georgian Bay canal, 3678; Military Service Act, 3678; Liberals returning to Opposition after war, 3679; Judges' salaries, 3680
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3910-32
Lachine canal bridge, 3675, 4308
La Salle—road repair, 4313-33
Perrot Island bridge, qu. 576, qu. 603
Pointe Claire, wharf, 4312
Three Card Monte, 1858

"Lake Champlain", icebreaker, 1985

Lake Freights, 3371. *See also* Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Transportation

Lake of the Woods and Other Waters, 3903. *See also* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Lake of the Woods Control, International Joint Commission, 1176, 1233

Lake of the Woods Control Board, estimates, 2437

Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill
1r., 788; 2r., com., 2033, 2346, 3r., 2445
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Board
Creation of, 2033-2346
Immunity from actions, 2355
Powers—enforcement of
By order of court, 2350
By taking possession of property, 2353
Purposes, 2350
Correspondence — International Joint Commission, 1176, 1233
Norman dam, English river, Winnipeg river, 2347
Statement by Prime Minister, 2033

Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill
1r., 3903; 2r., com., 4171; Amdt. (Mr. Pardee), six months' hoist—to 3r., 4226; 3r., 4227
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Backus, Mr. E. W., 4173-4224
Boundary award, 4181
Concurrent legislation, 3903
Correspondence between the Prime Minister and Hon. Mr. Drury, 3971, 4170, 4182
English river, 4172
Hudson, Hon. A. B., 4184, 4213
Kenora dam, 4172
Norman dam, 4173
Rivers and Streams Act, 4174-4225
Sioux Lookout, 4191
Statement by Prime Minister, 4171
Technical Board, 4173
White Dog Falls, 4172
Winnipeg river, 4172

Lalor, Mr. F. R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 3656. Change in official Opposition, 3657; free trade and farmers, 3658; manufacturers help to lower prices, 3659; Roumanian and Greek loans and contracts, 3661; protection proper policy for Canada, 3661
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2492-4
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping clause, 3817
Invoice certificate, fee, 4391
Position of Agrarian group, 4400
United States Customs regulations, 3817, 4417
Valuation for duty, 3817, 4417
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Highway construction in Ontario, 4300
Hon. F. C. Biggs, 3037
Immigration, 2582
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4351

Lambert, Mr. Norman P., 289, 3329, 3363, 3685. *See also* Grain Growers' Grain Company

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 3516; tariff revision; Canada's participation in the war, 3517; imports and exports, 3518; revenue; expenditures, 3519; military expenditure, 3519; railway situation, 3520; Grand Trunk Railway, 3522; lawyers and Justice Department, 3523
Chief Justice, income tax, 1572
Civil Service bonus, 2107, 2114
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4352
Interim Supply Bill, 2107
Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. to res. neg. 1572
Montreal and South Shore traffic bridge, 2216
Post Office, outside service, 4531
Shipbuilding, 1959

Land.—*See also* Soldier Settlement; Immigration
Settlement, western, 3249
Location, 4343
Tax, 3229, 3317, 3453, 3486, 3511, 3634-35, 3664

Lang, Mr. Norman (Humboldt)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 342; the amendment; desire for election confined to one side; questions affecting West; investigation of Grain Trade, 342; marketing conditions; series of unfavourable years; Wheat Board; Wheat pool; better understanding between East and West; live stock industry harvest help; National Railways, branch lines, 344

Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, appointment, qu. 2505, 2875, 4128

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 457; congratulations to Prime Minister; special circumstances under which Parliament meets; House must reflect national will; public confidence withdrawn from Government, 457; justification of amendment; Union Government formed for duration of war—continuance in office injustice to Canada; democracy; the soldiers' vote;

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
war mandate used for other purposes, 458; new Administration without public endorsation; origin of National Liberal and Conservatice party; no mandate given in 1917 to present Government, 459; withdrawal of Ministers who gave prestige to Administration; sincerity of Liberals who support Government, 460; Government no longer in harmony with public opinion; by-election, 461; the Government's majority, 463; Sir Thomas White; Sir Herbert Ames; constitutional duty of Government; British precedents, 464; Imperial conference, 467
Alcohol, tax on, 3705
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 464, 1296, 1310
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C—958, 1073, 1218, 1385, 2103-4, 4544
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 769
Canadian National Railways
Board of directors, 1605
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2429
Cattle embargo, 727
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2779, 4487-90
Religious holidays, 4487-90
Civil Service (res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political Patronage, 800; census commissioners and enumerators, 800; Judges, 801; commissions, 802
Closure, 2025
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3907
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods—marking, 3939-41
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 310
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4246-50
Nomination paper, 4246
Revising officers, 4250
French Trade Agreement, 2137-8, 2152
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3977-80
High Commissioner's Office, 2437
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill—(Deportation) 1497, 1858
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2165
Interim Supply, 2010-11; 2101-4
Judges
Judicial District of Quebec, 1081-2
Justice Department
Counsel employed, 1076
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4210
Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
League of Nations, contribution to, 2357-67
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2314, 2342
Marine estimates, length of debate, 1988
Minister of Labour, 4544
National Catholic Labour Union, 1625, 3584
National Industrial Conference, 4549
Naval policy, 4023
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3891
Order, point of, word of member should be accepted, 1641
Parliament buildings, 3994, 4075-8
Inscription on tower, 4544
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4060
Prime Minister's Conference, 2505, 2637-67
Naval defence—contribution of Dominions to, 4256
Privilege
Alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Correction of report in Ottawa Journal, 477
Explanation of remarks on Dominion Elections Bill, 4543
National Catholic Labour Unions, 3584
Provinces as traders, 3706
Purchasing Commission, 2015
Negative motion, 2019
Quebec riots, 1506
Railway Department employees, 1654
Representation in Parliament, 1307
Revenue from duty on wines, 2711
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4055-60

Laporte, Sir Hormidas, 1609-10, 4315. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

La Presse, 3217
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, criticism, 1709
Lord Atholstan, and, 3248
Yamaska by-election—Mr. Mondou, 3251

LaRochelle, Mr. M. G., 799. *See also* Civil Service; Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill

La Salle road, 4313-33

L'Assomption Experimental Station, 918, 946

Latchford, Mr. Justice, payments to, qu. 1500

"Laurentian", Government steamer, qu. 1348, 1863

Laurentide Pulp & Paper Company, 3049

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 3670. *See also* Address; Budget; Prime Ministers' Conference
Imperial Conferences, and, 3431-34
South African War, 1527
Tariff, 3614, 3642

Laval University. *See* Research

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 280; congratulations to Prime Minister; the French language; demand for general election; changed attitude towards Quebec; unfulfilled obligations to city of Quebec; equipment for Transcontinental railway; grain elevators, docks, workshops; Great Northern and Lake St. John railways; St. Charles river dam; the Quebec riots of 1918, 282
Canadian National Railways
Directors, 4315
Quebec bridge—highway, 4333
Civil Service bonus, 2112-13
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 686
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3977
Income tax, 2106
Marine estimates, 1987
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1649
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4575
Post Office
Fiset, Mr. Michel, 963, 4523
Loretteville, 4523
Quebec elevator, 282, 1443
Quebec-Loretteville line, 4328
Shipbuilding, 1971
Telegraph line, Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4539

Lavoie, Mr., and Canadian National Railways, 1659, 1670

Law Library, Canadian, 1090

Law Stamps, 1090

Lawyers. *See* Canadian Bar Association; Justice Department

League of Nations, 97, 110, 125, 157, 164, 186, 188, 195, 204, 227, 229, 237, 247, 285, 357, 400, 435, 474, 2629-50-52, 2789, 3157, 3205. *See also* Canadian Nationals Definition Act; Prime Ministers' Conference; Permanent Court of International Justice
Ames, Sir Herbert, 464. *See also* that title
Article X, 158, 1967
Elimination of, qu. 575
Assembly, 164, 436, 2629, 2710, 543
Canadian representatives, 188, qu. 602, 785

League of Nations—*Con.*
Assembly—*Con.*
French Canadians unrepresented, 552
Request for papers, 188
Aviation, 3782
Burnham, Dr., case of, 1521. *See also* that title
Canada's participation, 519
Canadian Nationals, 397. *See also* that title
Constitutional questions, 113
Council, 2709
Expenses, Canada's share, qu. 1235, 2356
Labour, 4547. *See also* that title
Nauru Island, 4255, 4541
Permanent Court of International Justice. *See that title*
Permanent Secretariat, maintenance, 2356

Leases of Federal Oil Lands. *See* Oil

Lecours, Mr. A. J. *See* Quebec Riots

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Budget, 3463. Comparison of present with Liberal administration; Government economy in expenditure necessary, 3464; methods of taxation, 3465; income tax, 3465
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3882
Public buildings, Nova Scotia, 2770

Lee-Enfield Rifle, 2783-7. *See also* Militia; Ross Rifle

Leeds
Status of member for, 464, 1294, 1326. *See also* White, Sir Thomas
Resignation of member for, 1619
Vacancy, 1293

Legal Responsibility. *See* Quebec Riots

Leger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Agricultural publications, 1074
Beef production, 1039
Cold storage—delegation from Maritime Provinces, 1038
Dairying, 1036
Dredging, 3982
Fruit growing, 1041
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1994
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2206-14
Public Works—transfer of district engineer's office from Chatham, 4081-5
St. John harbour, 4078
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement of, 1499, 2173, qu. 2618, 4501-5
Veterinaries in New Brunswick, 1050

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve; Gaspé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 177; Mr. Mowat; platform of Liberal Convention of 1919; Speech of Mr. Gauthier a "degrading incident", 178; the amendment; Government possible only with consent of governed; the "Khaki" election in England; Balfour administration, 178; no general election for ten years; issue in 1911; dissolution and election; only issue in 1917 was "Win the War"; that election a "sham" and "official debauchery"; tariff, 181; coalition illogical after the war; Cabinet changes; distinction between Tory and Liberal, 182; justification of amendment; Imperial Conference, naval defence; British foreign policy; Canada will never surrender rights; Government without mandate to discuss naval defence; organic change in constitution, 183; Canada a nation? Right denied to conclude commercial pact; consular agents, 184; Ambassador at Washington, 185; Chicago Drainage Canal; levels of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence river; League of Nations; increasing desire for national unity, 187
Air Board, 3778
Archives, provision for, 2949
Arctic expedition, 4106
Ascension Day, adjournment, 2688
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2916
Belgian Immigration, 4128
Berry boxes, 4116
Bertrand, Mr. Joseph Tetu, 4079
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1518
Budget, 3241. Tariff Commission; free trade and protection, revenue, raising of, 3242; income tax; two normal periods of recent history, 1879-1896, 1896-1911, comparison of, 3243; British preference, establishment of, 3244; relations with the United States, 3245; benefits of Liberal administration, 3245; war loans, debts and deficits, 3246; a free press, 3247; naval and military expenditure, 3248; vigorous policy of immigration and land settlement, 3249; mining industry; attitude of Quebec, Yamaska by-election, 3250
Burnham, Dr., and Serbian Government, M., 1520, 1528
Business of the House, 1851
Morning sittings, prorogation, 4338-40
Previous debate, 3627

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1833
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs of litigation, 4385
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2254-7
Canadian dollar in the United States, 3087
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1286
Canadian National Railways
Deficit--Mr. J. Lambert Payne, 3017
Foremen of engines, qu. 1673
St. Hyacinthe shops, qu. 2821
Special Committee, reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1774
Train agents, qu. 1349
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2396, 2430
Cattle embargo, 710; motion withdrawn, 766
Chicago Drainage Canal, 185, 1851, 2225
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3827-9
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 901, 1176
Griffenhagen and Associates, 799, 4555. *See also* under this title, Post Office
Outside Service, qu. 2820
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) Political Patronage in, 798; Liberal principles; Civil Service Commission; competitive principle; worries of patronage system; experience in England, United States and India; Hon. Sydney Fisher; confidence in Commissioners; Arthur Young and Company; Griffenhagen and Associates, 799
Reorganization, 4555
Superannuation, increase of allowances, 2112
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855-71, 4258-60, 4280-88, 4466-86
Religious holidays, 4485
Returned Soldiers, 4258-60
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2490-2; 4275
Copyright Act Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3838-49
Customs
Minister of
Letter to French Purchasing Commission, 3079
Private business connections, 3079, 3080
Montreal port officers, 3086
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4448
De Martigny divorce, 3767-71, 4008, 4203, 4477
Destruction of documents. *See also* under this title Printing Bureau

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Divorce evil, 4474
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 3092, 4246
Naturalization, 3112
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Editorial Committee, 4557-9
Estimates, Scrutiny of, Special Committee, M., 1503, 2193, 2210
Expenditure
National Committee on, 1835
Statutory, 1557
French Trade Agreement, 1557, 2127-41, 2193
Gaspé Peninsula railway facilities, 2507-9
Georgian Bay Canal, qu. 2625
Germany
Canadian claims against, 4534
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2450-80, 2564
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4290-3
In Quebec, 3029
Housing
(Amdt.) 1135-36
Point of order, 1135
Immigration
Central European, 2575-85
Deputy Minister, 3057
Exhibits, 3067
Inspectors, 3067
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3822-7
Income tax
Instructions in both languages, 2626
Penalties, qu. 2100
Regulations, 1272
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345-53
Insurance Act, proposed amendments, 2625, 4339
Insurance Conference, 3088
Interim Supply, 1679
Bill, 2101-2112
Motion to reduce, 2095
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 1561, 3010
Judges Act, 1920, Correspondence, 1851
Judge Snider's report. *See* under this title Printing Bureau
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4207-10
Langlois, Mr., 4128
Magdalen Island steamship service, 767
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2328
Military expenditure, South Africa, 3273
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, M., 1152; withdrawn, 1172
Murray Bay-Tadoussac Steamship service, 1825
National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* under this title, Research

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
National Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2509-19
Natural resources, 874
North American Trust Company, 1129
Oil and Gas permits and leases, 899
Oil bounties, 1421
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883-94
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2906, 3009
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payments to, 4570
Parliament buildings, 4077
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4367
Pensions
Etienne, Mde., claim, 4367
Martel, Mde., claim, 4367
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2712-14
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4053
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 1619, 2123-25
Post Office Department
Anderson, Mr., 4556
Annuities, 4524
Griffenhagen and Associates, 4556
Letter rate, 4515
Postmaster General, 4514
Railway mail service, 4516
Reorganization and administration, 4514-24, 4556
Verret, Col., 4525-56
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2642
Printing Bureau—destruction of documents, 2950-3, 4557
Judge Snider's report, 1625, 2444, 2943, 3905, 4062, 4436
Private members and money resolutions, 1135
Prohibition, 4474
Public moneys, expenditure of, 1678
Public Works in Gaspé, 4088
Purchasing Commission, 2021, 2018-22
Motion to strike out item, 2018
Quebec riots, 1514
Question not answered, 1621
Railways
Freight rates on, 2018
Refrigerator cars for fish, 1038
Revenue and expenditure, 4515
Salmon fishery licenses, 4341
Sandy Beach wharf, qu. 965
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 591
Senate Bills, delay in first reading, 1619
Shipbuilding, 1286, 1686, 2078

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Speech referred to, 1684
Soldiers pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4053
Speaker's Chair, 3694
Stony Mountain penitentiary, release of prisoners, 477
Thanksgiving day, date, qu. 2098
Trade with United States, 1481
United States tariff, Canadian duties, 4254
War tax, 4515
Woman suffrage, 4474
Yamaska election
Speech at St. François du Lac, 3528
Unsatisfactory arrangements for, 4534
Young Emergency tariff, 2905

Le Pas wharf, 3975-6

Letter Carriers. *See also* Post Office
Bonus, 2109-15. *See also* Civil Service, Bonus

Letter Rate. *See* Post Office

Letters. *See* Imaginary Letters

Levels, Great Lakes, 186. *See also* Chicago Drainage Canal; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway.

Lévis, expropriation of land at, 1846

Libel. *See* Criminal Code Amendments

Liberal Bloc, 3216

Liberal Convention, 1919, 73, 175, 218, 338, 3637. *See also* Address; Budget
Fiscal policy, 3213
Tariff resolution, 3643

Library of Parliament
Joint Committee, 110
Joint Librarians' Report, 3
Noise, 4000

Life Assurance Companies. *See* North American

Life-saving Service, 1990

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers, 1994, 2174
Bonus, 1622, qu. 1623
Signal service, 4040

Lignite. *See also* Coal, Natural Resources
Briquetting plants
Bienfait, qu. 672, 673, 848, 4499
Estevan, 2689
Conservation Commission, 3965
Utilization Board, qu. 672, 673, 1269, 4499

Lindsay
Arsenal, 2782
Wharf, 2616

Lindsay, General
Oil lands, 1342
Tar sand rights, 671

Linen Yarn, Bounty on, 1389. *See also* Flax

Liquor. *See also* Alcohol; Canada Temperance Act; Customs and Excise Dept. Act; Inland Revenue; Prohibition; Special War Revenue
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2258-9
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, cargoes, 1713, 1715
Export licenses in Saskatchewan, qu. 833
Illicit traffic, 4388
Seizure of at Baie St. Paul, qu. 696
Tax on, 3705, 3708
Theft of at Baie St. Paul, qu. 1132

Lira, exchange value of. *See* Italy

Live Stock, 344, 846, 923, 1116. *See also* Agriculture; Health of Animals
Abattoirs and cold storage, 1125
Accredited Herd, 4506-13
Breeding, aids to, 1117, 1245
Cattle embargo. *See that title*
Corning—cattle purchases, 1624
County fairs and exhibitions, 1123
Dairy herds and cow testing, 1118
Distribution of pure-bred animals, 923, 948
Eggs and poultry, 1122. *See also* Eggs
Farmers' Clubs, 1117
Feed. *See that title*
Guernsey cattle at Nappan, qu. 2686
Health of Animals, 4506-12. *See also* that title
Marketing, 1039, 1119
Molasses wash for hogs, 3787-3820
Saskatchewan, distribution, qu. 1236
Transportation charges on feed, qu. 2686
Wool grading, 1121

Living Conditions. *See* Housing

Loan Companies. *See also* Housing

Loans. *See also* Address; Budget; Credits; Finance; Housing
Belgium to, qu. 577, qu. 1001, 3379. *See also* that title
Canadian National Railways, 4131-68, 4288, 4313, 4334
Canadian Northern Railway, 3037
Domestic, qu. 566
European credits, qu. 2622
Foreign, 3286, 3347, 3611
Grand Trunk Railway, 4131-68, 4288, 4313, 4334
Grecian, 2812
Roumanian, and, qu. 564. *See also* under this head Roumanian

Loans—*Con.*
Maturing, 3478
Repayment in New York, $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Roumanian, 478, 564, qu. 566, 1072, 1441, qu. 2030, qu. 2344, 3811, 4430
Tax exempt, qu. 575

Lobsters. *See* Fish

Lockeport-Froude Point
Steamship service, 1496
Railway extension, 3054, 4323

Locomotives. *See* Railways

Long, Mr. C. E. (North Battleford)
Hudson Bay Railway, 996
Live stock commission men, 1123

Longueuil Bridge, 300

Loretteville, post office, 4523

Lowther, Right Hon. J. W.
Speaker's Chair, presentation, 3689
Expression of thanks, 3697

Lumber
Pacific coast trade, 1725
Piling of near stations, 1177
Profits on, Grain Growers' Grain Company, 3180, 3633
Sales tax on, 3449, 3736, 3742-3, 3751-7
Ties, railway, for Egypt, 1725
Tobique reserve, cutting on, 4503

Lunenburg County
Fishery overseers, 2179
Fruit inspectors, 1041, 1047

Luxury Taxes. *See* Taxation

Lynch, Mr. Frank, 4541

Macallum, Professor, 1328, 1432, 2144, 2688, *See also* Research

Dacdonald, Mr. E. M., 3529

MacDonald, Hon. Senator, appointment of, qu. 577

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 7; (seconder) retirement of Hon. Mr. Burrell; acceptance by Hon. Mr. Tolmie portfolio of Agriculture; new Prime Minister; unrest; agitation and unemployment; re-establishment of returned men; old age pensions and unemployment insurance; the tariff; fruit-growing industry; amicable relations between two great races forming bulk of population, 10

Mackenzie and Mann, 1960, 3206, 3288. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Mackenzie District
Oil Development, 2162. *See also* Oil, Petroleum

Mackie, Mr. H. A. (East Edmonton)
Cattle embargo, qu. 714
Civil Service—(res. Sir Sam Hughes)—Political Patronage in; abuses of system; promotions; deputy postmaster at Edmonton; census commissioners, 827; transfer of patronage to officials; political partisanship, 828
Debates, official, distribution of, 2224
Natural resources, 878
Oil and Gas
Expenditure for discovery, qu. 695
Permits and leases, res. 894
Leases, issue of, 598
Rights, 2555
Point of order—member reading speech, 544
Tar Sand rights, qu. 671
General Lindsay, qu. 671

Mackie, Mr. H. J. (North Renfrew)
Pembroke wharf, 4539

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 318; Prime Minister, congratulations to; tenure of Parliament; early dissolution desirable; life of Government measured by war, 319; attitude of members towards dissolution; Military Service Act and coalition, 320; understanding of electorate in 1917; War Times Election Act; redistribution, 322
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill (Public harbours) 1174, 2228-30, 2556
Canada Temperance Act
Pending litigation not to be affected (Amdt.) 4384
Rights of litigants, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2255-61
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information—M. (Mr. King) 1204
Proposed reference to Special Committee, M., 1573
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2823-75
Amdt. to M. for 2r., 2835, 4464-93
Commission—exclusion of certain positions, 4477
"In the public interest," 4477
Naval Service—preference, 4484

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Returned Soldiers—preference, 4492
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2490-2502
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Consular agents, United States, 3792
Consular certificates, 4390
Invoice certificate, 3792, 4389
Fee—who pays? 4390
Proclamation of Act, 4391
Trade agents, 3792
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods—marking, 3954
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4240-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4240
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4067
Fuel supply problem, 1264
Grain inquiry—remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
League of Nations—Canada's contribution, 2362
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1154-9
National Research Council, 2896
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3895
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-5, 2898-2908
Parliament buildings, 3995-7
Public harbours, 1174, 2228-30, 2556
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482-6
Unanimous consent, 1173
War Times Election Act, 322, 4240

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 769
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 3113
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 747
Hudson Bay Railway, 985, 996
National railways and telegraphs—Government business, 4130
Railways and immigration, 4129
Returned soldiers in Civil Service, qu. 963
Toronto post office, appointments, qu. 734

MacLeod Judicial District, qu. 2344

MacLeod's Breakwater, 4087

MacNab's Island. *See* Halifax Quarantine station

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 527; congratulations to Prime Minister; tariff; new Prime Minister but same old policy; position of parties uncertain; fusion; "moderate protection," 528; settlement of soldiers on the land, 529; high prices for seed and stock—low prices for products; suggestions for relief of returned men; housing; exchange, 530; amendments; no confidence in Government, 531
Budget, 3685. Budget a protectionist one; eminent men changing political opinions; Canadian navy, status of officers and men, 3686
Canadian navy, status of officers and men, qu. 3422, 3686
Census appointments, qu. 3260
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4234-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4234
Hudson Bay Railway—expenditure, qu. 2623
Immigration, 2584
Pre-emptions and purchases of homesteads, qu. 2506
Soldiers' Land Settlement Board, dismissal of Mr. Graham, 2618

MacPhail, Mr. E. S., 1232

McAdoo Award, 1588, 4325

McCallum, Miss Mary P., 3108

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 88; reply to Mr. Gauthier—almost identical argument by Mr. his attack on Hon. Mr. Lemieux; anxious to be taken into the Government; almost identical argument by Mr. Gauthier and Prime Minister; election, census, and redistribution, 89; Canadian National Railways; Mr. De Witt Foster, 90; Board of Commerce; profiteering; combines; Tobacco Buyers' Association; agricultural machinery, 91
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 584, Res. 666
Apple exports to Great Britain, qu. 1501
Budget, 3506. Taxation of necessaries of life, 3506; rural mail contractors' remuneration, 3507; agricultural implements, 2508; military expenditure, 3508; Government war scandals, 3508; tractors, 3509
Civil Service, bonus, 2029, 2109, 2115
Experimental farms, 943
Flax industry, 1397
Highway construction in Ontario, 4293-5
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 622
Interior Department—salaries, 1333

McCoig, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Militia
Annual drill, M. to reduce, 2296
Pensions, 2278

McCrea, Mr. F. N. (Sherbrooke)
Amherst drill hall, 2752
Grand Trunk loan, 4166
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4348
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4221
Military preparations, 2298
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4013
Shipbuilding, 1944

McCurdy, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Bryson-Calumet Island bridge, 3986
Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817
Commons Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Courtenay Bay improvements, 4097
Dredging, 3982
Drydocks, 3987
Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, care of, 4540
Halifax quarantine station, 2754
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3973-82
Montreal-South shore traffic bridge, 2217
Parliament Buildings, 3992-4001
Partridge Island Quarantine station, 2808-15
Pembroke wharf, 4536-8
Port Hood, wharf, 4104
Public Works
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Annapolis public building, 2741
Demobilization, 3989
Engineering Branch, 4080-90
Estimates, 2737-73, 3973
Expenditures, 4102
Nova Scotia, 4086
Return, inquiry for, 3008
St. John harbour, 4078
Telegraphs and Telephones
Isle aux Coudres, 4540
Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4540

McDermand, Mr. S. S. (East Elgin)
Apples, profit on, 1470
Encouragement of fruit-growing, 1469
European corn-borer, 1031
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 613

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Civil Service
Board of Hearing, qu. 2820
Bonus, qu. 3089
Meetings in Government buildings, qu. 3421
Prevailing rates, qu. 3089
Reorganization—Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 2623

McDonald, Mr. Angus—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Superannuation, qu. 2820
Whitley Councils, qu. 2820
Judge Snider's report, 3209
Returned Soldiers—civil servants, qu. 3531
Shipbuilding, 1884
Unemployment and immigration, 1377

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 154; the amendment; Opposition has no policy and no case against Government; taxation, debt, railways, repatriation, pensions; unemployment insurance; old age pensions; the tariff; vacillation of Opposition on question of the tariff, 155; the Government's record; war taxation, repatriation, pensions, expenditure, production—election; mistakes—who has not made them? 156; Government justified by its record—redistribution and representation—congratulations to Prime Minister, 157
Agricultural shows, 1242
Automobile theft, 3914
Budget, 3510. Business conditions of country; revenue by taxation; direct and land taxation, 3511; protection and industries, 3512; iron and steel industry; plate glass; pineapples; wire nails and sugar industry, 3513; prosperity and wages, 3514; exemption of farmers, 3516
"Canadian Inventor," 1891
Cattle embargo, 727
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2829-67, 4478
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—firearms, 3907-14
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Home brewing, 3788
Restrictive legislation, 3790
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 308
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4239-41
Revising officers, 3102
Farmers, protection for, 3748
Health Department
Report, 1852
Scientific branch, 3134
Highways, construction in Ontario, 4293
Hog cholera, compensation, 1060
Illustration stations and farms in Northern Ontario, 955
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 618
Military preparation, 2304
National Research Institute, 2895
Ontario timber limits, 3391

McGibbon, Mr. Peter—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-7, 2901
Convictions under, 3134
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4373
Pensions
Widowed mothers, 634
Record of member for Lunenburg, 1903
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4356
Shipbuilding, 1903, 1904
Trent canal, 2955-65

McGibbon, Mr. Peter R. (Argenteuil)
Questions, inquiry as to, 2943
Railway bridges, 1664

McGill University. *See* Research

McGilvray, Dr. C. D., 1055

McIntosh, Mr. J. C. (Nanaimo)
Fisheries—Mr. Justice Ebert's report, qu. 4254

McIsaac, Mr. James (King's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, moved, 5; congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to Sir Robert Borden; after-war problems and conditions; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 6; Customs Tariff, 7
Budget, 3397; congratulations to Minister of Finance; Canada's trade; financial position of country, 3398; revenue, raising of, 3399; sales tax; tariff revision, attitude of Opposition on tariff, 3400; Fielding, Mr., former speech on tariff, 3401; Amdt. of Mr. Fielding, 3403
Georgetown wharf, 4564
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Highways, expenditure, 4306
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4564

McKean, Mr. Melville, 4083

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 40; mover and seconder; congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to leader of Opposition, 40; disappointed in speech of Prime Minister; should place himself in the "hands of the country"; election before redistribution; position of West, 41; quotations from Calgary Albertan and Montreal Gazette; newspaper comment on by-election results, 43; amendment necessary to expression of views; the tariff; wait until report of Tariff Committee of Cabinet produced,

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
44; a government of the "big interests"; restoration of confidence in parliamentary institutions impossible while Government remains in power, 45; position and policy of Liberal party, 46
Agricultural publications, 1075
Alcohol, tax on, 3957
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim for compensation, 2273
Amherst drill shed, 2739
Australia-New Zealand service, 1494
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925-9
Budget, 3280. Minister of Militia and military expenditure, revenues and expenditures, 3283; speeches on Government side of House, 3284; luxury taxes, 3285; unfairness of taxation, 3286; foreign loans; Canadian Northern system borrowings, 3287, 3288; Grand Trunk borrowings, 3291; trade outlets; railway business, handling of; shipbuilding, 3292; combines, Nova Scotia coal, 3295; lack of railway facilities in Cape Breton
Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, 1526
Canada Temperance Act, costs, 4381-88
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, shipbuilding, 1280
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 778
Ruling of Chairman, 779
Canadian National Railways
Management — Information M. (Mr. King) 1210
Operating expenses and receipts, 4316
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1600
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2416
Cattle embargo, 763
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2781, 2844, 4287
Civil Service bonus, 4120, 2236
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; election officers in North Cape Breton and Victoria; census officials, 832; service overmanned and underpaid, 11,000 dismissed, 25,000 appointed; classification and reorganization, 833; Printing Bureau; Civil Service Commission, 834; patronage and the party system; appointments, 835
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4274
Coal supply in Maritime Provinces, 1281

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3912-38
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3806
Fee—who pays? 3807
Preventive service in Victoria county, 4388
Customs and Inland Revenue—payments for overtime, 4123
Customs officers, 3086
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking, 3947-55
Dairy products grading, 3760
Delinquent children, 3012
De Martigny divorce, 3766
Destructive insects, 1027, 1032, 1075
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 311
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill 3091, 4243-6
Election officers, disqualification, 4246
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4243
Nomination day, 3096
Recount, 3097
Revising officers, 3102
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4066
Flax industry, 1402
Flour, high price of, 1448
Fruit inspectors, location in one county, 1046
Fuel supply problem, 1260
Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of, Bill, 609, 2944
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2458-80, 2446
Position, 3321, 4436
Grand Trunk Railway
Coal mines in the United States, 4316
Default of interest, 1498
Loan, 3291, 4152-69, 4315
Portland terminus, 4316
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 695, 738
Immigration, 2584-96
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4343-55
Ingonish-Macleod's breakwater, 4087
Insect pests, 1027, 1032, 1075
Judges Exchequer Court, 1083
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2350-5
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224-6
Lignite, 4500
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Military Service Act, claim for services, 2807
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2269
National Research Institute, 2703
Naval policy, 4034
Newfoundland railways, 1485
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4032-6
North Sydney, removal of Public Works officials, 2817
Nova Scotia judges, 1572
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-5, 2908
Partridge Island Quarantine Station, 2813-15
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4372
Pensions, widowed mothers, 639, 4372
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2720-33, 3014
Prisons and reformatories, 3011
Proclamation—enforcement of Acts of Parliament by, 3758
Public buildings—Nova Scotia, 2736-71
Public harbours, 2229-31
Public Works—Engineering branch, 4083
Purchasing Commission, 1102
Quebec riots, 1511
Reid Newfoundland Company, 1486
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262
Ross Rifle, 2783-7
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2484
Russian currency, 1072
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 659
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4503-4
Shipbuilding, 1280
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3758
Steamship routes, new, 1494
Welland canal, construction, 2994
West Indies steamship service, 1490
Wharves and breakwaters, Cape Breton, 4103
Wheat Board, loss under, 1461
Witness fees, 3937

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Royal)
Chief Justice, salary of, 1562
Income tax, Chief Justice, 1561

McLennan, Professor, 1428. *See also* Research

McLeod, Late Col Harry, tribute to, 3-4, 153

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 65; congratulations to mover

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
and seconder; criticism of speech of Mr. Nesbitt; unemployment insurance; the tariff, 65; Minister of Trade and Commerce and League of Nations; speech of the Prime Minister, 66; right of the Government to carry on—pledged to hold office only during war and demobilization; evidence of the agreement, 67; no difference between parties in desire to win war—conditions in 1904 and 1917 not comparable; Brown-Macdonald coalition; National Liberal and Conservative party, 70; Ministry not united on tariff question; position of the Minister without portfolio (Mr. Spinney) 71; election of Minister of Customs; a portfolio for Quebec; tariff attitude of Liberal party, 72; platform adopted at Liberal Convention of 1919, 73; parliamentary institutions on trial—the Prime Minister a usurper; Liberal Unionists elected for war only, 73; fate of Government in their hands, 74
Air Board, 3779-83
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1301
Automobile theft, 3913
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2934-9
Bounties on oil, 1387
Budget, 3164. Income tax; League of Nations, 3165; war expenditure; protection of industries, 3166; debt and revenue; exports and imports, 3167; exchange rate; tariff schedule, raising of, 3168; short-sighted uneconomic policy, 3169; sales tax; cocoa, duties on, 3170; public men and private interests; St. John city, representation of, 3172; foreign governments; Ministers soliciting business, 3173; Imaginary letters
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 960
Progress of, 1230
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill
Costs, 4377
Pending litigation, 4377-86
Rights of litigants, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2251-9
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 649, 767
Canadian National Railways
Board of Directors, 1667
Questions on order paper, 1763
Special Com., M., (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1608

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway
Certificates, issue and sale of, qu. 605
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Canadian representation in the United States, 2395
Cattle embargo, 765
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 1062
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900, 3913-17
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Purchasing power of European countries, 4430
Valuation of currency, 4430
Valuation for duty, 4412
Customs brokers, payment, 1090
Customs—foreign monetary standards, qu. 1133
Customs Tariff, 1907, Act Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking of, 3944-54
Delinquent children, 3012
Documents placed on Hansard without being read, 1539
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4247-8
Election papers, 3098
New forms, 3101
Expenditures, curtailment of, 2978
Flax bounty, 1393
Fox breeding, 1428
French Trade Agreement, 2130-39
Fruit growing in Eastern Townships, 1043
Grand Trunk
Equipment trust certificates, qu. 604
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 604
Halifax Shipyards, Limited, 1698
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3973-8
Health of Animals, diseased herds, 1048
Highway construction in Ontario, 4290-4302
Imaginary letters, 3173
Good taste, 3174
Immigration, 2572-82
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4499
Income tax, qu. 3260
Interim supply, 2012
Interior Department, reduction of estimates, 1334
Justice Department, purchasing agent, 1079
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2355
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4204-24
League of Nations, contribution, 2359-70
Lignite, 4499
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2328
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2559
Military preparation, 2295, 2303

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown and directorships, 2228
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1169
Naval Service, 4022
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4013-29
Parliament buildings, 3998
Penitentiaries
Saskatchewan, increase in, 1091
Point of order—irrelevancy, 1066
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-22
Prisons and reformatories, 3012
Privy Council, limitation of appeals, 1089
Proportional representation, 1548
Purchasing Commission, 2016
Railway Board and Intercolonial, 1655
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, 2054
Research, 1427
Return, inquiry for, 3008
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4360
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 258, 585, 662
Statutory expenditures, 1423
Trent canal, 2953
University professors and scientific research, 1436

McNeil, Archbishop, and Housing, 1137

McPhail, Sir Andrew, 1353-55-60

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Farmers, protection for, 3748
Fisheries of British Columbia, 861
Housing, 1144
Natural resources, 861
Poultry industry in British Columbia, 3750
Unemployment and immigration, 1364

Machinery. *See* Agricultural machinery; implements

Madrid Postal Conference, 3001

Magdalen Islands
Steamship service, 557, 767

Magill, Dr., 1451, qu. 1624

Magrath, Mr. C. A., and Fuel Supply, 1256

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 485; congratulations to Prime Minister—statement attributed to Prime Minister; allegation that farmers in alliance with Bolshevists; what farmers did in the national crisis, Wheat Board, 487—results of discontinuance, 488; platform of Canadian

Maharg, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Council of Agriculture, 489; fiscal policy of Great Britain—Government's record—elections; United Grain Growers, sale of agricultural implements; pamphlet attributed to Mr. Cowan, 491; Government supplies purchased in the United States, 492; Canadian manufacturers refuse to sell to farmers' co-operative organizations; Commission to inquire into grain trade, 493; British Columbia apples, 494; the amendment, 495
Agriculture Dept., salaries of officials, 1036
Budget, 3362. Reference to Prime Minister's speech; Mr. Norman P. Lambert and his article, 3363; cream separators and the free list, 3364; protection and Great Britain, binder twine industry, 3365; imports and revenue, adverse balance of trade, 3366; tariff reduction, 3368; home market, 3369; western grain shipments, 3370; freight rates, 3371; implement manufacturing, 3372; sales tax, 3373; railway situation; canal expenditure, 3374
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, West Indies trade, 1913
Canadian Wheat Board, 1449
Flour, cost of, 1450
Fruit inspection in the West, 1043
Government marketing of wheat, 1460
Grain
Chemistry expert, 1228
Commission, 1447, 1462
Overages, 1463
Transportation rates, 999
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 749
Great Lakes, ships on, 1913
Ocean freights, 1936
Magill, Dr., and Agrarian group, 1451
Point of Order—political sagacity, 1066
Resignation of, 4340
Returned soldiers, employment on Welland canal, 3001
Saskatchewan
Co-operative Elevator Company, qu. 391
Militia organizations, 2794-6
Searls, Mr. George, grain inspection, 1445
Shipbuilding, 1920
Steamship subsidies, 1492
Terminal elevators, 1463
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1842
Welland canal, construction, 2999-3003

Mail Bags, repairing of. *See* Penitentiaries

Mail Contracts, 1823. *See also* Post Office; Rural Mail

Mail Contracts—*Con.*
Ste. Rose de Watford, qu. 3209
White Horse-Dawson contract, qu. 2686

Mail Subsidies, 1485. *See also* Steamship subsidies

Main Ducks, life-saving station, 1991

Maisonneuve and Gaspé, Representation of, 2247, 2310, 4437
M. (Mr. Edwards) 2314; agreed to, 2343
See also Privileges and Elections

Majority of Votes. *See* Proportional Representation

Management. *See* Canadian National Railways

Mange. *See* Health of Animals

Manion, Mr. R. J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 351; congratulations to Prime Minister; Liberal-Unionists not weak-kneed, servile or subservient, "Liberals" and "Conservatives", 352; the tariff, historical alignment of parties on, 353; the Farmers' party and free trade; position of Mr. McMaster; agricultural and industrial interests; the Government's mandate, 354; demand for election; no criticism of policies, principles or legislation; personal criticisms of Prime Minister and Quebec, 355; representation of French Canadians on Boards and Commissions, Supreme Court; friendship between Quebec and rest of Canada; Military Service Act; sane elements do not want election; the Government's record, 356; Canada's status, League of Nations; no charges against Government; the country prosperous, 357; social conditions; Canada's problems, 358
Alcohol and medicinal preparations, 3731
Budget, 3231. Speech of Mr. Clark (Red Deer) 3231; taxing of necessaries of life, 3232; attitude of Mr. Fielding on tariff; free trade policy in the United Kingdom, 3233; tariff policy for Canada a vital one, 3234; tariff and revenue, 3235; cheap countries; moderate tariff, 3236; carrying trade of Great Britain; adverse balance of trade; Great Britain's exports and imports, 3237; agriculture declining in the United Kingdom; United States manufactures and shipping, 3238; Great Britain suffering under free trade policy, reciprocity and the Fordney Bill, 3239
Canadian National Railways
Lake Superior Branch and Fort William, 3050
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2414-32
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Religious holidays, 4491
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2474
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 682
Macallum, Professor, 1435
Natural resources, Res, 841
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3879; Amdt. 3886
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 7, 2903

Manitoba
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Harbours and rivers, 3975
Highways, 4308
List of candidates and votes polled, 1539
Transfer of Natural Resources to. *See* Natural Resources

Manson's Landing, wharf, 3980

Manufacturers. *See* Address, Budget, Canadian Manufacturers Association, Customs and Excise, Labour, Trade Commissioners, Unemployment
Agricultural implements and United Grain Growers, 418, 491, 3372. *See also that title*

Maple Products Act Amdt. Bill
M. for leave to introduce: Speaker's ruling, 2150
Res. 2193, 2557; 1r., 2618; 2r., 2890, 3141, 3720

Maple Sugar, 887, 1047, 1474

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Baie des Chaleurs, steamship service, qu. 2506
Bonaventure-Gaspé mail service, qu. 577
Bonaventure wharves, 3992
Campbellton-Cross Point
Bridge, qu. 573, 3987
Ferry, qu. 573
Canadian Nationals, 777
Canadian National Railways
Gaspesian peninsula, train services, qu. 2623
Tourist traffic in Gaspesian peninsula, qu. 2622
Intercolonial—Campbellford train service, qu. 3903
St. Alexis, qu. 2375, qu. 3582

Marcil, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Census commissioners and enumerators, qu. 696
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4284
Dredging, 3985
Gaspé Railway, qu. 962, qu. 2623
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 608
Marcil, Mr. Joseph, pension, 3903
Marcil, Mr. Louis T., compensation for injuries, qu. 2942, qu. 3531
Metapedia valley highways, qu. 2505
Parliament buildings, 3993-8
Pensions, payment to Messrs. Louis T. and Joseph Marcil, qu. 2942
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and Quebec and Western Railways, qu. 573
Quebec salmon net licenses, qu. 1381, 2506

Marcil, Mr. Joseph, qu. 2942, 3903

Marcil, Mr. Louis T., qu. 2942, qu. 3531

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Canadian National Railways
Ste. Rosalie-Bagot
Claims between, qu. 571
Disposition of unoccupied land, qu. 572
League of Nations, Canadian representatives, qu. 602

"Marie Lydia," schooner, 1985

Marine. *See also* Canada Shipping Act; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping. For vessels, *see that title*
Department
Estimates, 2190
Johnston, Mr. Alex., reappointment, 644
Marine insurance, 1703
Salaries, 1617
Shipbuilding, 1683. *See also* that title
Dredging
St. Lawrence Channel, 1991. *See also that title*
Hospitals, 3135. *See also* Health
Life-saving service, 1990
Lighthouses. *See* that title
Montreal Dry Docks and Ship Repairing, Limited, qu. 2191
Navigation
Aids to, 1996
Schools of, 1989
Ocean and river service, 1736, 1979
Pilotage, 1999
Shipbuilding. *See that title*
Signal service, 1997
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, investigation, 1988

Mariners, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Maritime Provinces
Railway facilities, improvement of, 4516, 4561
Wooden ships, 1711

Marking of Goods. *See* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill

Marquis Wheat, 1033

Martin, Mr. Peter F. (Halifax)
Highways—Nova Scotia, 4304-7
Parliament buildings, 3993
Public Works—Engineers' Branch, 4090

Marwick, Mitchell and Company, Auditors, 1278, 1694, 1704, 1724, 1866, 1933. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Massey-Harris Company, 3393, 3496. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Massey, Hon. Mr., Prime Minister of New Zealand, interview with, 3008

Masters and Mates, Examination, 1736

Matane
Illustration station, 947
Wharves, 3992

Meat and Canned Foods Act
Administration of, 1048

Medicated Wines, 3709

Medicinal Preparations, 3709

Medicine Hat. *See also* House of Commons
By-election, 2151
Vacancy, 1174, 1293

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 28; mover and seconder of Address; personal and public relations with leader of Opposition; position of the Government; proposed amendment to the Address; right of the Government to retain office, 30; successor to and continuation of preceding government; issue in 1917; Government's duty in regard to war problems not yet done; the Government's right to retain office after principle upon which it was elected has been decided; appeal to people after Armistice, 32; no departure from policy justifying an appeal, 33; by-elections; reasons for the amdt., 35; leader of the Opposition seeking alliance with Farmers' party, 36; where Government stands on tariff; leader of Opposition evades issue, 37; no departure from historic policy proposed; challenge to dissolve Parliament; representation of the West, 38; duty of the Government to carry on; Opposition invited to make

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
clear and specific statement on issue to be decided, 39
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 584
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim for compensation, 2274
Amalgamation of departments, 1331
Amendment to Address, 348
Amendments, want of confidence, 1199
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation of, 478, 1071, 1298, 1300, 1311
Archives, provision for, 2952
Arctic, expedition, 4106, 4113
Ascension Day adjournment, 2688, 2941
Audibility of debates, 1625
Auditor General's report, delay, 903
Bermuda, trade with, 1271
Board of Trade reports, forms in French, 2819, 3320, 3375
Bolsheviki and wreckers, 3451
Budget, 3322. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; revenue and expenditures; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 3323; Farmers' party servile tools and minions of Opposition, 3324; tinplate industry, 3325; Liberal party and free list, 3328; binder twine; Mr. Clark and free trade, 3330; Mr. Fielding's amendment and tariff reduction; protectionist speeches of Mr. Fielding, 3332; Liberal press and protection, 3336; Government's attitude on tariff matters, 3338; Prime Minister's speech at Sherbrooke, 3339; moderate protection the policy for Canada, 3341; United States tariff revision, 3342
Building Trades Conference, 1498, 1556
Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, 576, 1523
Business of the House, 1340. *See also* under this title, Estimates, Interim Supply
Adjournments, 1841
Ascension day, 2688, 2941
Eleven o'clock, 1841
Victoria Day, 3531, 3698, 3738
Agriculture and Justice estimates, procedure, 1074
Announcement, 1073
Closure, notice, of, 1979
Complaint of undue haste, 4450
Delay, 1618
Distinction between Ministerial statement and Amdt. in Supply, 1308
Estimates, lateness of hour, 1330
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 1074, 1215, 1682, 2103-6, 2887, 4544

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Legislation pending, 2150, 2819, 3972
Monday—Government business, 2148
Non-debatable motions, 1320
Order of, 1618
Procedure, 1345
Prorogation, 4068, 4340, 4451
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Second reading by consent, 2890
Questions
Inquiry as to, 2943
Subject matter of, 1071
Sittings
Long, 897
Morning, prorogation, 4340, 4451
Morning and Saturday, 4451
Saturday, 2818, 2777, 2941
Two o'clock, 3737
Wednesday, 1384
Evening, 1002, 1841
Supply, to-morrow, 1270
By-elections
Dates, 903
Medicine Hat, 2151
York-Sunbury, 2151. *See also* this title,
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs, 4386
Damages, 4387
Effect of proposed amendments on plebiscite, 4386
"Having in view the provisions of this Act", 4386
Pending litigation, 4386
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 563
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1290
Insurance of officers and seamen, 4359
Special Com. proposed, 1440
Statement referred to, 1708
Canadian National Railways
Amqui station, 1177, 1233
Correspondence
Directors, with, 1004
St. Foy round house, 1502
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503, 2890
Management, Information, M. (Mr. King) 1180
Private ownership, and, 1498
St. Foy round house, 767, 1502
Special Committee, reference to
Amdt. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1589
Notice of, 1618
Reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1755, 1817, 1803
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1812
Special Committee appointed, 1845
Sully, Que., 1134

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2514
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2431
Cattle embargo, 725, 730, 761, 4543
Commission, inquiry, 1072
Chicago Drainage Canal, diversion, 2226
Chief Justice, salary of, 1567
Chippewa Power Canal, 2444
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2776, 2778, 3901, 4485-7
Religious holidays, 4485-7
Returned Soldiers—preference—provisions recommended by Pensions Com., 4257, 4577
Civil Service
Bonus, 901, 1176; statement, 1233; 2029, 2113-15, 3531
Number of civil servants, names, classification, 4255
Religious holidays, 1384, 2776, 4485-7
Superannuation, 2820
Allowances, 2112
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston, reported statement, 2567
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3958-70
Cost of living, 4551
Crerar, Mr., and attitude on shipbuilding, 1978
Customs, Minister of, private business relations, 3081
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 3760
Daylight saving in Ottawa, 2776, 2800
Debate
Motion to adjourn by member, closing discussion, 999
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Deceased members, tributes to, 3, 152
Destruction of documents, 1625, 2943, 2953, 4558. *See also* under this head Judge Snider's report
District Engineer's office at Edmonton, 4543
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 150, 152
Motion to vary order of House, 152, 242
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 2944
Dominion Parks, 1343
Editorial Committee, 4558
Empire Cabinet, proposed, 1385
Estimates. *See also* under this title Business of the House
Opportunity for studying, 1290
Scrutiny of by Special Com., 1503
Supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Extradition Treaty with United States, 2687

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 2231-4
Foreign trade, 3224
French Trade agreement, 767, 1271, 1351, 1559
Fuel Supply problem, 1268
Special Com. appointed, 1439
Evidence in French, 4251
Gaspé peninsula railway facilities, 2509
German reparation—Canada's claim, 643
Governor General
Address to on retirement, 4433-5
Lord Byng, reported appointment, 4436
Appointment, 4541
Grain inquiry, 1674
Grand Trunk Arbitration, 1498
Correspondence, 1619
Further, tabled, 3738
Progress of, 3321
Revival of, 4436
Grank Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2247, 2346, 2397, 2447-80, 2560-4; Senate amdts. 2777, 2822
Grand Trunk Railway
Assistance, 1498
Default of interest, 1498
Directors, 3741
Interest, alleged default of, 1556
Shareholders—return, 3697, 3740
Highway construction in Ontario, 4300
Homesteads, 1347
Housing, expenditure
Loan, 4552
Point of order, 1135
Hudson Bay Railway, M. involving expenditure, 982
Immigration, Restriction of, 1127
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 2819, 4352
Regulations, 1272
Returns, 2568
Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, withdrawn, 4453
Interim supply, 1682. *See also* under this title Estimates; Supply
Necessity for, 2004
Point of order, 2009, 2010
Procedure under, 1676
Interim Supply Bill, 2101-2116
Interior Department
Editors, 1331
Employees, dismissals, 1345
Surveyor General and International Boundary Commissioners, 1343
International Joint Commission. *See also under this title,* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods Control, and, 1072, 1176, 1233, 4172
Judge Snider's report, 1625, 2943, 2951, 2445, 3209, 3697, 3905, 4436-53. *See also* under this head Destruction of documents

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2117
Labour Department
Alleged combines, 4551
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Fair wages, 4545
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549-52
Minister, 4545
Letter of in Gazette, 1642
Lake of the Woods Control, 1233. *See also under this title* International Joint Commission
Board, 789
Inquiry, 1176
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033-36, 2348-55
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 3903, 4171-4226
Correspondence, 4170
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 2356
Labour, 4547
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2321-9, 4437
Massey, Hon. Mr., 3008
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1157
Ministers of the Crown and directorships, 2228
Musk-ox and reindeer, 4543
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1638
National Industrial Conference, 4549
National Research Institute, 4555.
Natural resources, adjournment of debate, 894
Transfer to western provinces, 1337, 2541-50
Natural Resources Branch, 1343
Naval Service, Capt. Adams' alleged statement, 901
Newsprint, alleged combine, 2099
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill, 3903, 4113
Oil
Leases, 1340, 2377
Surface rights, 583, 666
Oil and Gas permits and leases, 898
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3889
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt., 2941
Owens, late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 258
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4574
Parliament buildings
Book on, inquiry, 1175
Inscription on tower, 4543
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4361-5

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Pensions. *See also* under this title Soldiers; Returned Soldiers
Deductions for insurance, 629
Widowed mothers, 632
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4054
Prime Ministers' Conference, 564, 1073, 2504, 2634-42, 3320
Naval defence—contribution of dominions to, 4256
Reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Printing Bureau. *See* under this title, Destruction of Documents
Privilege
Veniot, Hon. Mr., alleged offer to, 3688. *See also* under this head York-Sunbury
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Proportional Representation, Special Com. appointed, 1554-5
Quarantine, typhus, 4170
Quebec Steamship Company, 2941
Railway Commission, alleged statements of Chief Commissioner, 2030
Reparations—difficulties between Allied Powers and Germany, 599
Representation in Parliament, vacancies, 1300
Research. *See* under this title, National Research Institute
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4260, 4356-60
Returned Soldiers. *See also* under this title, Soldiers
Housing, 4362
Relief for, 2688
Review of question, 4361
Special Committee, 732
Unemployment, 4361-4
Returns, inquiries for, 3321
Loans to Greece and Roumania, 3009
Motions for in general terms, 1555
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 1499, 1555
Riding Mountain Park, 1343
Roumania, loan to, 1441
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 657, 2228
Senate representation in Saskatchewan, 2567
Shipbuilding, 1290, 1976
M. that further consideration be postponed, 1979
Soldiers' insurance, pensions and reestablishment, 4054
Speaker's Chair, 3692

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3758
Supply. *See* under this head Business of the House; Estimates; Interim Supply
Tariff Commission report, inquiry, 1127
Tariff Revision, 2346. *See also* under this head Budget
Unemployment relief, 4549
Vacancies, 478, 1304. *See also* under this head By-elections
Victoria Day adjournment, 3531, 3698, 3738
Water powers, director of, 1345
West Indies Trade—Bermuda, 1271
Western provinces, natural resources, 1338-7
White, Sir Thomas, 477
York-Sunbury election, 2151
Government platform, 3481
Hon. Mr. Veniot, alleged offer to, 3638, 3716, 3688
Correspondence, 3716
Reference to by Mr. Stevens, 3627-8

Meighen, Mr. William, Warden of Dorchester penitentiary, 1092

Members. *See* House of Commons

Mencius, political economy of, 3228

Mental Defectives, Immigration of. *See* Immigration

Mental Hygiene, 3143

Merchandise, Branding of. *See* Customs

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Merchant Shipping. *See* Railway Act Amendment

Merchant Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Meredith-Duff Commission, 1788

Metal Tokens. *See* Criminal Code Amdts.

Metropolitan. *See* North American

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Battlefields Memorials Commission, competitive designs, 2566
Canadian National Railways and Shipping, Special Com., first report, 2095
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill (Warrant of Commitment) 2686
Fortifications of Quebec, 969
Militia
Cadet services, 2297
Command pay, 2291
Record office, 2281
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4457
Pensions
Widowed mothers, 635
Withdrawal from Government, 451

Mexico, compensation, 1507

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 436; Assembly of the League of Nations; Canada's war sacrifice; nations that profited should help the sufferers; immigration and repatriation; the tariff; early appeal to electors, 437
Canadian National Railways—cedar posts, qu. 1130
Cattle embargo, 566, 4543
Crosspoint-Campbellton bridge, 3987
De Martigny divorce, 3762
Dorchester penitentiary—farm, 1097
Dredging, Restigouche river, 3984
Edmundston post office, qu. 3422
Exchange, value of pound and dollar, qu. 3770
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 2233
Fisheries—Dominion and provincial jurisdiction, 2105
Grain elevators, 1443
Grand Trunk, Portland terminus, 1384
Madawaska, public building required, 2809
Parliament buildings, 3994
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4368
Potato seed inspectors, 1033
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1501
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2031
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4502
Shipbuilding, 1944
Tariff Commission, report, 1127
Transcontinental Railway
Claims against, 1656
Wilson, Judge, qu. 1622

Middlebro, Mr. W. S. (North Grey)
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1296
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2934
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage, 831
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2467-71
Pairs—Correction of list, 563
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373

Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2442; 2r., 2891; 3r., 2892
Enforcement, 4496

Militarism, 2294-2305, 2789-93. *See also* Military Expenditures

Military Authority. *See* Quebec riots

Military Districts, 2788-92
No. 12, 2279

Military Expenditures, 266, 509, 2294, 2305, 2792, 3269
Comparison by years and countries, 3270
Defence figures of various countries, 3275

Military Preparation, 2294, 2305

Military Service Act, 320, 356, 2807, 3200, 3678.
See also Quebec Riots
Employment of Mr. Stewart, qu. 2028
Exemption of farmers, 3516, 3592

Military Stores Shed, Cartier Square, qu. 3208

Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 2294, 3405
M. (Mr. McCoig) to reduce amount, 2296
Armouries for public meetings, 901
Associations, grants to, 2439
Cadet services, 2296
Command pay, 2290
M. (Mr. Power) to reduce amount, 2292
Department
Anderson, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Ashley, Sergt. T., qu. 3090
Black, Mr. A. H., qu. 755
Brackenbury, Mr. G. B., qu. 735
Central registry, 2281
Chief Engineer and Controller of Military lands, 2241
Douglas, Mr. H. S., dismissal of, qu. 735, 2246, 2277
Employees
Female, 2286
Increase in number, 2014
Quebec, in, dismissal, 2237
Retirement of, 4267-70
Engineer services, 2439
Permanent force, strength, 2278, 2797, 2800
Photographers, 2245
Record office, 2241, 2278-80
Salaries, 2234, 2275
Separation Allowance and Assigned Pay Branch, 2281
Supplies, 2239, 3244-5
Sale of to Roumania and Greece, 2245, 3564
Transfer to other departments, 1098
Survey Division, 2243, 2284
Topographic Surveys, 2806
Estimates
M. (Mr. Pedlow) to reduce amount, 2287-8
Highland regiments, 2307
Lee-Enfield rifle, 2783
Military and civilian caretakers, qu. 4340
Military district No. 12, 2279, 2792-97
Ordnance Arms and Lands, 2441, 2781
Permanent Force, 2278, 2797, 3279, 3405
Pensions, 2278, 2236
Strength, 2235
Purchasing Commission and Supplies, 2239
Ross rifle, 2783

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Royal Military College, 2802
Staff
Pay, 2787
Reduction, 2234-46, 2282
Warlike stores, 2807

Milk, Prices of, 3197

Milk River, water rights, qu. 2099

Milk-Testing, 1037

Mill Feed, 1126. *See also* Feeds, Live Stock

Milling Industry, 3543, 3544

Mines and Minerals, 2141, 2162, 3250. *See also* Coal; Geological Survey; Natural Resources; Lignite Research
Alberta penitentiary mining rights, 1092
Conservation Commission, 3965
Development of, 841
Federal mining legislation, 871
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4498
Machinery, duties on, 373
Returned soldiers, prospecting, 871
Zinc deposits of Gaspé, 876

Minister of Customs and Excise, 3785

Ministers and Directorships, 258, 585, 650 2228. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill

Ministers
Cabinet, and Post Office Department, qu. 1349. *See also* Blondin, Hon. P. E.; Minister of Labour; Postmaster General
Personal business, 3079, 3173-6, 3612
Proposed right to sit in either Chamber
M. (Mr. Lemieux) 1152; withdrawn, 1173
Upper Chamber in, 1154

Minority Representatives. *See* Proportional Representation

Missals. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Missisquoi Bay, net fishing, qu. 570

Missisquoi County
Census commissioners, qu. 1132. *See also* Census
Income tax forms in, 1176

Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 1609-10. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests of, 3610

Model Villages. *See* Housing

Molloy, Mr. J. P. (Provencher)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 495; congratulations to Prime Minister; demand for an election; the sub-amendment; redistribution and representation, 496; the amendment; soldiers, farmers, and business men; women against the Government; changed conditions, 497; danger in Government delaying; the Minister of Militia; Liberal and Agrarian platforms; the recall, 498; the acid test; Government must satisfy the manufacturers; tyranny and terrorism in 1917; people calling for an election, 499
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817, 1818
Live stock and grazing leases, qu. 1819, 2098, 2374, 2618
Fort Garry hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348
Grain Inquiry, Counsel, Secretary, cost, qu. 2625
Health of Animals
Glandered horses, 1054
Hog cholera, 1053
Inspectors, 1054
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4199
Manitoba harbours and rivers, 3975
Western farmers, 1035

Molasses
For destructive insects, 1027
For hog feed, 3787

Monastery station, 4324

Moncton
Canadian National shops, 1851
Census enumerators, 3972
Engine terminal site, 1017
Examining warehouse, 2815

Mondou, Mr. A., and Yamaska by-election, 3251

Monetary Standards, qu. 1133. *See also* Finance

Monsarrat, Mr. C. N., and Quebec bridge, 1653, 1670-71

"Montcalm," icebreaker, 1985

Montenegro Hospital Mission. *See* Burnham, Dr.

Montizambert, Dr., 3133

Mont Joli, 1800

Montmorency County, Tourist traffic, 4332

Montreal
Bank of, and Government ownership, 1895
Customs revenue, 3086
Grain handling at, 3371. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Montreal—*Con.*
Inquiry into public services, qu. 604
Post Office, Mutual Benefit Society, qu. 567
Registration of Government ships at, 1720
Revenue offices, qu. 1820
Transcontinental railway, qu. 574. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Montreal and South Shore Bridge, M. (Mr. Archambault) 2211

Montreal Dry Docks and Ship Repairing, Limited, qu. 2191

Montreal Gazette
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, comment on, 1707
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1627. *See also* Labour
Shipbuilding, criticism, 1893, 1900, 1917

Montreal Harbour Commission
Cold storage plants, 1041

Montreal Harbour Commission Bill
Res. 2151; 1r., 2160; 2r., com., 2268; 3r., 2269

Montreal Locomotive Company, 1203

Montreal Progressive Club and Mr. L. J. Gauthier, M.P., qu. 1131

Montreal-Quebec Pilots, superannuation, qu. 1501. *See also* Pilotage

Moore, Mr. Tom, and Labour, 1627, 1632, 1636

Morley, Alberta, air station, 3780

Morphine Imports, 3130. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Air Board, 3780
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2931-3
Budget, 3454. Congratulations to Minister; free trade and protection; United Kingdom and Customs duties, 3455; United States protective tariff; beet sugar industry, 3456; Great Britain and world trade, 3457; protection of industries, 3459; trade with the United States, 3460; trade agents; Canadian Merchant Marine, attack on, 3462
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2261-2
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 768
Canadian National Railways, Toronto train connections, 4569
Canadian representation in the United States, 2404-30
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2827-79

Morphy, Mr. H .B.—*Con.*
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4119
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3841
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3923-31
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, fee, 4393
Molasses wash for hog feed, 3787
Trade agents, 3788-95
United States consular service, 3796
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3952
Customs officer at Listowel, 3084
Debates, Official, distribution of, 2223
Entomology Bureau, 1025
Fuel Supply Problem, 1265
Geological survey, 2144-7
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2457
Great War Veterans, qu. 455
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4304
London-Stratford-Sarnia, 4307
Hog cholera—Alderson claim, 1063
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 952
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 615
Linen yarn, bounty on, 1389
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2331
Militia—photographers, 2245
Military districts, 2788-9
Polish battalion for service in French Army, 4056
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Estimates, vote to be dealt with as a whole, 2750
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 654
Stratford customs office, 3085
Trade agents and commissioners, 1475-77, 3460, 3788-95
Tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia in cattle, 1051
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1835
Wheat market, 1452

Morrison, Mr. J. J., rural depopulation, 403

Mortgages. *See* Housing

Motor Cars, Theft of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Moving Pictures. *See* Trade and Commerce

Mowat, Mr. H. M. (Parkdale)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171; Liberal-Unionists; conditions of 1864 and 1917; George Brown; no difference in principle between parties, 172; municipal and common rights v. rights of corporations; temperance legislation; woman suffrage; Liberal measures sponsored by Government; nationalization of railways; the game of politics, 173; amendment; election; leader of the Opposition wants power; ambitions that came to naught, 174; no reason for want of confidence vote; the tariff; policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; tariff resolution of Liberal Convention of 1919, 175; "substantial reductions", 176; National Liberal and Conservative party; Canada's status as a nation, 177
Armistice Day and Thanksgiving, 2555
Armistice Day Bill, 2618
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2926
Canada Temperance Act
Costs, 4378
Rights of litigants, 4378
Commercial agents in the United States, 1473
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3834-48
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3931-36
Probation of Offenders, 2097, 3931
Dogs, docking of, 3936
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. (Prohibition plebiscite) 311
Fortifications at Kingston, 969
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2465
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 687
Housing, 1148
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 3010
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2350-2
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4225
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1167
North American Trust Company, 1127-8, 1130
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3865
Parliament buildings, 4000
Private Bills, extension of time, 1625
Probation of offenders, 2097, 3931
Railway Commission—alleged statement of Chief Commissioner, 2029
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 595

Mulgrave
Ice tenders, qu. 963

Mulgrave-Canso Steamship services, 1496

Municipal Cold Storage Plants, 1040

Murdock, Mr. James, 3603-4. *See also* Board of Commerce

"Muriel W.", steamer, 1990

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Ambassador at Washington, qu. 671
Budget, date of, qu. 903
Budget, 3635; comment on speech of Mr. Stevens, 3636; Liberal Convention and Liberal platform, 3637; Mr. Crerar and York-Sunbury election, 3637; Budget born of necessities of Government, 3639; burden of taxation, 3640; Tariff Commission, 3640; speeches of Hon. Mr. Guthrie and Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, 3641; Hon. Mr. Calder and the Tariff, 3644; Canadian Manufacturers Association—Mr. G. M. Murray, 3645; newspapers—manufacturers, editorial control of, 3646
Building Trades Conference, 1498
Business of the House
Saturday sittings, 2941
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 771, 2032
Canadian National Railways
Employees remuneration, qu. 1672, 1737
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2890
Management, Information — M. (Mr. King) 1198
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1573
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1806
Chief Electoral Officer's reports, qu. 577
Chippewa power canal, 2444
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2779, 2833-70, 2940
Returned soldiers, 4260
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, foreign consular service, 3808-3995
Debates, translation of French speeches, 702
De Martigny divorce, 3765
Empire Cabinet proposed, 1385
Entomology—increase in item, 1024
Expeditionary force—Canteen funds, qu. 1133
Fox-breeding, 1430
French Trade Agreement, printing, 1380
Governor General, suggested appointment of Lord Burnham, qu. 599
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 1498, 2448-77
Grand Trunk loan, 4135-7
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 751
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555. *See also* under this title, Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill

Murphy, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Hickman, alleged deportation, qu. 574
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4295
Hull-Wakefield, 3034
Imaginary letters, 3261
Immigration, 2570-5
Mental defectives, 3583
Officials, 3060
Woman supervisor, position, 3058, 3062
Imperial Conference, 1073
Income and Business Profits Taxes, qu 837
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 609
Interim Supply, granting of, 2007
Judge Snider's report, 4436
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2034-36
Lord Byng, appointment, 4541
Luxury tax, qu. 600
Macallum, Professor, 1431
Massey, Hon. Mr., 3008
National Gallery, 2684
National Research Institute, 2962-2708
Naval Service, Capt. Adams, alleged statement, 901
Parliament buildings, 4071-6
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4373
Prime Ministers' Conference, reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Printing Bureau
Employees in, qu. 1131
Extension to building, qu. 1383
Quebec riots, 1510
Questions, inquiry for, 1502
Research Council, industrial chemistry, 1434
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2481-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Thorold, qu. 574
Royal Military College, 2805
Trade with Russia, 1003
Veniot, Mon. Mr., 3637, 3688
Welland canal, obstruction, 1990

Murray, Mr. G. M.
Editorial control of newspapers, 330, 442, 2622, 3645-7

Murray Bay public works, qu. 604

Murray Bay-Tadoussac Steamship Service, M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930

Musk Ox and Reindeer. *See* Reindeer

Musselman, Mr. J. B., 3382

Myers, Mr. E. T. W. (Kindersley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 388; Amendment to amendment (Mr. Campbell); congratulations Prime Minister; tariff; policies of the parties; alliance between Liberals and National Progressives; reform of Senate; freight rates, 389; Canadian National Railways; coal; the grain trade; Wheat Board, 390; Royal Commission to inquire into marketing; shipment through Canadian ports; no urgent demand for election; redistribution, 392
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340
Income tax collections in Saskatchewan, qu. 2028

Nadeau, Dr., 3133

Nagle and Wigmore, 3077, 3172. *See also* Customs, Minister of

Nantel, Hon. Mr., 3019

Napier, Mr. J. J., qu. 1624

Nappan, Gurnsey cattle at, qu. 2686

"Narbethong," steamer, 2175

Narcotic Drugs. *See* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

National Advisory Council, 4363. *See also* Research

National Assets. *See* Fuel Supply Problem; Natural Resources

National Battlefields Commission
Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, 4540
Fortifications of Quebec, 967

National Catholic Labour Unions. *See* Labour

National Dairy Council, 1126

National Expenditures, Committee on, 1835. *See also* Estimates

National Gallery, 2684

National Industrial Conference, 4549. *See also* Labour

National Liberal Convention. *See* Liberal Convention

National Parks, 4495. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks

National Policy, 3220, 3569. *See also* Address; Budget

National Progressive Party. *See* Progressive

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Railways and Shipping, Special Com., reference to
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1755; names substituted, 2776. *See also* Canadian National Railways

National Research Institute, 886, 2566, 2688, 2892, 4555. *See also* Research Council Act Amdt.
Annual report, 2897
Bequests and donations, 2896
Bursarships and studentships, 2894
Co-ordination, 2892
Council, 2892
Discoveries and inventions, 2895
Establishment of, 886
Materials, investigation and standarization, 2893
Trade agents, 2893

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Natural Gas, 879. *See also* Gas; Oil and Gas

Natural Resources. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply problem; Mines and Minerals; Research
Aerial explorations and surveys, 3776
Canadian hinterland, 852
Conservation Commission, 3961
Control of, 857
Development of, Res. (Mr. Manion) 841; neg, 894
Drainage of flooded areas, 871
Intelligence Bureau, 1343
Investigation of, 845
Mackenzie Basin, 879
Maple industry, 887
National Research Institute, 886. *See also* that title
Ownership of, 879
Timber and minerals, 893
Western provinces, of, 3555
Transfer to, 1336-40
Demand for, 484
M. (Mr. Campbell) 2519-84

Naturalization, 781. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill (Aliens who served in Allied Armies)
1r., 2441

Nauru Island, phosphate deposits, 4541, 4253

Naval Defence, 183, 227, 266. *See also* Naval Service; Prime Ministers' Conference
Contribution of Dominions, inquiry, 4256

Naval Service. *See also* Canadian Navy
Adams, Capt. Henry C., inquiry, 901, qu. 1237
Air stations, 3780
Appropriation, 4017-19
Cost of maintenance, 2107
Estimates, 4010
Esquimalt, Naval College, 4016
Fisheries protection, 4036
Halifax and Esquimalt, dockyards, 4017-36
Halifax naval college, 4010
Naval cadets in Imperial navy, 4017
Naval holiday, 4020
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," disposal of, qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
Pacific coast, vessels on, 4016
Preference in Civil Service appointments, 4482
Royal Canadian navy, estimates, 4010
Vessels presented by British Admiralty, 4016-23

Navigable Waters, obstructions, 1989

Navigation. *See also* Marine
Aids to, 1996
Schools of, 1989

Navy. *See* Naval Service

Navy League of Canada, grant, 4535

Nelson, Mr. Christian, 2880

"Neophyte", steamer, 1966

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 60. Government's term of office; no reason to seek re-election; group government versus the two-party system; War Times Election Act; Quebec most stable province; unemployment insurance; the labour situation, 61; extravagant living followed by curtailment; work the only salvation, 62; the "interests" all must work together; the Government not responsible for unemployment; the tariff—reasonable protection, 63; members not elected to promote partisan, selfish interests, 64
Agricultural shows, 1245
Alcohol for hospitals, 3706
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2933-6
Budget, 3252. Sugar, price of; congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3253; income and business profits tax; tariff

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
revision, 3254; reciprocity; free trade England, 3255; revenue and expenditure; cost of living, 3256; immigration; Great Britain and free trade, 3258
Canada Temperance Act
Cases pending, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2253
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1607
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1784
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2863, 4267-73, 4493
Consular agents, 1479
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping, 4414
Invoice certificate, fee, 4393
Trade agents in United States, 4393
Trade commissioners, 4393
Valuation for duty, 4415
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3712, 3724, 3942-55
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 306
Experimental farms and stations in Ontario, 950
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2460-75
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 741
Health of Animals, 4508
Hog cholera, compensation, 1060
Housing, 1142
Hudson Bay Railway, 992
Immigration, 2602
Imported goods, marking of, 3712, 3724, 3942-55
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 612
National Research Institute, 2693
North American Trust Company, 1130
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4367-73
Pensions, widowed mothers, 636
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4057
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4357
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 651
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4057
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Containers, 3755
Sales tax, 3735
Unemployment and immigration, 1357

New Brunswick
Minister of Public Works and York-Sunbury election, 3480. *See also* Veniot; York-Sunbury

Newcombe, Mr. E. F., and Grand Trunk Arbitration, qu. 1002

Newfoundland
Sick mariners, 3139
Steamship service, 1485, 1686, 1712

Newport News, Canadian vessels at, 1689, 1722

New York
Immigration officers at, 3131
Loans on Canadian bonds, 3288
Shipping pool, 1713

New Zealand
Steamship service, 1493
Trade with, 1223

Newspaper Comments on Shipbuilding. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Montreal; Press; Shipbuilding

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint, alleged combine, qu. 2099

Nickel, Coinage, 2160
Five cent coin, 2160, 2269

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 556; congratulations to Prime Minister; speech of Mr. Cannon; the Government's mandate; soldiers' vote in 1917, 556; the charge of coercion; majorities of Mr. Wigmore and Mr. McCurdy; Prime Minister's Truro speech; Canadian Mercantile Marine, 557; Magdalen Islands, Prince Edward Island; revenue, expenditure and taxation; highway expenditure in Nova Scotia; Mr. Maclean, Halifax, 558; revenue requirements; Mr. Gauthier; Quebec and other provinces, 559; stand by the national policy; toleration, 560
Highways, Prince Edward Island, qu. 2345

Nicholson, Mr. George B. (East Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 283; congratulations to Prime Minister; a unique debate; no constructive criticism by Opposition; "bloodless neutrality"; programme of legislation; unemployment insurance and old age pensions, 284; League of Nations; the tariff; the Government's mandate, 285; unrest amongst business men and soldiers, 286; suggestion that leader of Opposition should form Government a "flagrant insult" to returned men; election, 287; policy of Opposition; Farmers' party, 288; United Grain Growers; stock feed; attitude towards farmers and milling industry; Mr. Norman Lambert, 289; flour, agricultural implements, profits—Mr. Rice-Jones; payments to newspaper for educational propaganda; campaign of "blatant hypocrisy", 290; increased representation for Quebec; the Prime Minister and Quebec—harmony, not discord, 291

Nicholson, Mr. George B.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Budget, 3299. Flotation of Canadian National Railway bonds in New York; foreign loans, 3300; Canadian National Railways; railway merging, 3308
Canadian National Railways
Special Com., reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1794
Canal tolls, 2975
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Foreign-born wives of British subjects, 3103, 3106
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2565
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 690
Interim supply, reduction of items, 2023
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2797
Railways and ships, 1730
Research, 1432
Supply—point of order, 2757
Trent canal, construction, 3975

"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale of, qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041. *See also* Naval Service

Nolan Bill, 3008

Non-Confidence Motions, 1184. *See also* House of Commons, Divisions

Non-Political Operation of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Norman, Dam. *See* Lake of the Woods

Norris, Hon. Mr., 4198

Norrish, Mr., 1226

North American Trust Company, 1094, 1127. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Northcliffe, Lord. *See* Gulf Pulp and Paper Company

North Sydney
Port of, 1282
Public Works—removal of officials, 2817
Terminus, 1487

North West Grain Dealers Association, 277, 297, 379

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill (Council)
1r., 3903; 2r., com., 3r., 4113

Northwest Territories Explorations, 4494

Nova Scotia
Canadian National Railways
Freight to certain points, qu. 1620
Coal supplies, 1261, 3295. *See also* Fuel Supply
Fruit inspectors in, 1041, 1045
Highways, 4304-7
Mines. *See* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, 1611, 3407

Norwegian Boats and coastal trade, 1494

Nursery Plants, fumigation of, 1028, 1031

Oatmeal, tax on, 3735

Oats, 3395
Banner, 1033
Quaker, 2954-76, 3455. *See also* Grain; Trent Canal

Obregon, General, 1507

Ocean. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding; Steamship services
Freight rates, 1936-61
Decline, 1273
Pacific steamship service, 1493
Shipments by United States ports, 1975
Shipping—Government control of, qu. 3530
Trade routes, 1888

Ocean and River Service, 1736, 1979

Ocean Limited, 1800

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., and cost of living, 3548, 3606

Ogilvie, Messrs. D. W., and Company, 1846

Oil. *See also* Oil and Gas; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Bounties, 1385, 1413. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Development, 844, 2162-4
Expenditure for discovery, qu. 695
Government regulation, 3539

Oil—*Con.*
Leases, qu. 564, 3539
Issuing of, 598, 2377
Delay, 2029, 2377
Payments under, qu. 673
Mackenzie district in, 879, 2162, 3206
Purchase from Great Britain, 1253
Regulations, 1340
Rentals, qu. 672
Stability of title, 854
Surface rights, res. (Mr. Griesbach) 578; withdrawn, 666
Wells, penalty for injuring, 3922

Oil and Gas
Leases and permits, qu. 734
Res. (Mr. Mackie, Edmonton) 894; withdrawn, 901
Rights, 2555

Oil Burning Steamers. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill

Old Age
Pensions, 2, 9, 231, 237, 263, 284, 395
Provision for. *See* Housing

Oleomargarine, 3384. *See also* Dairying
Importation of, 3852, 4439
Inquiry, 3531
Inspectors under, 1068
Materials for, importation, 3747

Oleomargarine, 3384. *See also* Dairying
Res. 563, 3759; 1r., 3760; m. for 2., 3850; Amdt. (Mr. Denis) 3879; neg. 3886; com., 3886; 3r., 3905
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Label with statement of ingredients
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) neg. 3896
Manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Manion), limitation of one year, 3886
Agreed to, 3896
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Sutherland), oleomargarine not to contain milk or cream, 3887, neg. 3896

Ontario
Drury and Drury Govt. *See* that title
Duff, the late Hon. James, Minister of Agriculture, 1033
Government, expenditures, 3495. *See also* Drury
Highways, work on, qu. 1237. *See also* Highways
Prohibition plebiscite, 303
Referendum Committee, 304
Renfrew returning officer, 820
Voters' lists, 150, 242, 259, 303
Timber limits, 3391

One-sixth Vote. *See* Interim Supply

Open Market. *See* Canada Grain Act

Operation of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Opium, imports of, 3130. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. *See also* Health Department
Administration of, 3130
Convictions under, 3134

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 1069, 2263; 1r., 2268; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 2346; com., 2897; 3009; 3r., 3009
Report of Special Committee, 2708
Senate amdts. concurred in, 4062
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Failure to pay fine, 2908
Household remedies, 2902
Indictable offence, 2897
Penalty, 2897-2907
Possession, 2903-6
Prescriptions not to be filled more than once, 2897
Sale or gift to minors, 2897
Whipping, 2897

Orders in Council. *See also* Purchasing Commission
Appointment of representatives to Assembly of League of Nations, 188
Immigration, 2585
Peace Conference, 397

Oriental Immigration. *See* Chinese

Ottawa
Cartier square, stores shed, qu. 3208
Daly building, rental, 4094
Daylight saving, 2687, 2776
Hunter building, 4094
Lighting roads and bridges, 4090
Noon gun, 4091
Newspapers and shipbuilding, 1925
Parliament buildings, 3992. *See also* that title
Public buildings, 4101
Rental of buildings in, 3989, 4092-6
The "Reno" of Canada, 4474

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2941; 2r., com., 3r., 3759

Overages. *See* Grain

Owen Sound, wharf, 3974

Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, tribute to, 258, 430

Oyster Culture, 2177

Pacaud, Mr. L. T. (Megantic)
Belgium, credit to, qu. 577, qu. 1001
Purchases in Canada, qu. 736
Budget, 3343. Importance of debate; inefficiency of Administration, 3344; extravagance and economy, 3345; control by Parliament of necessary expenditures, 3346; credits to foreign countries; amendment of Mr. Fielding, 3347
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
"Canadian Ranger" and "Seigneur", qu. 1382

Pacific Ocean
Steamship service, 1493
Trade, 3649

Pacific Salvage Company, Limited, 1990

Packing Houses. *See* Health of Animals; Oleomargarine
Cold storage plants, and, amount collected, 607

Pagè, Dr., 3133

Paintings, in Senate Chamber, qu. 566

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Palmerston, Lord, and Don Pacifico, 1522

Panama Canal, Canadian shipments by, 3047

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Paper, Newsprint. *See* Newsprint

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Canadian National Railway vessels, qu. 1349
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Parliament buildings, furniture, qu. 2192
Staples, Mr. W. D., qu. 3260
War, adjustment of accounts, Canada-Great Britain, qu. 2191

Parasites. *See* Destructive Insects

Pardee, Mr. F. F. (West Lambton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 479; congratulations to Prime Minister; Minister of Militia, chameleon-like change of policy; the tariff red-herring; favoured free agricultural implements in 1914, 479; the Farmers' party, 480; reprisals against the United States; dissolution and appeal; by-elections; the "remnant" of Liberalism, 481; rural and urban representation; resignations of ministers; trust the people, 482

Pardee, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*
Budget, 3497. Tariff revision; luxuries tax; Great Britain, 3498; foreign trade; shipbuilding; railways and public ownership, 3499; position of Liberal and Agrarian parties, 3500
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2840
Civil Service bonus, 2111
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3908-28
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, brokers, 4432
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 743
Harbours and rivers, amdt. 3979
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3826
French language, 3824
Interior Department, draughtsmen, 1334
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4177-4226
Amdt. to 3r., 4226
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale of, 4018-32
Representation in Parliament, 1326

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Agricultural shows, 1242
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Annapolis public building, 2764
Boots and shoes, Canadian, 1225
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 779
Canadian National Railways
Agents, 1605
Cancellation of trains, 1004
St. Augustin station, qu. 695, 3018
St. Foy round house, Res. 840, 967, qu. 1501
Correspondence, 1502, 1659
Shawinigan service, qu. 573
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3829
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 1050
De Martigny divorce, 3762-9, 4006
Director of Commercial Exhibits, 1226
Dominion Shipbuilding and Repair Company, qu. 3423
"Druid," steamer, 1984
Experimental farms, hours and pay, 932
Fruit inspection, 1047
Fuel Supply, Special Com., evidence in French, 4251
Highways, amount of vote, 3024
Icebreakers and steamers, repairs, 1979
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3822-5
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 608
Intercolonial Railway
Work at Charny and St. Foy, qu. 1501
Interior Department, dismissal of employees, 1345
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1438
Liquor, tax on, 3707
Militia
Dismissal of employees in Quebec, 2237
Surveys division, 2244

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2269
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1646
National Research Institute, 2896
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4011-13
Pilotage, 1999
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-24
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Printing, Government, 1439
Quebec riots, 1918, Res. 974, 1503
Railway Commission—jurisdiction, 3017
Railways, law costs, 3015
St. Augustin Station, qu. 695, 3018
St. Lawrence dredging, 1992
Supply—procedure, 3014
Surveyor General and Boundary Commissioners, 1342
Trent canal, 2606-16
Waterpowers, director of, 1346
Welland Canal, construction, 2990-3001
Wrecks, investigation, 1988

Paris Agency, 2437

Paris Green, 1030

Park St. Charles Company, Limited, proposed payment to, 4570

Parks. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Antelope for, qu. 1134

Parliament
Availability of Information. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Earlier sessions of, 1843
Information for. *See* Ministers
Prorogation. *See that title*
Representation in, 1293. *See also* House of Commons, Vacancies

Parliament Buildings, 3992, 4040, 4070-8
Acoustics, 3998-9, 4000
Architects' commission, 3995-4000
Brown, Hon. George—letter to Sir John Macdonald on former buildings, 4002
Building stone, 3994
Commons Chamber, 3996
Concrete, 3997
Cost, 3993-7, 4000
Draughts, 3998
Expenditure. qu. 4341
Furniture, qu. 2192
Inscription on central column, qu. 568
Inscription on tower, 3995-8, 4543
Library, 4000
Probable date of completion, 3992
Purchase of materials, 3994
Tower, 3993-9

Parliamentary and Departmental Printing, 1438. *See also* Printing Bureau

Parliamentary Control of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways Special Committee

Parliamentary Elections. *See* Proportional Representation

Parliamentary Government. *See* Representation in Parliament

Parliamentary Guide, purchase of copies, 4533

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Restaurant, 4536
Additional vote for, 4535
Joint Committee, 303
Manager, 2027

Participation Certificates, 340. *See also* Address; Canadian Wheat Board

Partridge Island Quarantine Station, 2808-15

Party Politics. *See* Canadian National Railways, Management

Passport Office, 2436

Pas, The, wharf, 3976

Patent Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3007; 2r., 4453; com., 4456; 3r., 4460; Senate amdts. 4544
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Alien enemies, 4456
Fee, 4456
No patent void by failure to make or import between August 1, 1914, and Jan 10, 1922, 4457
Return of fees, 4457
Rights of those who have commenced to make, use, or sell, 4459
Time extended, 4457
United States legislation, 4454-60
Validity of patents protected during war, 4459

Patent Act Consolidation Bill, 4456

Patent Medicines, tax on, 3120, 3727-28

Patents, Commissioner of, 623. *See also* Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill

Patents of Invention Acts Consolidation Bill
1r., 303; M. for 2r., 2890; withdrawn, 2891

Patronage. *See* Canadian National Railways; Civil Service

Peace Conference, 164, 2629. *See also* Address; League of Nations; Permanent Court of International Justice; Prime Ministers' Conference
French Canadians, unrepresented, 552
Orders in Council, 397

Peat Industry, 2689. *See also* Supply problem

Peck, Mr. C. W. (Skeena)
Australian steamship services, 1495
Burnham, Dr., case of, 1526
Dease and Stikine rivers, qu. 1133
High Commissioner's office, 2438
Military districts, 2789
Militia, command pay, 2292
Rulings and Statements as Chairman
Decision of Chair must not be questioned, 1904
Members, reflections on, 1903
Shipbuilding, 1923
Interruption in debate, 1898
Special Committee on Returned Soldiers, 788

Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 736, qu. 1817, qu. 2027

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Air Board, 3778-82
Alberta penitentiary, 1115
Armistice Day Bill, 3773-6
Canadian National Railways
Purchasing agent, 1659
Cattle embargo, Amdt., 725, 758
"Champlain", steamer, 1995
Chief, Foreign Tariffs Division, 1437
Civil Service Classification
Filing clerks, 1660
Griffenhagen, 2242
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2488-2500
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; Liberal platform and administration, 815; defeated candidate should not control patronage; condition of civil service; discontent, dissatisfaction and unrest; classification and reorganization; Printing Bureau, 816; Civil Service Commission, competitive examination; census commissioners and enumerators, 817; prohibition plebiscite, returning officer at Renfrew, 820
Coats, Mr. R. H., salary of, 1232
Cocoa preparations, 3703
Confidential messengers, 1334
Customs and Excise Dept Bill
Currency inflation and commodity prices, 4431
Fines, 4392

Pedlow, Mr. Issac E.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise—*Con.*
German bounty on sugar, 4432
German mark, 4431
Imports and exchange, 3810-12
Invoice certificate, 3799, 3803-04
Fee—who pays? 3804, 4391-4409
Obstacles to importation, 4410-16
Restrictions on trade—letter from Gillies Bros., Ltd., 4418
Trade agents, 4410
Valuation of currency, 3809-12-19, 4430
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3938-55, Amdt. 3955
Customs estimates, 3087
Demography, chief of division, 1232
Fisheries, 2177-90
Flax industry, 1398, 1401
Free trade—Mr. Cockshutt, 3747
Halladay, Mr,, and Canada Cycle and Motor Co., 1227
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3976-9
Horse-breeding, 1121
Imported goods, marking, 3712, 3720-23, 3938-55
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 612
Interior Department, employees, 1343
Lignite, 4499
Militia
Estimates, 2239
M. to reduce, 2281-8
Purchasing Commission, 2239, 2287
Salaries, 2287
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4015-19
Parliament buildings, 3994
Pembroke wharf, 4536-9
Penitentiaries, increases in estimates, 1109
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051
Polish immigrants, rejected, qu. 914
Post Office
Letter rate, 4526
Parcel post rates, 4526
Purchasing agents, 4527
Rural mail carriers, 4527
Stamps, postage and revenue, 4526
Preferential tariff—West Indies, 3704
Preserved fruits, 3703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482
Shipbuilding, 1956
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4051
Special War Revenue Bill
Consideration en bloc, 3956
Houses, tax on, 3958
Lumber, tax on, 3743, 3957, 3958

Pedlow, Mr. Issac E.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue—*Con.*
Sales tax, 3755
Change in clause, 3957
Wholesalers opposed to, 3752
Steamship "Narbethong", 2175
Sugar imports, 3703
Trade and Commerce employees, 1226
Trade commissioners, 1399
Trent canal, 2606-16

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 381; previous arguments for dissolution endorsed; public ownership; Canadian National Railways; Board of Directors; employees and elections; sections granted privileges denied to others; Intercolonial, piling lumber in yard at Amqui; financial obligations due to nationalization; world-wide liquidation, 382; Prime Minister's duty to dissolve Parliament, 383
Canadian National Railways
Amqui station, 382, 1176
Illustration stations at Matane and Causapscal, 947
Matane, wharves, 3992
Quebec Union Telephone Company, 3343

Pembroke wharf, 4536

Penitentiaries, 1091, 1096. *See also* Justice; Prisons and Reformatories
Alberta, 1092, 1115
Appropriations for, 1104
Convicts
Number and cost of, 1092
Dorchester, 1092
Purchases locally, 1108
Salaries of officials, 1096
Warden, 1092, 4467
Flour purchases, 1107
Kingston, 1110
Staff and inmates, 1097
Trades at, 1092
Maintenance cost, increase in, 1111
Purchases, system of, 1108
Purchasing Commission, 1104
Report, 2027
Salaries and retiring allowances
Increases in, 1109-10
St. Vincent de Paul, 1078, 1091
Convicts, number of, 1091
Warden, qu. 575, 1078
Saskatchewan, 1091, 1110
Stony Mountain, release of prisoners, 477

Penitentiaries Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3738-39; withdrawn, 3973

Pensions, 164, 2236-78. *See also* Returned Soldiers, Special Committee
Application forms in French, qu. 965
Assignment in payment of insurance premium, 4355
Board of Commissioners, 4366
British funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1518
Deduction from widows' pensions, 4369
Deductions for insurance premium, Res. (Mr. Power) 629; withdrawn, 630
Disability, qu. 1235
Etienne, Mde., claim, 4367
Marcil, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3903
Marcil, Messrs. Louis T. and Joseph, qu. 2942
Martel, Mde., claim, 4367
Old age. *See* Address
Permanent force, deductions from pay of, 2275
Refusal to soldier disabled by accident, 4366
Scale for deaths, 4266
Scale for disabilities, 4264
South African, 2278
Special Committee, final report, 4041
"Unmarried wife," 4369
Widowed mothers, Res. (Mr. Power) 630; withdrawn, 642, 4047, 4368

Pensions Act Admt. Bill
Res. 4262; 1r., 4266; 2r., com., 4361; 3r., 4373
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Board of Pension Commissioners, 4366
Deduction from widowed mothers' pensions, 4369
Housing, 4362
Increased sale, 4361
Interpretation of Act, 4366
Military Service, "as such," 4366
Statement by Prime Minister, 4361
Unemployment, 4361
Widowed mothers, 4368

Pentland, Mr., and Quebec Admiralty district, 1086

People's Representatives. *See* Ministers

Per Capita Expenditure and Debt, 2012, 3246

Permanent Court of International Justice Bill, 56, 285, 645. *See also* Canadian Nationals; League of Nations; Prime Ministers' Conference
1r., 2096; 2r., com., 2708; com., 3013; 3r.,

Permanent Force. *See* Militia; Pensions

Perrot Island bridge, qu. 576, qu. 603

Peterborough
By-election, 504
Milling industry, 3544
Trent canal, 2953. *See also* that title

Petitions. *See* Private Bills

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Bounties, 1385, 1413
Government regulation, 3539
Leases, 3539
Natural gas, and, lease rentals, qu. 672

Pharmaceutical Compounds, 3726-7

Phonographic Discs. *See* Copyright

Pictou-Georgetown steamship services, 1496

Pierreville Postmistress, qu. 2624, 2858, qu. 3208; qu. 3422; qu. 3423. *See also* Yamaska

Pig iron industry, 3188

Pilotage, Administration of, 1999

Pilots, 1999
Montreal-Quebec, superannuation, qu. 1501

Pin, Mr. J. E. A., and Labour, 1642

Pipes, Mr., and Dorchester Penitentiary, 1093

Plate Glass Industry, 3513

Playing Cards. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—Three Card Monte
Tax on, 3126

Pointe Claire, wharf, 4312

Poisoning of Insects, 1028

Police Magistrates. *See* Judges

Polish Battalion for service in French Army, 4051

Polish Immigrants, rejected, qu. 964

Political Control of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Political Patronage. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Civil Service
Lawyers selected by Government, 1077

Pollution of Harbour Waters. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill

Pontiac
Census commissioners and enumerators, 828, 1127

Population, increase of, 843

Pootmans, Mr. G., Vice-Consul for Belgium, 3347, 3379. *See also* Belgium, loan to

Porcupine Forest Reserve, 538

Portage du Fort, war record, 1928

Port Arthur and Fort William harbour improvements, 4536

Port Aux Basques, 1468

Port Colborne, breakwater, 3974

Port Hilford, dredging, 3983

Port Hood, wharf, 4088, 4104

Port Margaree, wharf, 2174

Port Nelson, dredging, 1853

Porter, Professor, 1427

Porter, Mr. George, Maycroft, Alta., 384

Portland Terminus, 1384, 3291. *See also* Grand Trunk

Postmasters. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Post Office
Montreal and Toronto, qu. 566
Rural. *See also* that title
Appointment of, 2779, 4278-4460

Postmaster-General. *See also* Blondin, Hon. Mr.; Post Office
Election of, 1171
Necessity for presence in Commons, 1155, 4514
Payments to, qu. 567
Yamaska election, and, 3468

Post Office, 3003. *See also* Civil Service; Mail Carriers. For individual post offices, *see* their titles
Annuities, 4524
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Department
Anderson, Mr., 4526
Cabinet Ministers, and, qu. 1349
Mail superintendents and postal inspectors
Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 841
Outside service
Maritime Provinces, Inspection Branch 4528
Parcel post rates, 4526
Postmen, bonus to, 3549
Purchasing agent, 4526
Railway mail service, 4516
Religious holidays, 2626

Post Office—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Reorganization, 804, 4514
Moon, Mr., 4518
Northrup, Mr., 4518
Retirement of officials, qu. 3772
Smith, Mr. Sydney, qu. 1236, 4518
Troop, Mr., 4518
Verret, Col., 4525
Superintendent and inspectors, qu. 965
Employees in post offices, retirement, 4268
Letter rate, 3571, 4515
Madrid Postal Conference, 3001
Montreal Mutual Benefit Society, qu. 567
Offices in Canada, qu. 1235
Parcelpost rates, 4526
Railway mail service, 4516
Bonaventure-Gaspé, qu. 577
Revenue and expenditure, 4515
Rural mail carriers, 4523. *See also* that title
Bonus, 2115
Saguenay district service, 1825
Stamps, postage and revenue, 4526
Statistical schedules, 3758
War tax, 4515

Post Office Act Amendment Bill
1r., 1619-20; 2r., com., 2120; 3r., 2944
Subjects and sections discussed:
Insurance of registered mail matter, 2120
Obligations of ferrymen, 2122
Unpaid or underpaid letters, 2121

Potato Bug, destruction by, 1932

Potatoes, 3224, 3525
Diseases, 1032
Export, 3442
Market for, 3473

Poultry Industry, 939, 1122
British Columbia, in, 3750-51
Egg production, 1242-3. *See also* Eggs
World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Power. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 100. The new leader of the Government, 101; dissolution of Parliament and appeal to the people; different schools of thought; House of Commons "express image of the feeling of the Nation"; present parliament not representative, 102; history of the Government; power despotically used; Cabinet reconstruction: by-elections, 103; defections among Ministry and Government supporters, 104;

Power, Mr. C. G.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Government has lost confidence of country; deficits from public ownership; Great War Veterans Association, 105; enforced isolation of Quebec, 106; the public conscience, 107
Administration of Justice, 1325
Alpine Club, 4494
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2918
Burnham, Dr., treatment by Serbian Government, qu. 576, 1525
Cabinet-maker, Interior department, 1342
Canada Temperance Act
Quebec petition for suspension of Act, 4382
Canadian Government Merchant Marine Vessels, names of, 1962
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 782, 2033
Canadian National Railways
Employes, fraud by, 1669
Canal tolls, 2976
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780, 2881
Returned soldiers—preference, 4483
Superannuation—increased allowances, qu. 3903, 4541
Coats, Mr. R. H., 1232
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 304
Expenditures on public works, 2983
Fiji Islands, Mr. Catellier, 1465
Foreign agitators and elections, 903
Forestry
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Director of, 1346
Immigration, medical inspection, qu. 572
Interior Department law clerks, 1332
Ireland, South, Parliament for, qu. 603
Judges, Admiralty, 1086
Lights, repairs to, 1996
Marine signal service, 1998
Militia
Ashley, Sergt. T., qu. 3090
Command pay, 2290
M. to reduce, 2292
Estimates, 2275, 2310
Permanent Force, M. to reduce estimate, 2797
Record office, 2278-81
Staff, 2787-91
Military preparation, 2305
Miniature natural resources cabinets, 1342
Moving pictures, 599
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2265
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4366-73
Pensions
Application forms in French, qu. 965

Power, Mr. C. G.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Deductions for insurance, res. 629; withdrawn, 630
Permanent Force, deductions from pay, 2236, 2275
Widowed mothers, res. 630, 640; withdrawn, 642, 4369
Public Works—Quebec district, 2983
Quebec
Citadel, 1441
Fortifications, res, 967
Port and Merchant Marine, 1271
Riots, 1509
Ship repairing, 1986
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355-7
Ross rifle, 2782
Serbian Consul at Montreal, qu. 605
Shipbuilding, 1962
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Loyola college building, Montreal, qu. 569
Supply—Public Works, point of order, 2758
Trent canal, construction, 2983-94
Unemployment relief, qu. 570
Union Service Fund, qu. 2192
Welland canal, construction, 2983-94

Prairie Provinces
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Transfer of Natural Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Preferential Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Presentation of Speaker's Chair. *See* Speaker's Chair

Press
Bureau in New York, 2400
Canadian Press Limited, qu. 564, 4533
Comment on Shipbuilding. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Defamatory libel, publication of court proceedings, 2149, 3933
Murray, Mr. G. M., and, 330, 442, 2622, 3645-7
Propaganda, 290

Press Gallery
Long sittings of House, 2887

Preston, Mr. W. R. T., 3383

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Budget, 3427. National Liberal and Conservative Government; railway policy, 3428; expenditure, public debt and re-

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
venues; taxation, 3429; military expenditures and conscription, 3430; Canadian policy and Imperialist doctrine, 3430; Laurier and Colonial Conferences, 3431; Prime Minister and Quebec, 3435; fiscal policy, 3436
Canadian National Railways
Montreal-Transcontinental, qu. 574
Census, appointment of officials, 696
Debates, Official, distribution of, M. 2220-5
Highways
Approval of in Quebec, qu. 2098
Federal aid to, qu. 2375
League of Nations
Article X, qu. 575
Canada's contribution to, 1235
Postmasters, Montreal and Toronto, 566

Price-Fixing, 3200

Prime Ministers. *See* Ministers

Prime Ministers' Conference, 183, 193, 227, 246, 254, 270, 294, 467, 526, qu. 564, 2626, 3320, 4304, 4449
Agenda, 2504, 2638-47
Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 2637-9-57
Canada and the United States, 2653. *See also* Canadian Representation in the United States
Canada's status, 2642
Committee on Imperial Defence, 2637-49
Constitutional conference, 2637-8-47-49
Constitutional development, 2626-47
Imperial Conference, 2628, 2633-36
Imperial defence, 2633-44
Imperial War Cabinet, 2636-48
Imperial War Conference, 1917, res. 2626-36-48
International relations, 2651
Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill, 2633-44
Military, naval and air defence, 2640-50
Naval defence
Contribution of the Dominions to, 4256
Peace Conference at Paris, 2637
Proposed instructions to Prime Minister, 2554
Reparations, 2653
Reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Statement by Prime Minister, 2504
Wireless Communications, 2640

Primeau, Mr., and Railway Commission, 3018

Prince Albert, Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 673

Prince Edward Island
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Highways, Federal aid to, qu. 2345

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*
Railway, 4565
Steamship service, 558

Prince Rupert
Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Public Building, qu. 567
Purchase of land from Mr. V. W. Smith, qu. 963

Princess Creek, wharf, 3980

Printing Bureau
Bailey and Wolffe, Messrs., qu. 603
Building, extension to, qu. 1383
Destruction of Public Documents, qu. 599, qu. 603, 793, qu. 1621, 1625, qu. 2028, 2943, 2950-3, 4062, 4436-53, 4465, 4557
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Judge Snider's Report, qu. 2028, 2444, 2943, 2951, 2952, 3209, 3697, 3761, 3905, 4062, 4436-53, 4557
Statement of Messrs. Fred Cook and Frank Lynch, tabled, 4541
Statutes, plates of, qu. 603
Employees in, qu. 1131, qu. 1348
Additional, qu. 1234
Long sittings of the House, 2887
Reorganization, 793, 802, 816, 834, 836, 2827-79, 4465. *See also* Civil Service

Printing, Joint Committee, 110, 2618, 2889, 4041

Printing of Parliamentary and Departmental Publications, 1438

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 1069; 2r., com., 3011; 3r., 3013

Private Bills. *See* House of Commons, Bills

Private Bills Discussed
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Central Railway Company of Canada, 3715, 3716
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 3761, 4002-10, 4078, 4107, 4203, 4477
Fort Smith Railway Company, 3771
Gilmour and Hughson, Limited, 1096, 2442, 2503, 2800
James MacLaren Company, Limited, 598
North American Trust Company of Canada, 1094, 1127
Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company, 3343, 3421, 4105

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privileges and Elections Committee, 2314, 2373, 2617, 2685, 2775
Representation, Maisonneuve and Gaspé, 4437
Substitution of names, 2441

Privy Council, 99, 2105
Appeals, limitation of, 1089, 1090
"Insular" tribunal of England, 1090
Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Law library, 1090
Salmon fishery licenses, qu. 104, qu. 1381, 2104, qu. 2506, 4341

Prize Money. *See* Agricultural Shows

Probation, system of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Progressive Party, 331, 539, 1531, 1546, 3324, 3356. *See also* Address, Budget, Canadian Council of Agriculture, Crerar, United Grain Growers
Abolition of patronage, 822, 3163
Attitude on Tariff, 3212. *See also* Budget Speeches
Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See* that title
Railway problem, and, 1789
Wheat Board, and, 1451. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Canadian Wheat Board

Prohibition, 4474

Prohibition Plebiscite, 303. *See also* Canada Temperance Act; Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Alberta, 3901, 4374-88
Ontario
Renfrew returning officer, 820
Voters' lists, 150, 242, 259, 303

Proportional Representation, 346, 411
M. (Mr. Sexsmith) for adoption of, 1528
Amdt. (Mr. Calder) for Special Com., 1542
M., as amended agreed to, 1554; Special Com. appointed, 1554-5
Special Com., authority to print report, 2027

Proprietary and Patent Medicines, tax on, 3120

Prorogation, 4577
Alleged undue desire to hasten, 4068
Governor General's Speech, 4579
Probable date of, 4238-40, 4551

Protection. *See* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
British funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733
Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966
Canada Temperance Act
Pending litigation, 4384
Canadian Air Force, qu. 965
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Cattle embargo, 766
Chief Justice, salary of, 1571
Civil Service
Bonus, 2115
List, qu. 1349
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; amendments to Civil Service Act; Civil Service Commission; appointments in cities and rural districts; census commissioners and enumerators, 829
Clapp, Miss S., 1332
Condensed milk, tax, 3737
Cooper, Col. John A., qu. 697
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4442
De Martigny divorce, 3765
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4247-8
Elections in France, 1552
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4290-4306
Width, 4306
Judges
Exchequer Court and Grand Trunk arbitration, 1084
Superannuation and retirement, 1082
Justice Department
Lawyers in, 1077
Purchasing agents, 1079, 1115
Live stock breeding, 1116
Militia supplies, sale of, 1098
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1647
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2121
Roumanian loan, interest, qu. 2344
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 593
Unemployment and immigration, 1356
Welland canal, sand contracts, qu. 600

Provinces doing business, and taxation, 3705-6, 3742

Provincial Legislation, reports on, 2373

Provincial Responsibility. *See* Housing

Provincial Rights. *See* Canadian Bar Association; Lake of the Woods

Publications, Government, 1438
Editorial Committee, annual report, 901

Public Accounts Committee, 3582, 4105
Motion for reference to Com., 1069
Report, 397

Public Buildings
Estimates, 4090
Ottawa. *See also* that title
Charwomen, 4092
Elevator attendants, 4090
Nova Scotia, 2737-42
Toronto customs house, 4095
Yukon, 4096

Public Documents, Destruction of. *See* Printing Bureau

Public Harbours. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Harbours and Rivers

Public Money, voting of. *See* Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Supply

Public Ownership of Railways, 381, 1187, 1196. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Public Printing and Stationery Department. *See* Printing Bureau

Public Records, provision for, 2947

Public Service Retirements. *See* Civil Service Retirement

Public Works
Bridges. *See* Bridges
Demobilization, 3989
Department
Accounts, paying of, 1606
Salaries, 2680, 2736, 2808, 2945, 4070, 4079
District Engineers' Office, Edmonton, 4535
Engineering Branch, reorganization, 4079
North Sydney, officials, 2817
Expenditures, 4101
Property, protection of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill
Rents, repairs, etc., 3989
Shipbuilding, 1858. *See also* that title
Transfer of District Engineer's Office, Chatham-St. John, 4081

Pulp and Paper Industry, 873, 875. *See also* Natural Resources; Research
Freight rates on, 2511
Pulpwood, exportation, 3513, 3744

Punishments, Excessive or Inadequate. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Purchasing Agents, 1079
Canadian National Railways, 1659

Purchasing Commission, 1080, 2015, 2142, 2163, 2190, 2287
Authority for appointment, 1114
Canadian National Railways, 1659

Purchasing Commission—*Con.*
Closure, notice of, 2025
Creation of by Order in Council, 551
Limit of $5,000 without tender, 1101
Members of, 2016
Militia supplies, 2239
M. (Mr. Lemieux) to strike out item, 2108; amended 2020
Penitentiary supplies, 1097, 1108
Post Office, 4527
Public Works, 2681-3
Staff of, 1113
Surplus War supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Tenders, statute providing for, 1105

Pure-bred Cattle. *See* Health of Animals; Live Stock

"Pussyfoot" Johnston, 902

Quaker Oats Company, 2954-76, 3544. *See also* Trent Canal

Quarantine. *See also* Health; Immigration
Stations, 3128
Halifax, 2754-68
Partridge Island, 2808-15
Typhus, 4170

Quebec (City)
Arsenal, bonus to employees, 2113, 2782
Canada Temperance Act, 4382
Citadel, 1441
Elevators, 282, 1443
Employees, Militia, dismissal of, 2237
Fiset, Dr. Michel, qu. 963, qu. 4523
Fortifications, ancient. Res. (Mr. Power) 967; withdrawn, 970
Immigration buildings, 2757
Immigration officers, qu. 1131
Mail collection and delivery, qu. 576
Post Office, 4523
Riots of 1918
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 974
M. (Mr. Lavigueur) for compensation, 282
Mr. (Mr. Parent) 1503; neg. on division, 1518
St. Charles dam, 281
Transcontinental Railway workshops, 281

Quebec (Port)
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Discrimination against, 1965
Unfair treatment by, 1271
Elevator, 1443
Equipment, 687
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment, 4570
Repairing of ships at, 1986
Shipbuilding, 1972
Transcontinental Railway facilities, 280
Wharves, 3977

Quebec (Province), qu. 570
Attitude towards Government, 551, 3216. *See also* Address
Census commissioners, 832
Highways in, 2098, 2344, 3025, 3029-34, 4305-13-33
Increased representation, 391
Judicial district, judges, 1081
Vice-Admiralty district, 1084-6
Labour in. *See* National Catholic Labour Unions
Natural resources, 875
Salmon fishery, qu. 1381, 2104, qu. 2506, 4040, 4341

Quebec and Saguenay Railway
Mileage, 1005
Station agents, qu. 696, 963

Quebec and Western Railway, qu. 573

Quebec Bloc, 3216

Quebec Bridge, 1653, 1670

Quebec Conference. *See* Ministers

Quebec-Montreal Pilots, Superannuation, qu. 1501. *See also* Pilotage

Quebec Oriental and Atlantic Railway, qu. 573

Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company, Limited, 1990

Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
Petition presented, 3005

Queen's University. *See* Research

Questions, inquiry as to, 1502. *See also* House of Commons

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns, 578, 605, 606, 698, 839, 967, 1002, 1238, 1350, 1625, 1674, 1821, 2029, 2099, 2376, 2625, 2687, 2821, 3090, 3830, 3905

Quinlan and Robertson, 1972

Railway Act Amendment Bill (Inland Shipping Rates)
1r., 1497, order for 2r., stands, 2557

Railway Act Amendment Bill (Discrimination in rates) 1r., 1232-33

Railway Adjustment Board, 4547

Railway Commission
Cases before, 3021
Chief Commissioner, 451, 1690, 1725, 3017
Speech of with reference to Canadian National Railways, 1202, qu. 2029
Fuel Control, 2944
Inland Merchant Shipping, and, 1497. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Railway Commission—*Con.*
Maintenance and operation, 3016
Members, 3016
National Transcontinental Railway, fire protection, 4337
Railway mail service, 4517
Railway rates, and, 1803

Railway Problems. *See* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee

Railways, 484, 3014, 4131. For individual railways see their titles
Canadian National Railways. *See* that title
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk bonds, qu. 837
Car shortage, 512, 548, 3541, 4322
Charges on dining cars, 921
Coal for, duty, 1183-4
Coal mines in the United States, 4317
Competition, 1181
Deficit, 1577, 1585, 1946
Employees, income tax, 4353
Employees' wages, 1803
Export freight rates, 1224
Financial condition of, 1574
Freight cars for coal, 1254
Freight rates, 1009
Coal on, 1249, 1976. *See also* Fuel Supply
Government. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Auditing by Auditor General, 1189
Lack of information, 1336
Ships, and, 1730
Grand Trunk. *See* that title
Locomotives
Cost of, 1587
Obsolete, 1587
Roumania and Greece, for, qu. 1236
Losses generally, 1008
Mail Service. *See* Post Office
Management. *See* Canadian National Railways
Merging of, 3308
Minister of and administration of Canadian National Railways, 1190
Party politics, and, 1179
Public ownership, 508
Quebec, Oriental & Atlantic and Quebec and Western Railways, qu. 573
Railway Commission, under, 3017
Requirements for, purchasing, 1610
Securities, provincial guarantees, qu. 2619
Situation generally, 1007, 3406
Statistics, qu. 3422
Taxation, 1008
Tourist traffic, 4495
Traffic and government ships, 1936
Utilization of, 844

Railways and Canals, Department of, 3014
Annual report, 697
Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966
Law costs, 3015
Minister of, duties, 1663
Outside service, 1665
Printing and stationery, 4335
Salaries, 1652, 3014, 4131, 4288

Railways and Shipping Committee. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee
M. for Standing Com. on (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1555, 1582-3

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Committee, 1174, 2247, 2708, 3005

"Rainbow" and "Niobe." *See* Ballantyne; "Niobe"

Rates. *See* Railways, Freight; Shipping
Discrimination in. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Real Estate. *See* Housing

Reciprocity Agreement with the United States, 268, 297, 1487. *See also* Address; Budget, Customs and Excise Dept. Bill Amdt. to Supply (Mr. Fielding) 2038; neg. 2075, 2393

Reclamation. *See also* Natural Resources
Dominion lands, 4495
Moose Range area, 871

Recorder's Court Jurisdiction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Record Office. *See* Militia

Redemption of Gold. *See* Currency; Gold

Redistribution. *See* Address; Budget; Proportional Representation

Redlich on Procedure, 1675

Redman, Mr. D. L. (East Calgary)
Fuel Supply problem, 1253
Highway grants—Alberta, qu. 1821
Oil bounties, 1418
Tobin, Mr. W. J., qu. 1133

Re-Establishment, 314. *See* Returned Soldiers; Housing
Special Committee, final report, 4041

Referendum. *See* Prohibition Plebiscite

Reformatories. *See* Prisons and Reformatories

Refrigerator Cars for Transportation of fish, 1038

Regina
Indian Commissioner at, 2167-9

Regional Exhibitions. *See* Agricultural Shows

Registered Parcels, Insurance, 1619. *See also* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill

Registrars. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill; Judges

Regulations, Oil and Gas, 894. *See also* Oil and Gas, Petroleum

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Annual railway statement, 1004
Business of the House
Estimates, alleged agreement, 4532, 4569
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1702
Statement to be made, 902
Canadian National Railways
Betterments, 4317
Board of Directors, 4314
Box cars ordered, 331
Canadian Government railways—vote of $7,000,000 for working expenditure, 4335
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 3049
Loan of $50,000,000 to, 3037
Car shortage, 4323
Claims against, 1658
Coal mines in the United States, 4317
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Deficit, 4319
Electrification, 4328
Employees, 1735
Reduction in number, 1851
Expenditure, 1616, 1662
Fire claims in Shelburne county, 4569
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314
Fort William terminals, 3052
French language, 4331
Halifax and South Western line, 3053
Lockeport extension, 4324
Hudson Bay Railway, 985
Information, 1782
Intercolonial Railway, 1655
Land at Lévis, 1849
Transcontinental, and, management, 1189
Joliette bridge, 4322
Joliette county, 3038
Loan of $50,000,000 to Canadian Northern, 3037
McAdoo award, 4325
Management of, 1440, 1654
Manitoba, construction, 3053
Maritime Provinces, improved facilities, 4568

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Monastery station, 4325
Operating results, 4318
Operation, cancellation of trains, 1004
Portland terminal, 4317
Rails, price of, 1852
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1771-4
Tenders for coal and ties, 1772
Transcontinental, forest protection, 4337
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Western lines, 3039, 3048
Canal tolls, 2962
Fuel control, 2944
Government ships, 1731
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grain transportation rates, 2967
Grand Trunk arbitration, expenses, 4355
Grand Trunk loan, 4131-69, 4314-34
Grand Trunk railway
Lines in United States, 4326
Portland terminus, 1384
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 690, 740
Halifax Graving dock, 1698
Highways, 3030, 4289-4313
Construction, 3127, 3036
Expenditure on, 3024
Inspectors, 3023
Projected roads, 3026
Work on, 1661, 1664
Purchasing agents, 1660, 1670
Questions, answers to, 1502
Railway Commission, 3016, 3020
Cases before, 3021
Railway department
Auditors, 1661-70
Deputy Minister, 1665
Estimates, procedure in, 1666
Officials, 1654, 1660, 1672
Staff reduction, 1672
Travelling auditors, 1661
Railway estimates, 1652; 2953
Railways
Annual report, 1770
Congress, 3023
Items in supply, 3015
Law costs, 3015
Politics, 1771
Railway Commission, under, 3017
Traffic and Government ships, 1936
Red Deer river line, 3048
Returned soldiers, employment on Welland canal, 3001
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, extension of time, 2030, 2152-7
Soldier Settlement Board, Maritime Provinces, 4532

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Tariff investigation report, 3055
Trent canal, 2953-60, 2606-17
Welland canal, 2025, 2966-3003

Reid, Mr. John F. (Mackenzie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 329; congratulations to Prime Minister; leaders who were born on the farm; new name for an old party; Government allied to big interests, 329; Mr. G. M. Murray and the press; Hudson Bay railway; Canadian National Railways, scarcity of cars, 330; grain blockade, United Grain Growers, Limited; National Progressive party, 331; business methods of the company; Mr. Guthrie's charges, 332; Mr. Rice Jones; names and birthplaces of directors; American settlers and goods, 333; Progressive movement not confined to Western Canada, 334
Agricultural implements, 3492
Bonds, War, Victory, tax free and taxable, qu. 2821
Briquetting plant at Bienfait, qu. 672
Budget, 3388. Comment on speech of Mr. Cowan; Agrarian and Liberal parties, 3389; economy in expenditure, 3390; tariff on agricultural implements; Canadian National Railways and freight rates, 3392; tariff revision; Grain Growers Guide, 3393; attitude of Government towards big interests, 3395; sales tax, 3396
Canadian National Railways
Grading in western provinces, qu. 570
Canadian Wheat Board, 2117, 2158
Cattle clubs, 1120
Cattle embargo, 717
Civil Service
Bonus, 2110
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2879-80
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage in; Civil Service Federation; Saskatchewan Customs Association; National Progressive party; Federal Union No. 66, 822; Board of Hearing; Printing Bureau, 823; British Civil Service, no fault to find with appointments, 824
Cold storage plants, 1040
Distribution of pure-bred stock in Saskatchewan, qu. 1236
Emigration, United States to, 3068
Hudson Bay railway, 991
Immigration
Expenditure, qu. 2943
Immigrants, care of, 3069
Income tax, qu. 3422

Reid, Mr. John F.—*Con.*
Live stock commission men, bonding of, 1124
Natural Resources, transfer to western provinces, 2539-45
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2266
Parliament buildings, 3995
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4365-71
Pensions, widowed mothers, 4371
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Public buildings—Nova Scotia, 2771
Returned soldiers, housing, unemployment, 4365-8
Ross rifle, 2784
Sales tax collections, qu. 2506, qu. 3830
Trent canal, construction, 2987
United States, emigration to, 3066
Vancouver island railways, qu. 3422
Yorkton Judicial district, 1080

Reid Newfoundland Company, 1486

Religious and Racial Questions. *See* York-Sunbury

Religious Holidays. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Reindeer and Musk Ox
Arctic regions, report on, 2940, 4543
Economic value of, 841, 871

"Reno" of Canada, 4474

Rentals, of buildings, 3989, 4092-6

Reorganization. *See* Civil Service

Reparations. *See* Germany; League of Nations; War

Reports Tabled, 3, 39, 107, 150, 188, 229, 258, 350, 397, 562, 597, 643, 788, 836, 962, 1001, 1069, 1174, 1347, 1380, 1496, 1619, 2027, 2095, 2247, 2566, 2889, 3146, 3259, 3582, 3697, 3971, 4041, 4105, 4340, 4449, 4541

Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Representation in Parliament, 1293
Amdt. (Mr. King) in Supply, neg. 1329

Research. *See also* Natural Resources; National Research Institute
Advisory Council, 150, 341, 1426, 2688
Scientific and Industrial Research Bureau, 169, 2144

Research Council Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2566; 2r., 2688; com., 2701, 2892; 3r., 2897

Resignations. *See* House of Commons

Responsibility to Parliament. *See* Government

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Retail Merchants Association and Sales Tax, 3446

Retiring Allowances. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Returned Soldiers. *See also* Civil Service; Dominion Lands; Pensions; Re-establishment; Soldiers' Settlement; Unemployment
Canteen funds, 4050
Census commissioners, 2097
Civil Service and, 963, 2828-38-49-53-68-81, qu. 3259, qu. 3531
Preference in, 4482
Civil Service Act, Amdts. proposed by Pensions Com., 4257
Employment on Welland canal, 3001
Gratuity—estimate of cost by Mr. Thomas Cox, 3559
Handicap, problem and tuberculosis cases, 4050
Highways, employment on, 3033
Housing, 4362-8
Loan, 4552
Insurance, 4355, 4361
Insurance Act, 629. *See also* Pensions
Land for, 1344
Military training, 3279
Pensions, 4361. *See also* that title
Prospecting for minerals, 871
Re-establishment, 4361. *See also* that title
Relief for, 2688
Shipbuilding and, 1273, 1727, 1903, 1921, 1974. *See also* that title
Special Committee moved, 731, agreed to, 733
Mr. Sutherland substituted for Mr. Peck, 788
Quorum, 901
Statement by Prime Minister, 4361
Sympathy with, 1903-4
Unemployment, 4048, 4361. *See also* that title
Relief in Peterboro, qu. 4253

Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 4260; 1r., 4262; 2r., com., 4355; 3r., 4361
Sections and subjects discussed:
Annuity, 4356
Assignment of pension, 4355
Commencement of Act, 4357
Death of beneficiary during lifetime of insured, 4355

Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects discussed—*Con.*
Insurance and limits thereof, 4355
Mercantile Marine, officers and seamen, 4357
Old age and sickness insurance, 4357

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuter's and Imperial News Service, qu. 564

Revenue Bills
1. Customs and Excise Department Bill
Res. 3785; 1r., 3822; 2r., com., 4388; 3r., 4453
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Res. 3698; 1r., 3725; 2r., com., 3938; 3r., 3955
3. Income Tax Act Consolidation Bill. 1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4343; 3r., 4355
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3726; 1r., 3733; 2r., com., 3r., 3955
5. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3733, 3741; 1r., 3758; 2r., 3955; com., 3955-3958; 3r., 3958

Revising Officer. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. *See* Speaker

Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, Vice-President and General Manager, United Grain Growers, 289, 290, 333, 417, 3180, 3492

Richards, Mr. T. H., veterinary inspector, 1063

Riddell, Mr. Justice, payments to, qu. 1500

Right of Ministers to Sit in Either Chamber. *See* Ministers

Riley, Mr. R. T., 1609-10, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Rimouski
County Fairs, 1240
Customs office, qu. 839
Experimental station, 954

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 120; Prime Minister—right of Government to retain power, 120; formation of a new party to take place of Unionism—its misleading name, 121; the Prime Minister's Sherbrooke and Granby speeches, 122; by-elections; non-confidence amendment, 124; argument of Prime Minister analyzed; census and redistribution, 125; tariff; League of Nations; clamor for general election

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Budget, 3651. Dr. Tolmie and dry dock at Esquimalt, 3651; Prime Minister's discussion of the tariff, 3652; Tariff Commission and revision of tariff, 3653; St. James by-election, 3655; customs duties and rate of exchange; deficits and expenditures, 3656
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3835-49
Dominion Iron and Steel Company contracts, qu. 733
Exchange, value for duty, qu. 733
Excise officers and sales tax, 3955
Foreign decorations to Canadians, qu, 1132
German goods, holdback, qu. 1350
Government candidates, 3336
Immigration, 2579-2602
Importations from Germany, qu. 696, qu. 838
Income tax collections
For 1919, qu. 3422
For 1920, qu. 2821
Insurance against sickness, 2554
Loans, tax exempt, qu. 575
Member making serious charge should retract, 1904
Montreal Inland Revenue offices, qu. 1820
Taxation, mutual insurance companies, qu. 605
National Research Institute, 2894
Naval Service, maintenance, 2107
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4012-30
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Post offices in Canada, qu. 1233
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2677
Sales tax, 3955
Shipbuilding, 1898, 1908, 1926, 2094
Estimates, manner of bringing down, 1937
Holt, Sir Herbert, comment on, 1900
Unemployment, and immigration, 1367

Riordon Company. *See* Gilmour and Hughson

Riots. *See* Quebec Riots

Rivers and Streams Act. *See* Lake of the Woods

Roads, 3986. *See also* Bridges; Highways

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Agriculture, grasshopper plague, 1028, 1030
Business of the House
British practice as to, 1026
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Preference to Canadian goods, 1280

Robb, Mr. James A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Canadian Wheat Board, 2116
Cattle embargo, 730
Cattle feeds, exemption of, 3746
Chief Justice, income tax and, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2778
Crushed grain, 3745
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, brokers, 4432
Customs duties, increase in, 597
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 3760
Estimates, supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Flax industry, 1404
Foodstuffs, tax on, 3736
Freight losses, 1658
Fruit inspectors, 1046
Grain trade, investigation of, 2116
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2563
Hungry Bay road, 1660
Immigration, 2582-94
Imported goods, marking of, 3714, 3723
Indian "Shows" for distinguished visitors, 2169
Interim Supply Bill, 2115
International Trade Conference, qu. 2029, 2151
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2118
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2559
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2160
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3850-96; Amdt. 3896
Politics—participation in by railway employees, 4502
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120
Province trading subject to taxation, 3705
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company, 3421
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 656
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 4502-5
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Containers, tax on, 3754
Flour, 3755
Lumber, 3751-2, 3756
Trade agents, 1225
Trent canal, 2610-12
Unemployment and immigration, 1363
West Indies trade, 1271

Robertson, Hon. Senator G. D., 536. *See also* Labour, Minister of; Ministers

Roberval, air station, 3779

Robson, Judge, 3606. *See also* Board of Commerce

Robson, Mrs., and Immigration Department, 3058

Roche, Dr. *See* Civil Service Bill

Rockefeller Institute, 1433. *See also* Research

Rockefeller Interests and Mr. King. *See* Lapointe, Mr.

Rodrique, Mr. Didace, qu. 3208

Rondeau Harbour, 3975

Root Vegetables.. Res. withdrawn, 4343

Ross, Mr. D. C. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 3531. Reciprocity agreement great boon to Canada, 3532; attitude of various members on Budget, 3533; Minister of Militia and tariff reform; military expenditure, 3537
Customs—Strathroy office, 3085
Fuel supply problem, 1255
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3980-1
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 618
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187-91
Newfoundland steamship service, 1486
Parliament buildings, 3995
Railway Commission, members, 3019
Steamship passengers, 1495
Trade with Australia and South Africa, 1468
West Indies steamship service, 1490

Ross Rifle, 2783-7
Statement of Rev. Canon Scott, qu. 599

Rotation of Crops, 1033. *See* Agriculture

Roumania. *See also* Loans
Loan to, 478, 1441, 3444, 3811, 4430
Greece and, qu. 1236, 3563, 3611, 3620, 3661
Dominion Canners, purchases, qu. 1001, 1072
Interest on, 1072, qu. 2030, qu. 2344
Sale of military supplies to, 2245, 3564

Routhier, Late Judge, 1085-6

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (Durham)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 110; League of Nations and Assembly at Geneva, 110; co-operation to prevent armed conflict; Covenant of League; public rights and wrongs in international affairs; war, or threat of war, concern of all nations, 111; purposes and functions of League; some phases of the work at Geneva, 112; constitutional questions;

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
budget to be submitted annually; Council to report to Assembly; relations between Council and Assembly; Article XXIII, 113; vote to be not of a delegate but of the state he represents; proposed amendments to Covenant, 114; monopolies in and distribution of raw materials; admission of new states, Austria and Bulgaria, 116; questions of principle; case of Albania; minorities treaties, 117; Russian situation, 118; United States; attitude of representatives of self-governing minorities, 119; admission of Germany, 119
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2257
Canadian representation in the United States, 2394-2408
League of Nations, 110
Contribution towards, 2357
Letter of International Joint Commission, 691
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2722-24
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2647-67
Resignation of, 4340

Roy Building, Halifax, qu. 3089

Royal. *See* North American Insurance

Royal Assent, 486, 2160, 2899, 4578

Royal Bank of Canada
Canadian Government Merchant Marine and, 1719

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill (Fines and forfeitures)
1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2481; 3r., 2486

Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Dominion police force, withdrawal from, qu. 601
Recruits from England, qu. 601
Strength, 2798-2800
Thorold, qu. 574

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Royal Commissioners. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, 1712, 1714, 1870. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Royal Military College, 2802
Road, 3973

Royalty. *See* Copyright

Ruddick, Mr. J. A., 1036

Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons, Estimates

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Rural Homes. *See* Housing

Rural Mail. *See also* Post Office
Boxes, number of, qu. 1235
Carriers, qu. 964
Contractors, 3507
Delivery, 1156
Routes, qu. 605
Rural postmasters, 2829-33-41-84. *See also* Civil Service; Post Office

Russia
Currency, 1072
Flax. *See* that title
Trade with, 1003, 1072, 1224

Ruttan, Dr. *See* Research

St. Alexis, station, qu. 2375, qu. 3582

Ste Anne de la Pocatiere
Destruction of library at, 1075
Illustration station, 948

St. Antoine, Montreal, representation of, qu. 577, 1069, 1070, 1293, 1295. *See also* Ames

St. Antoine, wharf, 2616

St. Augustin station, qu. 695, 3018

St. Catherine's Bay-Tadoussac service, 4530

St. Charles de Bellechasse, 1801

St. Charles River dam, 282

St. Croix wharf, 2616

St. Foy
Artesian well, 1659
Engine house, 767, 840, 967, qu. 1501, 1502, 1659. *See also* Canadian National Railways

St. Francis Harbour, 3990

St. Francis River, 1992, 1995

St. Francois du Lac
Electoral list, 3468
Lemieux, Mr., Speech at, 3528

St. Hyacinthe
Inland Revenue collector, Dr. A. P. Cartier, 3821, qu. 3904
Shops, qu. 2821

St. Jean post office receipts, qu. 576

St. Joachim-St. Simeon highway, 3026

St. John (City)
Belyea, Mr., retirement of, 3082
Representation, 3171-2
Vacancy, 1293

St. John (Harbour and Port) 4097
Facilities for potato shipments, 3443
Harbour, 4097
Improvements, qu. 1383, 4078
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2808

St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1501, 4564

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill (Extension of time)
1r., 2030, 2097; 2r., com., 2152; 3r., 2157

St. John Rolling Mills. *See* "Niobe" and "Rainbow"

St. Lawrence, Gulf of
Fishing in, 1038

St. Lawrence Navigation Company, 1981

St. Lawrence River. *See also* Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Coal trade, 1494
Conservation Commission, 3960-8-70
Diversion of water, 186
Dredges and tugs, qu. 568. *See also* Dredges
Power development, 1252, 1263
Route and Channel
Deepening, qu. 2028
Development, 674, 691, 1252-63
Dredging, qu. 568, 1991, 4541
Navigation for coal vessels, 1260, 1854. *See also* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Sorel shipyards, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2618

St. Malo shops, 1017

St. Michel wharf, res. 967, 3991

St. Pascal, domestic science school, 1075

St. Roch, Upper Crossing light, qu. 1383

St. Romuald post office building, qu. 577, 604

Ste. Rose de Watford, mail contract, qu. 3209

St. Simon station agent, qu. 3208

St. Thomas de Pierreville, postmistress. *See* Pierreville

St. Valier wharf, qu. 965

St. Vincent de Paul. *See* Penitentiaries

Sackville public building, 2816

Saguenay river, crossing of, 1822

Sailors, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue; Taxation

Salmon. *See* Fisheries; Privy Council

San Jose scale, 1028

Sandy Beach wharf, qu. 965

Saskatchewan
Clay deposits for pottery, 3384-5
Co-operative Creameries, Limited, 1040
Co-operative Elevator Company, 391
Fish-breeding, 2185
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Highways, qu. 1820, 4307
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Pure-bred animals in, qu. 1236
Representation in Senate, 2567

Saskatoon, Canadian National engines, qu. 3090, 3903

Saturday Night, comment on shipbuilding, 1968

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 554; speech a "meagre dish"; non-confidence amendment justified; Government has lost confidence of country; by-elections—Government's mandate exhausted; precedents, 555; Liberal leaders record; Borden Government, 556
Chicoutimi
Customs collector, qu. 698
Pier, qu. 967
Murray Bay-Tadoussac steamship service, 1824
Rimouski customs office, qu. 839
Shipbuilding, 1969

"Scandinavian," smallpox on, 1498, 1556

Scientific Institutions, 4494

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 324; congratulations to Prime Minister; speech of Mr. Crerar; railway situation, economy in administration; financial situation in Ontario; Government's mandate; general elec-

Scott, Mr. F. S.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
tion, 325; business men opposed to dissolution; the amendment; confidence of the country; defections from Government; dissolution should be decided by Government not by leader of Opposition; Opposition and Agrarian party; Mr. Gauthier and province of Quebec, 327; Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and Liberal party, 328

Scott, Mr. W. D., and Immigration Dept., 3058

Scott Act, petition for suspension, 3584, 4382. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Scottish Canadian Trust Company. *See* North American Trust

Screenings, 3182. *See* Elevators; Grain

Scrub Cattle. *See* Live Stock

Seamen, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Search Warrants. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Searls, Mr. George, Chief Grain Inspector, 1444

Secretary of State. *See also* External Affairs
Enemy debts, demobilization, 4534
Estimates, 4557

Sedition
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, arrest for, 1556

Seed and Feed Control, 1125, 4513

Seed Fairs, 1126

Seed Grain
Advances, 4498
Inspectors, qu. 1624
Purchase, 4506

Seed Purchasing Commission, 1126

Seguin, Mr. P. A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Budget, 3668. Administration of public business, 3668; tariff commission; tobacco-growing, 3668-9
Income tax—instructions in French, qu. 2624
L'Assomption
Experimental station, 918, 946
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Point of order—attack on members, 1904
Religious holidays, qu. 1499
Shipbuilding, 1916

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk wharf, 3976

Senate
Age limit, 1171
Committee, leave for Mr. Crerar to attend, 3259
Free Conference—Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 3972, 4040, 4061, report 4250
Government representation in. *See* Ministers
Governor General—Address to on retirement, 4493
Macdonald, Hon. Senator, appointment, qu. 577
Members of to have seats in Commons. *See* Ministers
Members should be elected, 1163
Ministers in. *See* Labour; Postmaster General
Paintings in, qu. 566
Printing of Senate Bills, 3938
Reform, 389. *See also* Ministers
Representation of Saskatchewan, 2567

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships)
1r., 258; M. for 2r., 585, 650, neg. 665

Serbia
Consul at Montreal, qu. 605

Serbian Government, Dr. Burnham and M. (Mr. Lemieux) for papers, 1520

Sessional Employees. *See* Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill

Settlers' Relief, 4498

Sex Offences. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Sexsmith, Mr. J. A. (East Peterborough)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4283
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4442
Highways, 3031
Metal, 4307-8
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 954, 956
Proportional representation, M., 1528
Toronto-Kingston highway, 4306
Trent canal, 2959, 2971-3

Shaughnessy, Lord, 1195, 1896, 3046, 3572
Letter on railway situation, 2503, 2890

Shaw, Mr. H. M. (Macleod)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 383; investigation of grain trade; winter grazing in forest reserves; letter from Mr. George Porter, Maycroft, Alberta; the Government's mandate, 384

Shaw, Mr. H. M.—*Con.*
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1818, 1819
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340
Macleod judicial district, qu. 2344

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 253; Mr. Gauthier; Imperial Conference; Lord Beaconsfield; Imperial Council, 254; isolation of Quebec; pledges of 1917; no discontent regarding Government; urban and rural representation, 255; the tariff issue; seceding Liberal Unionists; Mr. Pardee; railway policy; Agrarians and free trade, 256; by-elections; union and harmony; Opposition policy, 257

Shediac and Cape Tormentine Railway, 4564

Shell Contracts, 1788

Sherbrooke, Prime Minister's speech at, 3339

Sheridan, Mr. John, Indian Agent
Resignation and reinstatement, 1499, 2173, qu. 2618, 4501-5

Sherwin-Williams Paint Company, profits, 372, 1897, 3484, 3565

Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Labour; Unemployment
Advances at Victoria, qu. 599
Amount required for, 1683, 1858
Assistance to, qu. 603
Auditing, 1933
British Government policy, 1865
Closure, 1979-2094. *See also* that title
Continuation of after the war, 506
Contracts, 1683, 1689
Cancellation, 1726
Cost plus basis, 1910
For steel ships, qu. 565
Details of construction, 1874
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, qu. 733, 1233
Freights, lack of, 1284
Government programme, estimate, 2076
Government shipyard at Sorel, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2028
Interest on cost, 1886
Labour for, 1889. *See also* Labour
Newspaper comment, 1893, 1900, 1917, 1925, 1934, 1968
Returned soldiers and, 1727, 1909
Royal Bank, remarks of President of, 1900
Sinking fund, 1885
Steel and, 1876, 1884
Tonnage depreciation in value of, 1734
Trade routes, 1888

Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Unemployment, 1882, 1897, 1902, 1909. *See also* that title
Victoria, qu. 599
Wooden ships, 1711

Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canals; Great Lakes; Shipbuilding
British Chamber of, 1716
Flag, recognition in foreign waters, 786
Great Britain and, 3236
Inland, 745, 1497, 2192
Rates, 2963-9
Ocean, decline in, 1273
Special Committee. *See* Canadian National Railways
Tonnage into Canadian ports, 3650
United States discrimination in tonnage dues, qu. 697

Ships
Deadweight value per ton, 1702
Private control of, 1717
Publicly-owned, disposal of, 1718
Repairing at Quebec, 1986
Steel plates for, 1233

Shipyards. *See also* Shipbuilding; Sorel
Construction at, 1927
Government loans to, 1883
Vickers, 1967

Shortt, Professor Adam, 799. 2948. *See also* Civil Service

Sick and Distressed Mariners, 3129, 4039

Sickness, Insurance against, 4357
M. (Mr. Rinfret) withdrawn, 2554

Sifton, Late Right Hon. Arthur, tributes to, 3, 153

Sifton, Sir Clifford, and immigration, 3245

Silver, discovery at Kino Hill, Yukon, 856

Simpson, Mr. T. W. (West Algoma)
Natural resources, 872
Pulpwood, 3744

Sinclair, Mr. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
"Brant," steamer, 1982
Budget, 3470. Liberal party's record when in power; comparative tables of imports, 3471; average customs duty on imports, 3472; tariff issue; Prince Edward Island, potato growing, 3473; high freight rates, 3474; York-Sunbury election; record of Government during war, 3475
Cold storage plants, 1041

Sinclair, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Co-operative marketing of live stock, 1124
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4439-48
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4066
Dredging, Hillsboro river, 3984
Government shipbuilding programme, 2076
Health of Animals, 4506
Highway construction in Ontario, 4306
Migratory Birds Act, enforcement, 4496
Post Office, Maritime provinces reorganization, 4528
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4566
Soldiers Settlement Board, Maritime provinces, 4532
World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 358; congratulations to Prime Minister; duty of Opposition to criticise; National Liberal and Conservative party; same old party; "strange bedfellows"; Cabinet changes; retrenchment, 359; practical suggestions; nation builders and nation wreckers, 360; Dominion Franchise Act; withdrawals from Government, 361; tariff of special interests, revenue, protection; Mr. Calder's change of heart, 363; Liberals and Farmers; hazards of the farmers' calling; prices of farm produce, 365; price-fixing; forces of progress must unite; big interests behind Government, 366; amendment a challenge to Government, 367
Air Board, 3785
Alcohol for medicinal purposes, 3957-58
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Auditor General's report, 597, 913
Blue books, printing of, 1485
Camp Borden, aeroplanes, qu. 1820
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2259-62
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1729, qu. 3089
  Information, 1440
  Trade routes, 1733
  Vessels
    "Canadian Beaver," qu. 1673
    "Canadian Otter," qu. 1382
    "Canadian Recruit," etc., qu. 1381
    "Canadian Sapper," 734
Canadian National Railways
  Coal purchased, 1763
  Freight, Nova Scotia points, qu. 1620
  Monastery station, 4324
  Mulgrave, ice supply, qu. 963

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canso
  Harbour, 3983-9
  Navigation school, 1989
Civil Service
  Bonus, 2109-10
  Payments to Arthur Young and Griffenhagen, qu. 4251
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2487-2503, 4270-77
Coal trade, 1936
Commercial exhibits, 1227
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3840
Corning, Mr. H., cattle purchases, qu. 1624
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
  Valuation of currency, 3812
Customs and Inland Revenue, overtime, 4123
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
  Imported goods—marking, 3712, 3941-54, 3954
Debates, Official report, distribution of, 4560
Dominion and provincial jurisdiction over fisheries, 2105
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
  Polls, hours of, 3095
  Qualified voters, 3096
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4065
Dominion notes
  Circulation, qu. 1001
  Securities, qu. 1383
Dominion securities—grain, 1443
Dredging, 3983
Drydocks, 3987
Editorial Committee, 4560
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C, 958, 1026
Export trade, development, 1732
Fish—breeding establishments, 4036
French Trade Agreement, 2135-40
Fumigation of nursery plants, 1031
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2452-69
Grand Trunk loan, 4162-5, 4317
Grand Trunk Railway, lines in United States, 4326
Half Island Cove, breakwater, 3981
Halifax fishery award, qu. 2191
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3976-82
Hoarded liquor, tax on, 3706
Horse breeding, 1120
Intercolonial branch railway in Guysborough county, 4567
Interior Department, editors, 1331
Job printers, taxation, 4123
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2118

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 2357
Marine hospitals, 3130-36
Maritime Provinces, improved transportation facilities, 4567
Mercantile Marine, insurance of officers and seamen, 4359
Migratory Birds Act, enforcement, 4497
Military expenditure, 3278
Militia—surveys division, 2243
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2268
Moving picture films, 1226
Mulgrave, ice tenders, qu. 963
Murray, Mr. G. M., qu. 2622
Natural resources and western provinces, 1338
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4012-14
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3851-94
Parliament buildings, 3994-8
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2808
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4366
Pensions, refusal to soldier disabled by accident, 4366
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2717-21
Pilots, pensions to, 2000
Port Hilford, dredging, 3983
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2124
Post Office
Expenditure, 4521
Reorganization in Maritime Provinces, 4521
Rural mail, carriers, 4523
Public Works engineering branch, 4082-90
Purchasing Commission
Staff of, 1113
Statutory authority to appoint, 1113
Quebec riots, 1516
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4359-60
Returns, inquiries for, 1176
Russia, trade with, 1003
St. Francis harbour, 3990
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2152-4
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1992
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 591
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4504
Shipbuilding, 1858, 1869, 1920, 2085
Contracts, 1683, 1872
Excessive tonnage, 1873
Newspaper comment, 1932
Progress of debate on, 1727
Ships under construction, 1927
Sick mariners, 3130-36
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Hospital supplies and medicines, 3957

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Steamship services, 1493, 1489, 1495
Sugar, importation of, 3702
Swan, Mr. D. D., consulting engineer, 1997
Toronto Customs building, 3772
Trade with Russia, 1003
Trent canal, 2609-13
United States discriminatory tonnage dues, qu. 697
Vessels commandeered, qu. 2943
Victory bonds, expenses, qu. 1620
Whitehead life-saving station, 1991
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, removal of, 1990

Sioux Lookout, 4191

Six Months' By-Elections. *See* Representation in Parliament

Six Months' Hoist. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Smallpox on "Scandinavian", 1498, 1556

Smith, Mr. Alexander. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Smith, Mr. Sydney. *See* Post Office Dept.

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Cattle embargo, res. 702
Eggs, importation from China, qu. 568
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3893

Smuggling
Aerial preventive service, 3778

Snider, Judge. *See* Printing Bureau, Destruction of Documents

Societè des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 82

Soldiers. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment, 315
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051
Settlement on land, 529
Special Committee, final report, 4041

Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Department of, report, 836
Disabled unemployed, 4364
Estimates, 4532
Loyola College building, Montreal, qu. 569
Operating expenses and working capital, 4532

Soldier Settlement Board, 314, 529, 538, 3554, 4532
Advisory and Qualification Board at Prince Albert, qu. 673
Estimates, 4532
Graham, Mr. A. M., qu. 2618

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Maritime Provinces, 4532
Operation of, 529
Tobin, Mr. W. J., and, ques. 1133

Solicitor General. *See* Ministers

Sorel Dockyard, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2028
Shipyards, qu. 568
Superintendent, qu. 2618

Soudan War, 1882

Soulanges Canal. *See* Canals

South Africa
Steamship service, 1491
Trade with, 1468

South African War, 1527
Pensions, 2278

South Gabriola Wharf, 3981

Soviet. *See* Russia

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes. *See also* Deputy Speaker, House of Commons
Rulings and Statements of
Address, debate on,
Tariff not excluded from discussion, 58
Adjournments
For purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc.; question may be discussed on motion for Supply, 4106
Amendments
Must amend, not merely negative, 561
Put subject to consideration, 376
Ames, Sir Herbert
Resignation of, 469, 1001
Member (Hon. Mr. King) may go into matter on motion for Supply, 1070
Bills
Additions to, proposed, 4259
Com., referred to after second reading, 2776
Details properly discussed in Com., 624
Preceded by resolution
Notice not necessary, 2942
Trade Bills should be, 2150
Press interview not germane to principle of, 2870
Printing of Senate Bills, 3938
Private
Notice not required, 3971
Reference back by Com. of Whole, 1094
Suspension of Rules for, 3716
Second reading, order must be proceeded with or stand, 650

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills—*Con.*
Senate, motion for first reading not debatable but rule relaxed for Prime Minister and leaders, 151
Senate amendments, correction of error, 4068
To be disposed of by consent without discussion, 2890
1r.,
Senate Bills, unusual to explain, 151, 1619-20
3r.,
Debate on, 3343
Chair
Good taste, 3174
Ruling—exception to must be taken in constitutional manner, 3174
Should be permitted to exercise jurisdiction, 1308
Com.,
Standing, competent to consult Law Clerk, 598
"To-morrow" means next Government day, 563
Debate
Adherence to rules, 649, 2333
Closed by mover, 900, 2447, 2518, 3968
Questions not to be asked as in Com., 2450
Restriction of, 969, 2067
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents
After reading, 1539
Not read, 2067
Unanimous consent necessary, 1009
Decorum, 3174
Conversation in Chamber and galleries, 2053
Debate cannot be conducted from seats, 287
Debate, in, 286
Good taste, 3173-4
Governor General
Acknowledgment of Address, 3830
Address to on retirement, 4493
Imaginary letters, 3173, 3260
Minister of Crown and, 3174
Substitution of names, 3174
Interruptions, 3228
Language
"Coward", 287
"Deliberately false and untrue", 2444
"Flagrant insult", 287
"Mean appellation", 463
Unparliamentary, 1516
Members
Asking question may not make statement, 77, 987, 1308, 2865

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Comment on speech in other House not in order, 536
Debating, should be mindful of rule, 1758
Discussing principle of Bill on second reading restricted to one speech, 649
Having already spoken no right to speak again, 1307
How to be referred to, 69, 444
Leeds (Sir Thomas White) 69, 469
Limited to one speech on motion, 1177
May not reflect on judiciary, 812
Must be seated when Speaker rises, 3228
Not to be put on trial in House, 2443
One may give his own interpretation to remarks of another, 1197
Promises made by subject to rules of order, 4204
Reading from documents or newspapers when asking question, 736, 972
Reading speech, 544
Resignations, 1619. *See also* House of Commons
Ames, Sir Herbert, 469
Right to reply, 1245
Right to reply to reflection implied in question, 1172
Right to speak exhausted, 985, 1812, 2780, 3859, 4113, 4116
Should confine remarks to question before House, 816
Sitting, may ask question but may not make remarks, 127, 2225, 2867
Speaking, may not interrogate members sitting, 126, 2333
Speaking when no motion before House, 4203-4
To speak only once on motion, 2889
Speaking, has floor, 1794
Statement of must be accepted by House, 1197, 1641
Motions
Adjournment
Competency to withdraw, 1173
Adopted as amended, 1846
Amendment must amend not merely negative, 561
Committee
Not in order to discuss general railway problems, 1782
Error in, 1810
Involving expenditure
Housing, 1135
Hudson Bay railway, 985
Not in proper form, 4052

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Notice not given—unanimous consent necessary, 732, 1439, 2027, 2776, 2940, 4250
Notice not required with respect to Private Bills, 3971
Practically identical, 974
Strict application of rule would leave only portion debatable, 1758
To adjourn for purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc., 4106
Withdrawal by unanimous consent, 2554
Non-debatable subjects
Evidence before Committee not reported to House, 2881
Subjects already debated, 2824
Orders of the Day
Debate limited, 110, 1271, 1439, 2250, 2377, 3972
Alleged incomplete return may not be discussed in detail, 2250
Appropriateness of matter, 2626, 2776
Argument improper, 1070
Argument under guise of question, 901
House reverting to certain motions, 1851
Latitude allowed, 1070, 4254
Local questions, 110, 1271
Member not to be put on trial in House, 2443
No cross-examination of Ministers, 1004, 1441, 3321
Optional with Government to give information, 478
Questions reflecting on Government's policy, 1441
Questions unanswered, attention directed to, 1621
Summarizing newspaper articles, 1441
Pairs, correction of list, 563
Parliament buildings, inscription on tower, 4544
Petitions, manner of presenting, 562
Previous debate, 2824
Privilege. *See also* this title under House of Commons
Matter not affecting member personally, 2443
Questions
Answer of Government to be accepted, 1004
Deferred until Com. of Whole, 1024
Reflecting on Parliament, improper, 736, 1441

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Supplementary answer to, 1755
Unanswered, member should direct attention to on Orders of the Day, 1621
Reference by way of illustration and not reflection, 3261
Relevancy, 1172, 1193, 1196
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2865
Resolution
Amended by avoiding mention of money, 1136
Latitude of discussion, 1135
Money, 1135
Propriety of form, 1146
Rules of the House
Discussion, widest possible measure of, 1135
17C, Thursdays and Fridays. *See* House of Commons, Estimates
Senate
Committee
Leave for Mr. Crerar to attend, 3207
Debates, reference to, 3968
Free Conference on Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 4040
Members of, reference in terms of disrespect, 536
Supply
Amendments to
Discussion confined, 2067
Irrelevancy, 1193
Questions of detail should be withheld for, 1280
Rule 17C—Thursdays and Fridays, 1004. *See also* House of Commons, Estimates
Unanimous consent, 1009, 1233, 3715, 4433, 4453. *See also* under this title, Debates, Official Report
Canada Temperance Act, 3902
Minister making statement while Speaker in Chair, 1024
Votes and Proceedings, correction of, 737
Warrant for election writ—Durham and Maple Creek, 4340

Speaker's Chair, presentation of, 3689, 3691
Addresses to be printed in Official Report of Debates, 3696
Expression of thanks to Empire Parliamentary Association, 3696
Presentation of, notice, 3688
Speeches, 3689

Speech from the Throne debated. *See* Address

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3733, 3741; 1r., 3758; 2r., 3955; com., 3955-3958; 3r., 3958
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Amendments, 3742
Binder twine fibre, 3746, 3756. *See also* that title
Boxed goods, 3735
Condensed milk and ice cream, 3737, 3956
Containers, 3737, 3754, 3956
Excise taxes, 3955
Fishing boats, 3745
Foodstuffs, 3589, 3734
Lumber, tax on, 3734, 3736, 3742-3, 3756-57
Missals and prayer-books, 3756
Mixed grains for feed, 3745
Oatmeal and rolled oats, 3735-6
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3745-6
Package goods, 3735
Sales tax, 3120, 3170, 3399, 3996, 3735, 3752, 3957. *See also* Taxation
Opposition to change, 3752
Sparkling wines, 3734

Speedways. *See* Highways

Spinney, Hon. E. K. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2685, 2778, 4278-80
Annual report, Amdt. 4482
Special Com., report, 3901
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4271

Spirits, Tax on, 3120, 3506, 3576, 3705, 3726. *See also* Alcohol; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Liquor

Spirituous and Alcoholic Liquors, 3705-8

Sprays. *See* Insects

Spruce Bud Worm, 1031

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Fraser Valley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 140; examination of reasons advanced in support of amendment; pre-election pledges of Government fulfilled or in process of fulfilment; no charge of maladministration, 141; Government policy in interest of country; unification of Canadian people, 142; class consciousness; by-elections in British Columbia; the Agrarians, 143; no demand for a change, 144
British Columbia, fishing regulations, 2180

Stacey, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1163

Standardization. *See* Agricultural machinery

Standing Orders Committee, first report, 3005

Staples, Mr. W. D., and Grain Inquiry, 1674, qu. 3260

Statistical Department, 1231, 1672

Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 3007, 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Statutes, destruction of plates, qu. 603

Statutory Officials. *See* Purchasing Commission

Stayner, postmaster, 4470

Steamers. *See* Vessels

Steamship Services
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Baie des Chaleurs, qu. 734, qu. 2506
Baie St. Paul-Tadoussac, qu. 734
Halifax-Newfoundland, 1485, 1686
Halifax-St. John-Newfoundland, 1712
Magdalen Islands, 557, 767
Mulgrave-Canso, 1496
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930
Newfoundland, 1485, 1686, 1712
Pacific, 1493
Pictou-Georgetown, 1496
Prince Edward Island, 558
South Africa, 1491
Supervision, 1496
West Indies, 1275, 1488, 1712, 1714, 2253-62

Steamships. *See also* Vessels
Government control of, qu. 2530
Subsidies, 1735

Steel
Nova Scotia, 3295
Plates for ships, 1283, 1884
Shipbuilding contracts, 1876. *See also* that title

Steel and Iron Industry, 3526

Steel Company of Canada, Limited, 1611

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Cattle embargo, debate adjourned, 731
Sub-amendment, 757
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2497
De Martigny divorce, 3769
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 306

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Fuel Supply Problem, Res. 1247
Special Committee, evidence to be printed, 2027, 4251
Highways in Ontario, 3034
Immigration
Immigrants rejected, qu. 1624
Typhus fever, precautions, 643
Point of Order, letter reflecting on Minister, 2176
Proportional representation, 1550
Strikes, number of, qu. 569
Rulings and statements as Acting Speaker and Chairman
(as Acting Speaker)
Member not precluded from quoting from same debate, 3627
Member must accept statement of another, 3628
(as Chairman)
Conversation, 4307
Debates, Official report of
Insertion of documents not read, 4309
Discussion not relevant to item, 1665
Interim Supply
Schedule customary, 2015
Language
"Misleading the House", 1457
Relevancy, 1451, 1452, 1456, 1665, 3766, 3808, 3821, 4090, 4123-4, 4306, 4312
Letter from Gillies Bros., Ltd., 4418
Supply motion to strike out item not in order, 2018, 4513

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjalmar, 871
Northern lands, possibilities of, 841. *See also* Reindeer and Musk Ox; Natural Resources

Stein, Mr. Adolphe (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 550; charges of maladministration; war contract scandals; Purchasing Commission; feeling in province of Quebec; French Canadians not represented at Peace Conference; Assembly of League of Nations; other instances of discrimination; election proclamation in French, 553; election, 554
Agricultural publications, 1075
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2914-16
Bankruptcy Act Judges, 1084
County fairs, assistance to, 1123
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 3761, 3769, 4004-10, 4107
Illustration station at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, 948
Judges, local, in criminal cases, 1085

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 212; the amendment; argument of the Opposition; Liberals and Agrarians, 213; Leader of Opposition's incentive is accession to power; redistribution before election; increased representation for West; freight rates, relative representation of urban and rural districts, 214; no general demand for an election; War Veterans, Mr. Harry Flynn; Peterborough by-election; Yale, Colchester, St. John, East Elgin; War Time Elections Act, 217; the tariff—Opposition dare not make it an issue; National Liberal Convention, 1919, 218; statement of leader of Opposition at Kingston; tariff a matter of vital interest; Opposition resolutions of 1919 and 1920, 221; Government will welcome campaign on fiscal policy; coalition between Liberals and Agrarians; leader of Opposition lacks sincerity in proposing amendment, 222
Average duty during Liberal regime, 3471
Budget, 3619; speech of Mr. King, comment on; Canadian National Railways, administration, 3620; loans to Roumania and Greece; members of Parliament and sale of goods to foreign countries, 3621; comparison of this year's expenditure and expenditure under Liberal administration, 3621; position of leader of Opposition on tariff, 3622; American tariff a factor in tariff revision, 3623; tariff for revenue only, 3625; Mr. Fielding and protection, 3626; Mr. Crerar and York-Sunbury election, 3627; Hansard, changes in Mr. Crerar's speech as delivered, 2627-8; tariff question, boot and shoe industry, 3631; agricultural implements, 3631; United Grain Growers and lumber combine, 3633; grain overages, 3634; taxation, 3634; land tax, 3634-35; Canadian representative at Washington, 3635
Canada Temperance Act, qu. 736
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1721
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1723
Canadian manufacturers and export trade, 1222
Canadian National Railways
Special Com. (Mr. Meighen) M., 1805
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Customs, Minister of, 3081
Private business of, 3078

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
De Martigny divorce, 3770, 4203
Government shipbuilding programme, 2088
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3978-9
Immigration, 2595
Deputy Minister, 3056
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 619
Interim Supply, Purchasing Commission, 2021
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4195
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill Amdt. (Penalty—whipping) 2901
Oriental immigration, 2594
Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Discrimination in rates) 1232
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 596, 650
Wednesday evening sittings, 1829
Wheat Board, qu. 489

Stewart, Mr. J. A. (Lanark)
Alcohol, tax on, 3729, 3730
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268-73
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commercial agents, payments to, 4405
Dumping clause, 4413
Ports of entry, 4414
Trade extension, 4405
Valuation for duty, 4414
De Martigny divorce, 3765

Stewart, Mr. R. A., qu. 2343

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill (Automobile theft) 3916
Highways, 3028
Construction, 3036

Stikine and Dease Rivers, qu. 1133

Stock Feed. *See also* Feeds; Live Stock

Stockyards, 1124. *See* Live Stock

Strathroy
Customs, 3085
Destruction of pasture lands, 1030

Streams Bill. *See* Lake of the Woods
Strikes. *See* Labour

Submarines. *See* Shipbuilding

Sugar, 3699
Beet industry, encouragement to farmers, 301, 3426, 3456
Canada-West Indies trade, 2255-7, 3699
Customs tariff on, 3698, 3725, 3938, 3955

Sugar—*Con.*
German bounty on, 4432
Imports, 3703
Industry, 3513
Refiners, prices, 3245
Season, vessels for, 1489
West Indies, from, 2255, 3699

Sully, Quebec, station, 1822

Summary Cases, Fees, 3006. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation; Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill

Supplementary Estimates, 1618. *See also* Estimates
Inquiry for, 3741

Supplementary Extradition Convention with the United States. *See* Extradition

Supreme Court. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Bill
Appeal to in Criminal cases, 3006
Appointment of Mr. Mignault, 356
Exemption of Salary of Chief Justice, 2118
See also Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Gold Seal Liquor Co., appeal. *See* Canada Temperance
Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Privy Council appeals, 1089. *See also* that title

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 562, 917, 1215, 1330, 1385, 1442, 1617, 1652, 1736, 1979, 2076, 2234, 2270, 2275, 2356, 2378, 2568, 2680, 2736, 2781, 2800, 2889, 2940, 2945, 3014, 3055, 3068, 3127, 3776, 3973, 4010, 4070, 4117, 4288, 4494, 4544

Supply, Committee of
Amendments
Canadian National Railways—Information—M. (Mr. King) 1178, neg. 1215
Prime Ministers' Conference
Amdt. (Mr. King) 2626, neg. 2679
Reciprocity with the United States
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2038, neg. 2075
Representation in Parliament
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1293, neg. 1329
Closure. *See that title*
Concurrence, 4541, 4576
En bloc, 2006
Estimates. *See also* that title
Committee on, 2193
Justice—without consent estimates cannot be considered, 1073

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Non-confidence motions. *See* Representation in Parliament
One-sixth vote. *See* Interim Supply
Procedure in
Business for "to-morrow", 1025
Resolution introducing money bill should be preceded by notice, 1676
Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons
Subjects and items discussed:
Accredited herd, 4506-13
Agriculture, 4506
Entomology, 1024
International Institute of Agriculture, 1116
Live stock, 923, 1116
Publications, 1074
Salaries and contingencies, 917
Air Board, 3776
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of. *See that title*
Archives, 4533
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Canada Temperance Act, 4533
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1272, 2076
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 2164
Canadian National Railways, 1004, 4131, 4169, 4288, 4313, 4334, 4561
Canadian National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* under this title Scientific
Canadian Northern loan,, 3037
Canadian Press, Limited, 4533
Canadian representation in the United States, 2378
Canals, 2025, 2602, 2953, 2960, 2966-98
Civil Service
Bonus, 4534
Reclassification, 4541, 4555
Courtenay Bay improvements, 4097
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2889, 3077, 4117
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1027 4512
Dockyards, 4036
Dredging, 3982
Entomology, 1024
Exchequer Court, 1083
Experimental farms, 922, 928, 931, 932-36, 945, 4512
External affairs, 2437
Fish-breeding establishments, 2185, 4036
Fish inspection, 2182
Fishery officers and guardians, 2177
Fisheries patrol service, 2177

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items discussed.—*Con*
Fishery problems, scientific investigation, 2188
Fisheries protection service, 4036
Flax, 931
Geological Survey, 2141-8, 2162
Government Shipbuilding Programme, 2076. *See also* under this title, Shipbuilding
Grand Trunk Loan, 4131, 4168, 4288, 4313, 4144, 4334
Harbours and Rivers, 3973-82, 4097, 4536
Nova Scotia, 3989
Prince Edward Island, 3990
Health, 2940, 3127
Health of Animals, 926, 1048, 4506-13. *See also* under this title, Live Stock
High Commissioner's office, 2437
Highways, 4289
Housing, 4552
Immigration and Colonization, 2568-2602, 3055, 3077, 4127, 4131
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4498
Indian Affairs, 2167, 2171, 4501
Interior, 1330
International Fisheries Commission, Fraser River, 2189
Justice, 1076
Labour, 4170, 4544
Emergency relief, 4535
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2437
League of Nations, 2356
Lighthouse and coastal service, 1994, 2174, 4040
Lignite, 4499
Live Stock Branch, 923, 1116. *See also* under this title, Health of Animals
Marine, 1617, 1736, 1979, 2190
Marine Biological Board, 2189
Marine estimates, notice of closure, 1979
Migratory Birds, 4496
Militia, 2275, 2438, 2781
Annual drill, 2294
Cadet services, 2296
Clothing and necessities, 2305
Command pay
M. (Mr. Power) to reduce, 2291
Permanent Force, 2797-2800
Salaries, 2234, 2275
Mines, 2141, 2162
National Parks, 4495
Naval Service, 4010
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4010-36
Northwest Territories, explorations, 4494
Ocean and River Service, 1736, 1979
Oyster culture, 2177
Paris agency, 2437
Parliament buildings, 3992, 4040, 4070

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items discussed.—*Con*
Passport office, 2436
Penitentiaries, 1096
Pensions, 2236-78
Post Office, 3003, 4514
Outside Service, 4528
Public buildings, rents, repairs, etc., 4090
Public Works, 2680, 2736, 2808, 2945, 3973, 4070-9, 4535
Quarantine stations, 2754-68
Salaries, 2680, 4079
Shipbuilding, 1858
Railways and Canals, 1652, 3014, 4131, 4288
Railway Commission, 3016
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Roads and bridges, 3986
Royal Canadian Navy, 4010
Royal Military College, 2802
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 4541
Scientific institutions, 4494
Secretary of State, 4534, 4557
Shipbuilding, 1857, 2076
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4532
Soldier Settlement, 4532
Telegraphs and Telephones, 3987
Telegraph lines, 4539
Trade and Commerce
Bounties, 1385
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Salaries, 1215
Trent canal, 2025, 2606, 2953, 2966
Welland canal, 2025, 2493, 2960-98
Yukon Territory, 1087

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of, 924, 1052, 2270-4, 4508
Animals slaughtered for export trade, 1051
Budget, 3584. Railway construction, 3585; industrial enterprise; class organization, 3586; Prime Minister and Progressive party, 3587; Grain Growers' Company, 3587; mill feeds, adulteration, 3589; foodstuffs and free list; farmers' sons and military service; Mr. King and the Government, 3593; Liberal platform of 1919, 3594; Farmers' party and record of Prime Minister, 3595
Butter importations, 3749
Cattle embargo, 706, 764
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4441-8
Experimental farms, 928, 931-6
Agricultural publications and, 1076
Flax industry, 1395
Grasshoppers, destruction of, 1030
Health of Animals, 1052-67; 2270-4

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Highway construction in Ontario, 4296-4306
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 953, 956
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 610
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4219
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3872-95; amdt. 3887
Oleomargarine, importation of materials, 3747
Parliament buildings, 3996
Return, alleged incomplete, 2250, 2270
Returned Soldiers, Special Committee, 788
Tubercular cattle, slaughtering of, 1051
Unemployment and Immigration, 1369
Veterinary Director General, 4508-13. *See also* under this title, Alderson
White grub, destruction by, 1030

Swan, Mr. D. D., consulting engineer, 1997

Tadoussac-Murray Bay Steamship Service
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930

Taft, The Hon. William H., 3205

Tailors, Sales Tax, 3955

Tampico, Government vessel at, 1716

Tappert, Rev. N., qu. 1673

Tariff, 7, 96, 125, 130, 132, 136, 147, 155, 161, 162, 167, 175, 181, 211, 218, 238, 241, 251, 256, 263, 272, 285, 296, 315, 322, 337, 350, 353, 371, 388, 394, 398, 412, 528, 559, 417, 437, 432, 570, 476, 479, 484. *See also* Address; Canada-West Indies; Customs; French Trade Agreement; Special War Revenue; Ways and Means
Changes, 2938-55, 3119, 3121, 3696, 3725. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commission, 3055, 3241, 3640
Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, evidence before, 418. *See also* Rice Jones
Report, inquiry for, 1127, 3055
Legislation, 3118
Policy, 1878
Preferential, with West Indies, 2251
Protective, 1285
Reciprocity Agreement with United States —Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2038, neg. 2075
Reduction of—Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Budget, 3155, neg. 3686
Resolutions, 3121. *See also* Customs Tariff; Ways and Means
Revision of, 2, qu. 903, 2346, 3150, 3159, 3160, 3220, 3342, 3392, 3420, 3482, 4254. *See also* United States, Young Emergency Tariff

Tar Sand Rights, General Lindsay, qu. 671, 834

Taxation. *See also* Revenue Bills
Banks, qu. 2192, 3664
Burdensome, 1292
Business profits, 484, qu. 576, 3120, 3253, 3445
Cost of collection, 2100
Direct, 3147, 4344
Excise, qu. 1236, 3120. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Forms—revision, qu. 1237
Income Tax. *See also* that title
Appointments to staff, 2106
Collections in Saskatchewan, qu. 2028
Farmers from, in each province, qu. 569
Incomes of over $200,000 qu. 838
Instructions in French, qu. 2624
Penalties, qu. 2100
Preparation of return and computation of tax, 2567
Regulations, 1272
Returns, 2625, 3147
And penalty, 2101
Tax-payers—farmers, qu. 838
Taxes for 1920, qu. 2821
Income and Business Profits, cost of administration, qu. 837
Inconsistencies in, 3550
Indirect, 3221
Land. *See* Land Taxation
Law stamps, 1090
Job printers, 4123
Luxury, qu. 402, 600, 1191, 3114, 3285, 3445
Abolition, 1185
Motorbus, remission, qu. 603
Mutual companies, qu. 605
Postal war tax, 4515
Provinces, 3705-6, 3742
Railways, 1008
Sales, 3120, 3372, 3485, 3545, 3735-52-54, 3957. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Collections, qu. 2506, qu. 3830
Sales by farmers, 3956
Three main principles of, 3221

Taxation of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Teakle, Mr. R. B., 1934

Telegraphs and Telephones, 3988, 4539
Cape Breton, 3987
Government business, 4130
Isle aux Coudres, extension, 4540
Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4539

Telephones. *See also* Marine Signal Service
Berthierville, qu. 1233
Kamouraska and Temiscouata Co., 2175
Service, 4093

Témiscouta
Indians 2168
Telephones 2175

Temperance Act, prescriptions under, 3730. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Tenders. *See* Purchasing Commission

Terminal Elevators, 277-79, 1442. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Grain; Wheat
Maintenance, 1463
Overages, 3634

Textiles. *See* Trade

Thanksgiving Day, date of, qu. 2098. *See also* Armistice Day Bill

Theft, Motor cars of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Thessalon wharf 3975

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill 4480
League of Nations, 55
Mail contract, White Horse-Dawson, qu. 2686
National Research Institute 2698-2700
Natural resources, 851
Proportional representation, 1553
Rulings as Chairman:
Member in order in reading from newspaper, 1891
Tedious repetition, 1892

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4441-7

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 345; congratulations to Prime Minister; country's obligations to returned soldiers; conscription; United Grain Growers, Limited, 345; marketing of grain; sale of implements and other commodities; two party vs. group system; proportional representation 346; the amendment; different premises but same conclusion; confidence of the country; by-elections; consequences of vote on amendment, 348; no confidence in Government; the tariff, 350
Agricultural shows, 1241
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1317
Automobile theft, 3914
Budget, 3310. Sales tax and valuation of foreign imports; Canadian Reconstruction Association, 3312; protective

Thomson, Mr. Levi—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff for industries, 3315; free trade, 3315; raising of revenue; land tax, 3317
Cattle embargo, 714
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3897-9, 3914-35
Crushed grains, 3746
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Free trade, 4419
Indirect increase in tariff, 4419
Trade agents, 3808
Valuation for duty, 4419
Customs drawbacks, qu. 2375
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Candidate, death of, 3095
Disqualified voters, 3098
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3104
Forms, 4228-47
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4237
"Personal naturalization", 4245
Recount, 3097
Revising officers, 3102
Dominion notes and gold reserve, qu. 1234
Farmers and protected interests, 3751
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 751
Justice Department
Law-clerk stenographers, 1078
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2335
Military preparation, 2300
Point of order—member must accept statement, 3629
Proportional representation, 1534
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2064
Representation in Parliament, 1317
Trade commissioners in the United States, 1465, 1484
Welland canal, construction, 2989
Wheat Board, 1453
Position of Mr Crerar, 1460

Three Card Monte. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt., 3921

Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, 2174

Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons, Estimates

Ticket-of-Leave, case of W. H. Tapley, res. (Mr. Casgrain) 970

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001. *See also* Grand Trunk Arbitration

Timber. *See also* Forestry
Culling, 1426
Ontario limits, 3391
Tobique reserve, cutting on, 4503

Tinctures and Elixirs. *See* Customs Tariff

Tinplate Industry, 3326-7

Titaniferous Ores. *See* Research

Tobacco
Canada-West Indies Trade, 2254. *See also* that title
Cigars and, unlawful sale, 3786
Duty on, 3698
Excise taxes on qu. 1236
Experimental station at L'Assomption, 918, 946
Growing, 91, 1076, qu. 1500, 3669
Protection, 300, 3676
Harrow tobacco station, 1076
Licenses, 2554

Tobacco Buyers' Association, 91

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Anderson, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Black, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Brackenbury, Mr. G. B., qu. 735
Civil Service bonus, qu. 1623
Douglas, Mr. H., qu. 735
Grand Trunk
Arbitrators, salaries, qu. 1130
Pensions, qu. 964
Taking over, qu. 838
Printing Bureau employees, qu. 1348
Quebec highways, aid to, qu. 2344
Rural mail carriers, qu. 964
Taxation forms, revision, qu. 1237

Tobin, Mr. W. J., and Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 1133

Tobique reserve, timber cutting, 4503

Tofino wharf, 3981

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd, 1049, 4506-12
Agricultural shows, 1245
Agriculture. *See also* under this title, Health of Animals, Live Stock
Benefits from agricultural bulletins, 1075
Department, estimates, 917
Publications Branch, 1074
Salaries, 1036
Seed inspectors, 1033
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of, 925, 1052, 1059, 4512
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, 2031, 3011, 2942
Banff National Park, 4495
Berry boxes, 4115-16
Budget, 3648; dry dock at Esquimalt, 3648; Pacific coast trade, 3649; tonnage entering Canadian ports, 3650
Canadian Forestry Association, 4495

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Cattle
Embargo, 722
Feeding for export, 1120
Marketing, 1121
Cold storage, 1039
Montreal Harbour Commission, 1041
Municipally-owned plants, 1040
Dairying, 1036
Dairy herds, 1118
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4437-48
Destructive insects, 1027
Dominion lands, 1334
Entomology, 1024
Esquimalt dry dock, 3648
European corn borer, 1032
Exhibitions and fairs, 1123
Experimental farms, 942
Farmers' clubs and cattle herding, 1117
Flax industry, 931
Forestry, 4494
Forests—aerial patrol, 4495
Fruit growing, development of hardy varieties, 1043
Fruit inspection, 1041
Inspectors, 1042; distribution of, 1045
Grasshopper and insect plagues, 1030
Health of Animals, 4506, 4513
Compensation for slaughtered herds, 1048
Diseases, 1048, 1051
Glanders in Frontenac, 926, 1058
Hog cholera, 1058
Garbage feeding, 1058-9
Procedure in dealing with, 1061
Alderson, case, 925, 1052, 1059, 4512
Increase in amount of item, 1057
Inspectors, 1067-8
Pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis, 1048
Slaughtering, 1048, 1051, 1062
Veterinary system, 1058
Horse breeding, 120, 1118
Illustration farms in Ontario, 952
Illustration station at L'Assomption, 947
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166, 4498
Indian affairs, 2167-71
Insect and Pest Act, inspectors, 930, 1044
Inspection of root vegetables, 4343
Interior Department
Cabinet maker, 1342
Clapp, Miss S., 1332
Employees, 1332
Salaries, 1331
International Institute of Agriculture, 1116
Lignite Utilization Board, 4499
Live stock, 1116. *See also* under this title Agriculture, Health of Animals

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Live Stock—*Con.*
Commission men, 1122
Marketing, 1039
Pure-bred animals, distribution of, 948
Rescue policy, 1119
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2442, 2891, 4496
Mines and Geological Survey, 2141, 2162-67
Municipalities—cold storage, 1040
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 563, 3850-96, 3905
Pacific coast trade, 3649
Politics, participation in by public officials, 4503
Potato diseases, 1032
Refrigerator cars for fish, 1038
Seed Branch, 1125
Seed Grain 4506
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 4501-5
Spruce bud worm, 1031
Surveyors, pamphlets for, 1335
Tourist traffic, 4495
Wool grading, 1121-2

Tonnage into Canadian ports, 3650. *See also* Shipping

Toronto
Customs building, qu. 3772, 4095
Customs officials, 1351
Harbour improvements, 687
Post Office
Appointments, qu. 734
Promotions, qu. 1673
Shipyards, 1889
University. *See* Research

Torrance, Dr. *See* Hog Cholera

Tourist Traffic, 4495.

Tractors, free, 3509. *See also* Agricultural Machinery

Trade. *See also* Board of Trade; Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; French Trade Agreement; Steamship services
Africa with, 1468, 1965
Agents and Commissioners, 525, 1392, 1464-77, 2893, 3460-2, 3785-3809. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Buenos Aires, 3794-8
Europe, in, 1473
United States, in, 512, qu. 1001, 1473, 3460. *See also* United States
Aggregate, 3115
Australia and New Zealand, 1223-4, 1468
British preference, 3699

Trade—*Con.*
Chamber of commerce, 1224
Development of, 1466
Export, 1688, 1712, 1732
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, by, 1276-77
Expansion, 1276
Figures, 3349
Foreign, 1221-1225
Canadian enterprise in, 3409
Imports, value, 3310
Invoice certificate, 4389
France, with. *See* French Trade Agreement
German. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff
Gillies Bros., Limited, letter on restriction of, 4418
Great Brtain with, 3116
Imported goods, marking, 3938. *See also* Customs Tariff
International Trade Conference, 2151
Report, 4541
Restrictions, 4418
Routes, 1888
Rates on. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Russia, with, 1003, 1072, 1224
South Africa, with, 1468, 1965
Treaties. *See* Canada-West Indies; French Trade Agreement; Reciprocity
United States. *See* that title
West Indies 1271, 1275, 1870, 2251. *See also* Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement

Trade and Commerce
Department
Bounties. *See that title*
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1442
Demography, Chief of, 1232
Dominion Statistician, 1231
Employees, 1218
Moving pictures, 599, 1225, 1467, 1558
Artists and Lecturers, 1225, 1232
Patent and Copyright Branch, 1496
Salaries, 1215
Increases, 1218
Statistical Branch, 1231
Subsidized steamers, 1712. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly bulletins, 1220
Weights and Measures, 1485

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 229; withdrawn, 2891

Trades and Labour Congress. *See* Labour, National Catholic Unions
Platform of, 1634

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 223; disregard of rights of French language, 223; religious holidays; violation of pledge given by Sir Robert Borden; Prime Minister's professed friendship for Quebec, 224; attack on leader of Opposition and his supporters; military imperialism the mailed fist of commerce and industry; agriculture, the basis of industrial stability; industrialism fraught with danger; the "crisis of moral sense"; Pensions Act; the Prime Minister still a "downright imperialist"; Mr. Gauthier and the Minister of Marine; Quebec will remember 1917; War-time Elections Act; Government shows contempt for rights of Parliament and people; Peace Treaty; country's credit involved without the consent of Parliament, 226; Purchasing Commission; Canadian Navy; League of Nations; Prime Ministers' Conference, 227; Imperial defence; divorce; Quebec, 228; Government undeserving of confidence, 229
Civil Service
Ascension day, 2775
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4484-89
Holidays, amdt. 4484
European credits, qu. 2622
Finance. *See also* that title
Accounts with Great Britain, qu. 2622
Dominion note issues, qu. 2621
Expenditure accounts, qu. 2621
Investments "other" and "non-active", qu. 2619
Public debt—non-active miscellaneous banking accounts, 2621
Repayment of $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Revenue accounts, qu. 2620
Income tax returns, 2625
International Financial Conference, qu. 1237
St. Simon station agent, qu. 3208

Trains, Cancellation of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Tramp Steamers. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Transferable Votes. *See* Proportional Representation

Translation of French Speeches. *See* House of Commons; Debates; French language

Transportation, 738. *See also* Canals; Grain and grain trade; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Railways; St. Lawrence river
Difficulties, 3567
Car shortage, 512, 548, 3541, 4322
Rail and water, 484
Res. (Mr. Keefer) 674; withdrawn, 756

Travelling Expenses of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Treaties. *See also* Canada-West Indies; Extradition; Canadian Representation in United States; French Trade Agreement
Extradition between Canada and United States, 2687
Migratory Birds Treaty, 2892. *See also* that title
Negotiation of, 2387

Tremblay, Edouard. *See* Quebec Riots

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Tributes to Deceased Members. *See* House of Commons

Trowers, Miss Catherine, qu. 1131

Trustees, remuneration of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Tubercular Cattle. *See* Health of Animals

Tuberculin Test, 1049

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, Canadian Association, grant, 3142

Turgeon, Mr. O. (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 144; congratulations to mover and seconder; the new Prime Minister, 144; the "Great Liberal" dead but spirit survives; the world in an abnormal condition; Prime Minister's reasons for not holding general election; Government has forfeited confidence of country, 145; reasons for formation of Union Government; Government elected for term of war and demobilization, 146; people clamouring for election; tariff; increase of railway rates, 147; redistribution, representation of rural and urban communities, 148; increased production and population, 149
Budget, 3447. Financial conditions and Government policy, 3447; tariff revision, 3448; value of home market, 3449; luxury taxes; taxation of lumber; tariff and protectionist spirit, 3450; income tax, 3451; free trade and

Turgeon, Mr. O.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Agrarian party, 3452; Brussels Conference; taxation of unemployed land, 3453
Caraquet Gulf Shore Railway extension, 4338
Civil Service bonus, 2112
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage in; Civil Service Commission; classification, 825; exercise of patronage by members; outside service, 826
Grain exported, 3054
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 745
Intercolonial Railway, 4568
Lumber, sales tax on, 3450, 3743
Maritime Provinces, improved railway facilities, 4568
Privilege—Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3740
Railway situation, 3039
Shipbuilding, 1951

Turnover, Tax on. *See* Sales Tax

Tweedie, Mr. T. M. M. (Calgary West)
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs, 4387
Gold Seal Liquor Company vs. Dominion Express Co., 4379
Proclamation, omission of date, 4379
Rights of others than litigants affected, 4379
Strict compliance with statute, 4380
Vote, 4379
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1789
Canadian representation in the United States, 2411-14
Cattle, slaughtered, compensation, 1061
Chief Justice, salary of, 1566
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2833-84
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3926
Punishments, 695, 2228
Dairymen, loss to through destruction of cattle, 1061
De Martigny divorce, 3765-7
Estimates, Committee on, 2202
Excessive or inadequate punishments, 695, 1857, 2228
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 619
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2904
Natural Resources—transfer to western provinces, 2547-49
Pensions, widowed mothers, 636
Public buildings in Nova Scotia, 2744
Tubercular cattle, destruction of, 1061

Typhus
Epidemic in Europe, 4534
Precautions, 643. *See also* Immigration

Under Secretaries. *See* Ministers

Unemployment, 2, 3203, 3259, 3367, 3811-12, 4361. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Housing; Immigration; Labour; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding
Emergency relief for, qu. 2623, 4535
Employment offices, 4363
Extent of, 4549
Housing loan, 4552
Immigration, suspension of
M. (Mr. Deslauriers. 1351; withdrawn, 1380
Insurance, 2, 9, 231, 237, 263, 284, 395, 4547. *See also* Address
Labour and, 1373. *See also* Labour
National Advisory Council, 4363
Relief, qu. 570, 4550
Emergency, qu. 2623, 4535
Returned soldiers, 4048
Peterborough in, qu. 4253
Shipbuilding, 1727, 1882, 1897, 1902, 1909
Quebec at, 1986

Unified Buying. *See* Canada Grain Act

Union Service Fund, qu. 2192

United Farmers of Ontario, 791, 3199, 3592, 4297, 4301. *See also* Drury
Railway nationalization, 1787

United Grain Growers, Limited, 289, 316, 331, 346, 417, 3662. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Progressive Party
Commercial activities, 516
Dockages, 3633-34
Lambert, Mr. Norman. *See* Lambert
Lumber business, 3633
Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, 289, 290, 333, 417, 3180, 3492
Sale of American implements, 346, 418, 491, 3372. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget

United States. *See also* Ambassador; Canadian Representation; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Reciprocity; Trade
Annexation with, 1483
Attitude of Southern States on protection, 3458
Boots and shoes, Canadian in, 1225
Borrowings from, 3266
Canadian dollar, value in, 3087
Canadian Government Merchant Marine cargoes, 1689, 1722. *See also* that title
Canadian War Mission, 3388, 2400
Capital invested in Canada, 3219

United States—*Con.*
Coal from, 1248. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem
Coal mines owned by Canadian Rys., 4317
Commercial agents in, 1473
Constitution, comparison with, 1166
Consular service, 1475, 3460, 3796. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Customs regulations, 3817, 4417
Emigration to, 3068
Exchange rate, 3167
Extradition Treaty with, 2687, 3008, 3207. *See also* Extradition Convention
Tabled, 3207
Farming, competition in, 3187
Fordney Bill, 512, 3239, 3368, 3442. *See also* under this title Young Emergency Tariff
French Canadians in, 1483, 3675
Grand Trunk Railway
Amount due, 4135
Lines in, 4326
Immigration, 1360, 3064, 3068, 3072
Commissioner, 3059
Restrictions, 1357
Importation of farm implements from, 417, 492, 3372, 3409
Migratory Birds Treaty, 2892. *See also that title*
Nolan Act, patents, 4454
Patent legislation, 4454-60
Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 1817. *See also that title*
Premium on American money, 3087
Progress in farming, 3188
Pure bred cattle, 1049
Railways, 1007, 1576
Cost of operation, 1576
Government control, 1583
Systems and freight vessels, 1730-31
Reciprocity with. *See also* Address; Budget, 268, 297, 1481, 2038, 2045, 2058, 2066, 2075, 2393
Relations with, 400, 3245
Shipbuilding, 1288. *See also* that title
Tariff, 3456. *See also* under this head, Fordney, Young Emergency
Canadian duties, 4254
Tariff legislation, 3118, 3342
Tinplate industry, 3326
Trade agents in, qu. 1001, 1219. *See also under this title* Consular Service
Agents in Canada, 1221. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Trade with, 1482, 3460, 4397-4400. *See also* that title
Barriers to, 3599

United States—*Con.*
Young Emergency Tariff Bill, 2905, 3160, 3115, 3352, 3809
Rumoured new tariff resolutions, 3905

United States Transportation Act, 1007

Universities, Scientific work at. *See* Research

Unopposed Motions for Returns, 578, 606, 674, 767, 840, 1134, 1238, 1350, 1502, 1625, 1821, 2193, 2346, 2507, 2821, 3090, 3423, 2772

Upper Chamber. *See* Ministers

Upper Crossing, St. Roch light, qu. 1383

Uruguay, seizure of Nova Scotia vessel, 1527

Vacancies. *See* House of Commons

Vallée, Dr., case of, 3131

Vancouver Island
Canadian National Railways on, qu. 3422
Returned soldiers and shipbuilding, 1727

Vegetable Insects, 1027

Vegetables, Root, Inspection and Sale, 4343

Venereal Diseases, 3127

Veniot, Hon. P. J., 3637, 3688, 3717, 3740. *See also* York-Sunbury

Verret, Colonel Hector, 4525

Versailles Treaty. *See* League of Nations; Patent Act Amdt. Bill

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Housing loan, 4552
Income tax collections, qu. 569
Unemployment, 4550
Emergency appropriation for, qu. 2623

Vessel Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Canadian National Railway, qu. 1348
Commandeered, qu. 2943
Names of
"Brant", 1982
"Canadian Beaver," qu. 1673, 1862
"Canadian Conqueror," qu. 1381
"Canadian Explorer," 1714
"Canadian Inventor", 1890
"Canadian Mariner", 1713, 1715
"Canadian Otter," qu. 1382
"Canadian Pioneer," qu. 1382, 1689, 1722, 1894

Vessels—*Con.*
Names of—*Con.*
"Canadian Planter", qu. 2942
"Canadian Rancher", 1716
"Canadian Ranger," qu. 1382, 1863
"Canadian Recruit," qu. 575, qu. 1381, 1382, 1703, 1863
"Canadian Runner", 1715
"Canadian Sapper", qu. 734
"Canadian Seigneur," qu. 1382, 1863
"Canadian Squatter", 1894
"Canadian Voyageur", qu. 1381, 1382, 1716, 1894
"Champlain", 1980, 1983, 1995
"Druid", 1980, 1984
"Esperanto", 4341
"Lake Champlain", ice-breaker, 2174
"Laurentian", qu. 1348
"Marie Lydia", 1985
"Montcalm," ice-breaker, 1985
"Muriel W.", 1990
"Narbethong", 2175
"Neophyte", 1966
"Niobe", qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
"Rainbow", qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
"Scandinavian", 1498, 1556
Seagoing, tonnage, 3650
Service, in, qu. 568
Wooden, 1714, 1728, 1871

Veterinary Director General, 4508-13. *See also* Alderson; Health of Animals

Veterinary Inspector General, 4513

Veterinary Inspectors. *See* Health of Animals

Veterinary Surgeons. *See* Health of Animals

Vice-Admiralty
Judges, 1084
Registrar in Quebec district, 1086

Vickers' Shipyards, 1967

Victoria
Drydock, 265
Contract for, qu. 565
Shipbuilding, qu. 599

Victoria Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Victoria Bridge, widening, 300

Victory Bonds, 1285, 3444. *See also* Finance
Expenses, qu. 1620
Government investment in, 1704

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbiniere)
Address in reply to Governor Generals' Speech, 430; Tribute to the late Thomas P. Owens, Editor of Debates; the late Mr. Gladu; does majority in the House reflect public opinion?; the Government's mandate, 430; Government elected in 1917 to enforce Military Service Act; the question of confidence; Liberal members of Cabinet; tenure morally at an end; Prime Minister's argument, 431; tariff, 432; fiscal policy of Liberal party; Farmer's platform; refusal of Canadian Manufacturers to sell to farmers' organizations, 434; Minister of Immigration; Canada's status; unity a real element of nationhood; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; dissolution, 436

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Administration of Justice, Yukon territory, 1087
Agricultural shows, 1240
Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1085
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Administration, 1441
Insurance and value, 1278
Vessels in service, qu. 568
Canadian manufacturers and United States trade, 1222
Canadian nationals, 772
Canadian National Railways
Conductors, qu. 569
Divisional points, qu. 574
Freight cars, qu. 568
Operating expenses, qu. 1131
Policy and history of, not in order, 1773
Service between Winnipeg and Quebec, qu. 569
Special Committee, reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1768, 1779
Transcontinental, transportation of grain, 2984
Canadian Record, 1438
Canadian representation in the United States, 2386
Canadian Wheat Board Bill, 2159
Cattle and horse breeding, 1118
Cattle embargo, qu. 709
Civil Service
Bonus and reclassification, 1463
Copyright—Bill not printed in French, 649
County Fairs, assistance to, 1123
De Martigny divorce, 4078
Director of Commercial Intelligence, 1219
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Estimates
Before item passes question should be put in Com., 1091
Discussion of, 1230
Experimental farms, 939
Flax industry, 1408

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Fortifications of Quebec, 970
Gilmour and Hughson Bill, 1096
Grand Trunk loan, 4134-51
Grand Trunk loan, 4134-51
Hudson Bay Railway, 989
Iron ores, 1436
Law stamps, tax, 1090
Linen yarns, 1407
Loans, domestic, qu. 566
Judges
Ad hoc, and Admiralty, 1084
Yukon territory, 1088
Justice Department
Purchasing Commission and, 1103
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2319
Parliament buildings, 4077
French inscription, qu. 568
Penitentiaries, 1115
Purchasing of supplies, 1097, 1104, 1107
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 3422
Point of order—statement misquoted, 2231
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4058
Privy Council—"Insular" tribunal of England, 1090
Purchasing Commission, 1098, 1103, 1114
Civil Service Commission and, 1100
Railways and Canals, annual report, qu. 697
Research Council, 1436
Russia, trade with, inquiry, 1072
St. Croix and St. Antoine wharves, 2616
Searls, Mr. George, grain inspection, 1444
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4058
Trade commissioners in United States, 1220
Trent canal, 2953, 2978, 2606-17
Veniot correspondence, 3719
Vice Admiralty, registrar, salary, 1086
Welland canal, construction, 2978
Wheat Board, 1454, 1463, 2159
Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill, 2158

Ville Emard Tunnel, 3677

Vote on Account. *See* Interim Supply

Votes. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Walker, Sir Byron, 2684

Wallace, The Late Mr. Tom G., tribute to, 152

War. *See aslo* Demobilization; Germany, Reparations
Accounts, Canada-Great Britain, adjustment, qu. 2191
British Remount Commission, qu. 4341
Canada's share, 3583
Canadian Mission in the United States, 2388, 2400

War—*Con.*
Claim of Canadian citizens, qu. 1820
History, qu. 1625
Indemnity, 3195
Loans, 3246. *See also* that title
Reparations. *See* Germany
Scandals, 3509
Surplus supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Union Service Fund, qu. 2192

War Measures Act, 4459. *See also* Purchasing Commission

War Purchasing Commission, 2309. *See also* Purchasing Commission

War Times Election Act, 217, 322
Perpetuation of, 4238-40

Washington. *See* Ambassador at; Canadian Representation in the United States; Prime Ministers' Conference

Water Powers. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Canadian General Electric Company, 2607
Conservation Commission, 3960-70
Development of, 844
Director of, 1346
Films showing, 1467
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Lake of the Woods, 4171. *See also* that title
Trent canal, 2954-64

Waterways. *See* Canals; Transportation Commission. *See* International Joint Commission
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence, 674, 738
Chicago Drainage Canal diversion, 186, 2225

Watson, Dr., Chief Pathologist, 1050

Ways and Means, Committee of, 562, 2100. 3688, 3698, 3719, 3726, 3733, 3741. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Resolutions, printing of, 3207

Webster, Hon. Senator, 1990

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Weed Seeds, 289

Weekly Bulletins, 1220

Weights and Measures, 1485

Welland, Binder twine factory, 3227

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

West Durham Election, 1324

West Indies. *See also* Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement
Cable, 1438
Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships, 1913. *See also* that title

West Indies—*Con.*
Canadian ships for, 1870
Conference of 1920, 1870, 2252
Customs tariff, goods under, 3698. *See also* that title
Importations, preference, 3698, 3704
Preferential tariff, 3704
Proposed union with, 2254
Steamship service, 1275, 1488, 1712, 1714, 2253-62
Sugar imports from, 3699-3700
Trade with, 1271, 1275, 1870, 2251

West Indies Trade Agreement. *See* Canada-West Indies

Western Canada
Antelope in, qu. 1134
Colonization Association, 2583
Natural Resources. *See* that title

Western Dominion Railway Company, 3343. *See* Private Bills

Western Provinces and Natural Resources
M. (Mr. Campbell) 2519. *See also* Natural Resources

Wharves and Breakwaters, for individual wharves. *See* their titles
Cape Breton, 4103
Lighting of, 1929
Repairs to, 1971

Wheat. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Elevators; Grain and Grain Trade; Transportation
Consumption and production, 3369
Credit to Belgium for purchase of, qu. 1001
Crop of 1920, 438
Marketing, 342, 346
Marquis, 1033
Milling in bond in United States, 3368
Pool, 391
Price of, 369, 3395
Rust, 341

Whipping. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Opium and Narcotic Drug

White, Sir Thomas, 451, 477. *See also* Leeds
Resignation of, 1619
Status of, 69, 463, 469, 477, 1294, 1326

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 548; congratulations to Prime Minister; grievances of the West; car shortage; Commission to investigate grain trade, 549; sentiment of the West; the Agrarian group, 550
Agricultural implements, 3394
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1818, qu. 1819, qu. 2098, qu. 2374
Budget, 3538. Alberta's representation in House; Government regulation of oil

White, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and petroleum resources, 3539; inadequate transportation facilities in West, 3540; freight cars for grain shipments. 3541; agricultural implements, 3544
Canadian National Railways
Car shortage, 548, 3541, 4322
Western representation on Board, 4315
Canadian Pacific Railway, patents to lands, qu. 2821
Cattle embargo, 704
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4234-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4236
Immigration, 2574-9
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3823-6
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, 2071
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2484
Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 673
Transportation charges on stock feed, qu. 2686

White Cross. *See* Burnham, Dr.

White Dog Rapids, 4172

White Grub, destruction by, 1030

Whitehead Life-saving station, 1991

White Horse, Judge at, 1088

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Wholesalers. *See* Sales Tax

Widowed Mothers. *See* Pensions

Wife Desertion. *See* Extradition

Wigmore, Hon. R. W. (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2500-01
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, 3821
Brokers, 4432
Certificate, form of, 3799
Explanation by Minister, 3786
New and unused goods, 3813
Preventive service, Victoria county, 4388
Provincial analysts' certificate, 3788-90
Valuation for duty, 4411
Customs and Inland Revenue Department
Belyea, Mr., retirement, 3082
Consolidation of offices, 3083
Estimates, 3077, 4117
Officers, 3083
Nova Scotia, 3096
Overtime, 4123-5
Retiring allowances, 3084

Wigmore, Hon. R. W.—*Con.*
Customs and Inland Revenue Dept.—*Con.*
Job printers, taxation, 4124
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4018-32
Personal business, Nagle & Wigmore, 3077, 3079, 3612
Shipyards, 1927
York-Sunbury election, Veniot correspondence, 3718

Wilson, Judge, superannuation of, qu. 1622

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Highway construction in Ontario, 4289-4300
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 3582, qu. 3904, 4252-3
Privilege—Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4448
Purchase of trucks by Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4291
Warren company, qu. 4252

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Highways—Saskatchewan, 4307
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill
Prosecutions in Saskatchewan, 4347
Unemployment and immigration, 1373

Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2095-6; 2r., com.; 3r., 2158

Windsor, use of armoury, 902

Wines
Imported, duty on, 3126, 3705, 3710, 3734
Medicinal, 3709
Other than sparkling, 3710
Sparkling, 3711

Winnipeg
Fort Garry Hotel, insurance, qu. 1348
Grain Exchange, 277, 335, 343, 379, 440, 489, 513. *See also* Grain
Grain laboratory, 1228
Proportional representation in, 1532, 1535, 1538
Strike, 3359, 3360, 3560

Winnipeg river., 2347, 4172. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Winter Fairs. *See* Live Stock

Wireless Communications. *See* Prime Minister's Conference

Wire Worms, 1027

Wolffe, Mr., 793. *See also* Printing Bureau, Destruction of documents

Woman Suffrage, 173, 527, 4474

Women Voters. *See* Dominion Elections Act; Canadian Nationals

Wood, Mr. E. R., 1609-10, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Wooden Vessels, 1714, 1728, 1871. *See also* Shipbuilding

Woods, Mr. H. W., 288, 331, 380, 513

Woodstock Exhibition, 1125

Wool Grading, 1121.

Working Expenses. *See* Penitentiaries

World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Wrecking Plants, 1990

Wrecks, Investigation of, 1988

Wright, Mr. A. A., and Labour, 1647

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 511; Congratulations to Prime Minister; Fordney Bill and its possible effect on Canada; Ambassador at Washington, 511; trade between Canada and the United States; adverse trade balance, 512; shortage of cars; Commission to investigate grain trade; foreign-born in Western Canada, 514; broader national spirit; national classification of census; leader of Progressive party, 515; commercial activities of organized farmers, 516; sale of American goods; purchases by Government in United States; Government's mandate, 517
Budget, 3565. Budget and taxation, 3566; Canadian Wheat Board; Agricultural and transportation difficulties, 3567; low price of farm produce and high price of farm implements, 3568; Farmers' platform, 3569
Civil Service bonus, qu. 967
Fish-breeding in Saskatchewan, 2185
Highways, Saskatchewan, qu. 1820

Yamaska By-Election, 1156, 1898, 3215, 3250, 3467, 4534
Boucher, Mr. Aime, 3422, 3423. *See also* Pierreville Postmistress; Park St. Charles
Mondou, Mr., 3251
Vacancy, 1293

Yarrows, Limited, 3649

York-Sunbury
By-election, 2151, 3475, 3480, 3627, 3630, 3662, 3637, 3717
Catholic Minister, and, 3480. *See also* Veniot
Vacancy in, 1293

Yorkton Judicial district, Judge, 1080

York, West, vacancy, 1293

Young. *See* Arthur Young and Company; Civil Service, Classification

Young Emergency Tariff. *See* United States

Yukon Territory
Administration of Justice, 1087